Pope and Horace:
Imitation and Independence

Thèse présentée à la Faculté des lettres et sciences humaines
Institut d'Histoire
Université de Neuchâtel

Pour l'obtention du grade de docteur ès lettres

Par

Megumi OHSUMI

Acceptée sur proposition du jury :

Prof. Jean-Jacques AUBERT, directeur de thèse
Prof. Margaret TUDEAU-CLAYTON, directrice de thèse
Prof. Paul DAVIS, rapporteur
Prof. Damien NELIS, rapporteur

Soutenue le 8 février 2013

Université de Neuchâtel
2013

UNIVERSITÉ DE
NEUCHÂTEL

Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines
Espace Louis-Agassiz 1
CH - 2000 Neuchâtel
Tél : +41 (0)32 718 17 00
Fax : +41 (0)32 718 17 71
secretariat.lettres@unine.ch

IMPRIMATUR

La Faculté des lettres et sciences humaines de l'Université de Neuchâtel, sur les rapports de M. Jean-Jacques Aubert, co-directeur de thèse, professeur de philologie classique et histoire ancienne à l'Université de Neuchâtel ; Mme Margaret Tudeau-Clayton, co-directrice de thèse, professeure de littérature anglaise à l'Université de Neuchâtel ; M. Paul Davis, professeur, University College, London ; M. Damien Nelis, professeur, Université de Genève, autorise l'impression de la thèse présentée par Mme Megumi Ohsumi en laissant à l'auteur la responsabilité des opinions énoncées.

Neuchâtel, le 8 février 2013

Le doyen
Patrick Vincent

Mots clés en français :

- Poésie augustéenne
- Patronage romain
- Poète et politique sous Auguste
- Littérature anglaise du dix-huitième siècle
- Traduction et imitation
- Etudes de réception
- Littérature comparée

Mots clés en anglais :

- Augustan Poetry
- Roman Patronage
- Poets and Politics under Augustus
- Eighteenth-Century English Literature
- Translation and Imitation
- Reception Studies
- Comparative Literature

Résumé

The present dissertation concerns Alexander Pope's Horatian *Imitations*, which were modeled principally on Horace's *Satires* and *Epistles*. It focuses on the parallels which the English poet sought to draw with the Roman poet with regards to his background as an outsider, his rise to success, and his views on the relationship between politics and poetry. The argument lies in the idea that Pope's motivation for composing the Horatian *Imitations* was based on multiple factors.

Taking a chronological approach, the dissertation consists of ten chapters and may be divided into three parts: Chapters 1-5 discuss the poets' origins and path to fame, as well as explaining the cultural and historical context of eighteenth-century English literature; Chapters 6-8 focus on poetry and politics and provide comparative analyses of Horace's poems and Pope's corresponding *Imitations*; Chapters 9 and beyond, while pointing out certain similarities, trace

the progression of Pope's wavering views towards the ancient poet until he eventually renounces the Horatian series.

The first chapter opens with Pope's birth and origins. Aspects such as Catholicism and physical deformity are presented as struggles which were unique to Pope, but the chapter demonstrates how Pope in his *Imitations* cleverly manages to align his background with Horace's in accentuating their ability to overcome adverse circumstances.

The second chapter attempts to define imitation in Pope's era. It also discusses parallel texts and argues that the purpose of the parallel texts in Pope's *Imitations* was to enable him to assume an authority that was equal to Horace's.

The third and fourth chapters concern Pope's ascent to becoming a renowned poet. Chapter 3 provides information on different classical authors as material for translation into English and highlights Horace as being one of the most popular. The chapter argues Pope's ambition in attempting to surpass Dryden as both writer and translator. Chapter 4 deals with the growing book trade in eighteenth-century England and the argument centers on Pope's persistence in choosing an independent path instead of relying on the system of patronage.

The fifth chapter on patronage first points out Pope's uniqueness in his refusal of patronage, and the rest of the chapter argues that Horace's patron-client relationship with Maecenas differed from that with Augustus.

This leads the reader to the chapters on politics. The sixth chapter contrasts Horace's consciousness of his limits on freedom under Augustus in *Sat*. 2.1 to Pope's temerity, in his *Imitation*, in defying censorship under King George II and Sir Robert Walpole. Chapters 7 and 8 focus on Horace's *Ep*. 2.1 and Pope's corresponding *Imitation* and argue that, unlike Horace's Augustus, Pope sees no hope of proper appreciation and diffusion of the literary arts by his king.

Chapter 9 presents the similarities between the two poets. It argues that Pope sees parallels with Horace, in such matters as their bachelorhood, but that Pope cannot detach the idea that Horace has become an insider in mainstream society while he remains an outsider.

The final chapter focuses on Pope's two *Dialgues* and posthumously published *1740*, which, though not based on Horace's poems, nevertheless serve as conclusions to the Horatian *Imitations*. The chapter argues that, although Pope eventually falls out with Horace, it is only so that he may turn his focus, from comparison with Antiquity, to the present and future of his nation and the welfare of his own people.

The dissertation concludes with Pope's newly adopted assumption that Horace was, unlike himself, a court poet. However, notwithstanding the apparent divergence, the reader is reminded that Pope's admiration for the ancient poet did not change. Furthermore, it demonstrates that, although Pope expects no improvement in the current Hanoverian regime, he still remains optimistic that a better England awaits his people in the future.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction **1**

Chapter 1 Early Years: Family and Education **9**

I. Birth and Family: "Parentibus Benemerentis Filius Fecit" 9

II. Barred from Education: Catholicism and Deformity 31

III. A Precocious Child: Literary Exposure and First Publications 40

Chapter 2 Imitation: "How far the liberty of *Borrowing* may extend" **55**

I. Origin of Imitation: Dryden's Metaphrase, Paraphrase, and Imitation 59

II. "In Horace's Manner:" *Opus Magnum* and the Horatian *Imitations* 71

III. Parallel Texts: "Let me be Horace" 75

Chapter 3 Classical Authors in Eighteenth-Century England: Pope's Choices **81**

I. Translations of Horace in the Eighteenth Century: A Highly Popular Poet 82

II. *Essay on Criticism*: Enter Horace 86

III. The Ovidian Enterprise: "The world forgetting, by the world forgot" 93

IV. Classical Philosophers, Rhetoricians, and Orators: "Still fit for use" 102

V. Roman Satirists and Martial's Epigrams: Popularity of Juvenal and Persius 108

VI. Pedagogical Texts: Literal and Faithful Translations 111

VII. Pope's Process of Elimination: Dryden and Epic 113

Chapter 4 The Translator and the Book Trade: "I am now like a wretched man of business" **123**

I. Status of the Translator: "They'll swear they understand all the languages in the universe" 126

II. The Book Trade: Publishers, Booksellers, and Printers 129

III. The Literary Market: Predictability and Profitability of Translations 148

IV. Readership: Class, Purchasing Power, and Profit for Writers 153

Chapter 5 Patronage: "Indebted to no Prince or Peer alive" **163**

I. Pope and Patronage: "Homer will at last do me justice" 164

II. Horace's Ambitions and Process of Elimination: "periculosae plenum opus aleae" 173

III. The Will to Succeed: "libertino patre natum" 186

IV. Horace's Gratitude and Resistance: From Maecenas to Augustus 193

Chapter 6 Politics and Censorship: *Sat. 2.1* and *The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace Imitated* **211**

I. "Ultra legem:" An Answer from Horace 212

II. Lucilius: "I will Rhyme and Print" 221

III. Law of Libel: "Such as Sir *Robert* would approve" 238

Chapter 7 Politics, Emperor, and King: *The Epistle to Augustus* and *The First Epistle of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated* **251**

I. Augustus in Eighteenth-Century England: "*Against the Emperor himself*" 254

II. The Beginning: Address to Augustus 262

III. Past and Present: Artistic Tastes 270

Chapter 8 Politics Continued: The Rift Between Horace and Pope **279**

IV. Society and the Arts: "Utilis urbi" 279

V. Poetry and the Theater: "*Praise undeserv'd is scandal in disguise*" 295

Chapter 9 The Similarities: "non qualis sum eram" **313**

I. The Countryside Retreat: "Good air, solitary groves, and sparing diet" 313

II. Mortality: "Near fifty, and without a Wife" 324

III. Waning Motivation to Write: "What will it leave me, if it snatch my Rhime?" 338

IV. The Younger Generation: "Vive, vale" 341

Chapter 10 Virtue: Fall and Redemption **351**

I. Parting with Horace: "Please at Court, and make AUGUSTUS smile" 352

II. Fallen Virtue: "A resolution to publish no more" 364

III. *1740* and the Prince Frederick: A New Hope 371

Conclusion **377**

Bibliography **385**

INTRODUCTION

The humanism of the Renaissance propelled certain writers to explore the life and career of Horace and to weave them into their own. Ludovico Ariosto (1474-1533) struggled with poor compensation and, more importantly for him, little recognition for his literary talent, from his patron, the Cardinal Ippolito d'Este. The strained relations came to a definitive rupture when Ariosto refused to accompany the Cardinal to Hungary in 1518. Ariosto's collection of *Satires* in which he reflects on his patrons, Ippolito and later his brother Alfonso d'Este, draws on Horace's first book of *Epistles* in which the ancient poet contemplates his relationship with his patron Maecenas. The English Renaissance dramatist and poet Ben Jonson (1572-1637) shared many similarities with Horace. Like Horace, Jonson came from humble origins, as he was the stepson of a bricklayer. And, like Horace who was educated in Rome and Athens and later fought at the Battle of Philippi, Jonson attended the elite Westminster School and for some time served as a soldier in the Low Countries. Jonson clearly represents himself as the character Horace in his *Poetaster* (1601).[1] Poets could identify themselves with Horace, and they turned to Horace to find ways of expressing their thoughts.

It is in these contexts of writers drawing parallels with Horace - seeking similarities in ideas and life experience, mirroring their status and circumstances, and searching for a model both in life and career - that I discuss Pope's *Imitations* of Horace. I argue that Pope's motivation for composing the Horatian *Imitations* was based on several factors. The first is the similarities in their backgrounds. Chapters 1-5 will cover the parallels which Pope can draw with Horace, from his origins to his rise to fame. The second factor is politics and, in particular, a poet's relationship with the powerful. As imitations invite both comparison and contrast, Chapters 6-8 will explore the contrasts which Pope draws between himself and Horace with regards to their attitudes towards their respective rulers. The third factor, discussed in Chapter 9, involves once more the similarities which Pope finds between himself and the ancient poet, but this time as a mature poet who shares comparable views on retirement.

Modern scholarship has of course provided deep insight on a broad range of topics concerning Horace and Pope. Fraenkel (1957) and Brink (1963, 1971, 1982) cover almost the entirety of Horace's works. Of relevance to this dissertation are the valuable research on Horace and Roman satire by scholars such as Rudd (1966), Anderson (1982), and DuQuesnay

[1] Cf. Moul 2010, 2-3 and 136.

(1984). Syme (1939) remains a groundbreaking work on Roman history, as it focuses on senatorial and equestrian prosopography, while Gold (1982), White (1993), and Lyne (1995) provide a vast wealth of material on Roman patronage.[2] W.R. Johnson (1993) and Galinsky (1996) study in depth Horace's social status in Roman society. Martindale and Hopkins (1993), Sowerby (1994), and Harrison (1995) study the receptions of Horace from the sixteenth century on. Rudd (1993, 1994, 2005) also offers further insight into Horace's poetry and its reception.

In England, Joseph Warton may be said to have written the first substantial critical work on Pope in two volumes (1756, 1782). Samuel Johnson recognized Pope's poetic genius and included him in his *Lives of the Poets* (1779-1781). With the exception, perhaps, of Byron, the Romantics, represented by Wordsworth and Coleridge, upheld as models Shakespeare and Spenser rather than Pope whom they deemed more a satirist and a critic than a poet.[3] Revival of appreciation and critical work came in the early twentieth century. Warren (1929) and Sitwell (1930) are among the important critics. Sherburn (1934) produced a scholarly biography of the first half of Pope's life, which was followed towards the end of the century by the comprehensive biography by Mack (1985), and also Rosslyn (1990). Studies on Pope's poetry appeared, such as Tillotson (1938), but most remarkable is the appearance of scholarly editions of Pope's works: Butt's Twickenham editions of Pope's poetry (1939-1969); his prose works by Ault (1936) and Cowler (1986); and his correspondence by Sherburn (1956), supplemented recently by Erskine-Hill (2000). Later in the century scholarly material was produced on specific topics: Shankman (1983) on Pope's translation of the *Iliad*; in the realm of politics, Brooks-Davies (1985) on Jacobitism and Cruickshanks and Erskine-Hill (2004) on the Atterbury Plot; Griffin (1978) and Ferguson (1986) on the person of Pope; Nussbaum (1984), Pollak (1985), and Rumbold (1989) on Pope and women; Nicolson and Rousseau (1968) on Pope's deformity; and Guerinot (1969) and Bateson and Joukovsky (1971) on the criticisms which the poet received.

There has also been a fairly constant flow of scholarly works on Pope, imitation, and the "Augustan" age. Lejay (1911) and Fiske (1920) from the early twentieth century have been followed by Brower (1959), Maresca (1966), Aden (1969), Weinbrot (1978, 1982), and Erskine-Hill (1983). My approach is comparable to Stacks (1985) and Fuchs (1989) in that this is a study devoted to Pope's Horatian *Imitations*. Stack argues that Pope's *Imitations* are

[2] Lyne (1995), focusing primarily on the *Odes*, discusses the relationship between politics and Horace's position as public poet. See also the review by Tarrant (1996), who takes a rather critical view of Lyne's book.
[3] See, for example, Rosslyn 1990, 1.

highly original poems. He examines Pope's interpretations of Horace which are present in the *Imitations*, and he demonstrates Pope's originality by actively comparing the *Imitations* to contemporary receptions found in the commentaries of Dacier and Shaftesbury, respectively from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Fuchs focuses on the aspect of comparison in imitation. He argues the validity of Pope's *Imitations*, as they enable Pope to compare and contrast his circumstances with Horace's in order to gain a deeper understanding of his own life and society. Both Stack and Fuchs arrive at the conclusion that Pope's Horatian *Imitations* lead to a "darkening struggle" as Pope realizes that "Horace will gain [him] nothing."[4] My focus lies in Pope's motivation to imitate Horace's poems and, more specifically, in Pope's status as an outsider, which he felt was comparable to Horace's. How a poet is made is important in that his life influences shape his views and are reflected in his works. I thus place weight on Pope's and Horace's origins and their ambitions for success, which stem from their consciousness as outsiders. Both poets have a lifelong desire to be understood and accepted – to become an insider in their respective societies. While I agree with Stack and Fuchs that Pope makes a departure from Horace, I show that in the two *Dialogues* and *1740* Pope, who has returned to his independent self, expresses not despair but hope.

The structure of this dissertation is such that I present material in largely chronological order, from Pope's background and early influences to the composition of his epitaph in the conclusion. In the first chapter, I trace Pope's life from his birth to his early literary career. It will at once serve as an introduction to Pope's background and to the ways in which he reflects on them decades later in his poetry in the 1730s. Citing mainly Horace's *Sat*. 1.6, in the first section I discuss Horace's expressions of gratitude towards his father and argue that Pope wishes to show that he shares the same view as Horace in his reverence towards his parents in the *Epistle to Arbuthnot* in 1735. In the second section I continue with Pope's biography with particular focus on his Catholic faith and his deformity, factors which contributed to his leading an isolated childhood and learning through self-education. These are aspects which differ from Horace, but I point out the ways in which Pope nevertheless successfully draws parallels between his early life and Horace's by showing that, although the nature of their barriers were different, they both surmounted difficulties in life before attaining success as poets. In the third section I explain Pope's early literary influences. It will serve to demonstrate how Pope read Horace's works in his youth, but that it is only when he

[4] Stack 1985, 278 and Fuchs 1989, 144, respectively.

reaches middle age that he feels a strong urge to relate to the ancient poet. The materialization of this is effectively the Horatian *Imitations*.

In continuation with the last section of the first chapter which deals with Pope's first publication, which is also a translation, the focus of the second chapter will be on imitation. Citing Dryden's Preface to *Ovid's Epistles, Translated by Several Hands* (1680), I devote the first section to distinguishing different types of translation as they were defined in Pope's era. I argue that the defining characteristics of imitation in Pope's eighteenth-century England were transformation to a modern setting and recognition of the original text. Drawing from Pope's own manner of titling his *Imitations*, I show, however, that there was no clear-cut definition of an imitation and that the term was used interchangeably with others, such as paraphrase. In the second section, I turn to the late 1720s, in which we have evidence that Pope was planning to produce work based on Horace's poetry. I examine how Pope began to contemplate Horace as a viable model in middle age. In the third section I focus on the parallel Latin texts which were printed alongside Pope's *Imitations*. I introduce other contemporary examples which provided original texts to explain that, though not frequent, the use of parallel texts was not unique to Pope. I suggest that Pope's intention in providing the original Latin falls in line with the conventions of imitation and its characteristic switch to a contemporary setting. Pope wished to highlight the similarities between himself and Horace, but he also wanted to expose the different social and political situations in which they lived.

The third chapter examines the popularity of classical translations in eighteenth-century England as well as Pope's interests in Greek and Roman works. I argue in this chapter that, despite my claim that Pope turns to Horace only in late life, Horatian influence was already present in many of his earlier works. I explain first and foremost that Horace was the most popular classical author for translation in Pope's era. There were other popular writers such as Ovid, and I give as an example of this Pope's early work *Eloisa to Abelard* (1717). However, I show that we also find echoes of Horace in the same poem, as well as in the *Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady* (1717).

To measure the popularity of Horace, I discuss in this chapter translations of other classical writers. Translations from Latin works tended to outnumber those from the Greek, owing to the Latinate culture of education and literature in eighteenth-century England. I thus explain that while Lucretius and Seneca enjoyed some popularity, translations of Plato were few in number. Likewise, poetry was more appreciated than prose. I show that relatively few translations of classical philosophers, rhetoricians, and orators appeared, because the

voluminous prose works of Livy and Tacitus in Latin and Herodotus and Thucydides in Greek proved to be too burdensome for translators. Many prose translations, usually accompanied by parallel texts, were for educational use, and I conclude that translations for pedagogical purposes, which were literal and faithful, stood in stark contrast to Pope's imitations which allow room for creativity, interpretation, and even alterations. The last section is consecrated to an analysis of Pope's intentions in his rise to fame. While epic was the most highly regarded genre and Pope looked up to Virgil, he was aware of the incontestable authority of Dryden's complete translation of the *Aeneid*. I argue that it was through a process of elimination that Pope arrived at the idea of producing a complete translation of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

I continue in the fourth chapter on the topic of translation but here I focus on the economic aspects of Pope's translations. Both Horace and Pope had ambitions for success, and I argue that they took different paths in supporting themselves as poets. In the first section I explain that translators did not enjoy high social status in eighteenth-century England, and I introduce examples from Pope's correspondence which illustrate that Pope did not regard the profession of translator, or editor, as prestigious. The second section proceeds with an examination of the English literary market, in which I define the roles of printer, bookseller, and publisher. Pope was keen to earn as much as possible from his publications, and I discuss the importance of the Copyright Act of 1709 for an author in retaining the rights to his own works. I also enter into a detailed discussion of Pope's subscription venture with his translations of Homer. I explore the system of subscription and reveal that it was in fact a method of publication reserved for works for which profitability was difficult to predict.

In the third section I explain how translations offered certain benefits to agents, as it was usually cheaper to pay nameless translators than a renowned author with a new book. Sales were also more predictable as they depended more on the reputation of the original than the quality of the translation. With this in mind, I turn my attention to customers and the purchasing capacities of the public. I compare the incomes which some writers made from their books with the average cost of living in England in the eighteenth century. Books were an expensive commodity. However, purchasing powers rapidly extended to the middle classes in Pope's era, and I show that Pope prepared varied editions to accommodate different classes - all in an endeavor to maximize his profit.

As I trace Pope's road to independence in chapter 4, only the first section of chapter 5 concerns patronage in England and the remainder of this chapter is consecrated to Horace and

Roman patronage. After demonstrating that it was a hard-won route for Pope to become an independent poet in eighteenth-century England, I argue that it was equally difficult for Horace to be a client-poet in ancient Rome where he had no choice but to remain socially, and also perhaps financially, dependent on powerful patrons. I trace the circumstances which led Horace to aspire to a literary career, and I focus particularly on his methods of *recusatio* in writing under patronage. Drawing examples from *Carm*. 1.6, 2.1, 4.2, and 4.15, I examine the various reasons which he provided in his refusal to write about powerful Roman rulers. In the third section I cite from *Sat*. 2.3, 2.6, and 2.7 to illustrate how, once derided as a "libertino patre natum" (*Sat*. 1.6.46) and with a failed military career, his ambitions led to success and he claims that he has become an object of envy.

I discuss also Horace's manner of walking the fine line between gratitude and resistance towards Maecenas. Citing the various ways in which the poet interacts with his *amicus*, from expressions of gratitude in *Sat*. 1.6 and *Carm*. 2.7, flattery in *Carm*. 1.1, as a devoted and caring companion in *Epod*. 1, *Carm*. 2.17, and *Carm*. 3.29, to resistance towards Maecenas in *Ep*. 1.1 and *Ep*. 1.7, I argue that the relationship between Horace and Maecenas went beyond that of a client and patron and exhibited signs of true friendship. However, a major transition occurs in Horace's career as Maecenas fades from the scene and he must embrace Augustus as his new patron. I conclude the chapter by demonstrating that political factors played an effect on literary patron-client relationships.

Politics in fact was not negligible for both Horace and Pope, and it is the central theme of my discussions in chapters 6-8. I argue in these chapters that the relationship between poetry and politics is what led Pope to produce the series of Horatian *Imitations*. Chapter 6 concentrates on Horace's *Sat*. 2.1 and Pope's *First Satire of the Second Book of Horace Imitated*, the first poem in his Horatian series. Horace and Pope share in their resolution to write, but I show that the poets' attitudes diverge, as Horace takes a stance of defense, but Pope one of offense. I demonstrate that, though Horace knows that he may never be able to write as freely as Lucilius, he realizes that he can benefit from the protection provided by the current ruling powers. Pope, on the other hand, who can cite only political outcasts and retired aristocrats as his friends, sees no compromise and declares that he will write to expose the vices of English men and the English nation. I also discuss the precautions given by the poets' figures of lawyers and the poets' reactions to them, and I conclude that Pope claims that he will compose poems "Such as Sir *Robert* would approve" (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.153) only to appease his lawyer.

Chapters 7 and 8 continue with the theme of politics, but they focus on Horace's *Epistle to Augustus* (*Ep*. 2.1) and Pope's rendering, *The First Epistle of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated*. I argue in these chapters that Horace in his belief in the *princeps*' capacity for proper judgment makes a plea to Augustus for a better appreciation of poets, but that Pope in his hopelessness towards George II makes no such plea for improvement. I offer my views on how Pope interpreted Horace's attitude towards the emperor. While Pope saw that Horace's purpose of the *Epistle* was "*to render* Augustus *more their Patron*," Horace did not resort entirely to flattery and actually voiced criticism "*against the Emperor himself*."[5] In the course of the chapter I also discuss the difference between Horace's plea that a poet can be "utilis urbi" (*Ep*. 2.1.124) and Pope's claim for his poetry that it "benefits mankind" (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.191). I conclude by pointing out Pope's emphasis in his *Imitation* that his king fostered no Virgil or Varius and how he makes it clear that he will write nothing to please the king, as "*Praise undeserv'd is scandal in disguise*" (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.413).

In Chapter 9, I argue that Pope turns to Horace again to seek similarities and guidance as he reaches middle age. Citing Horace's *Ep*. 2.2 and Pope's *Imitation* of the original, I explain that both Horace and Pope loved the country as it allowed for calm reflection and poetic inspiration. I conclude, however, by pointing out that one must not neglect the fact that Pope as a Catholic had no choice but to live outside of London while Horace was an accepted member of the elite circle in Rome. Pope and Horace also shared a sense of isolation. After the deaths of several longtime friends and especially his mother, Pope finds solace in Horace who, like himself, remained a bachelor and has no known offspring. I show that in imitating Horace's *Ep*. 2.2 and 1.7, Pope, who owns no property and has no heir, attempts to convince himself that it suffices for him to have lived a life in independence and liberty. The two poets also feel a decreased motivation to write, and I explain that, in their later poetry, they turn to the younger generation to bestow hopes for the future on their juniors.

The tenth and final chapter is consecrated to a discussion of Pope's two concluding poems to the Horatian series, *One Thousand Seven Hundred and Thirty Eight. A Dialogue Something like Horace* and *Dialogue II*, and the posthumously published *1740*. I argue that these poems make clear Pope's departure from Horace as the eighteenth-century poet returns to his public self. I explain that Horace is not mentioned again after the first *Dialogue* because he is no longer a fit model for Pope who returns to his role as promoter of public virtue and expresses opposition to the government. In discussing Pope's descriptions of Vice and Virtue

[5] *TE*, 4:191.

in the two *Dialogues*, I show that Pope still hopes for a bright future in England. Finally, in my analysis of *1740* I explain that Pope entrusts this hope on the political and national level to Frederick, Prince of Wales.

Pope's poems are quoted from the Twickenham edition (abbreviated *TE*). Quotations of Pope's letters are found in George Sherburn's edition of *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope* (abbreviated *Corr*.). Some new letters not included in Sherburn's *Correspondence* are from Erskine-Hill's *Selected Letters* (2000). For Horace's poems I use the Teubner edition by Shackleton Bailey (2008). Unless otherwise indicated, all translations are mine.

Chapter 1
Early Years: Family and Education

As Howard Erskine-Hill has stated, "Of all ancient writers Horace was arguably the one with whom Pope most closely identified,"[1] Pope felt a deep personal attachment to Horace. In this introductory chapter, I explore this special admiration with which Pope viewed Horace. By charting Pope's path, from his birth to his first possible encounters with Horace in his education and the influences which he absorbed from his early mentors William Walsh and Sir William Trumbull, among others, I will investigate the journey by which Pope became acquainted with classical literature and with Horace. Pope was familiar with Horace since youth. Horace was certainly not an author whom he discovered late in life.

Although the first Horatian *Imitation* did not appear until 15 February 1733, when Pope was forty-four years old, Horace was always somewhere in his mind, scattered in his correspondence and, as we shall see in Chapter 2, alluded to in his earlier works. One of the obvious similarities that come to mind regarding the two poets is their status as an outsider. By this I refer to the famous account of Horace as a freedman's son (*Sat*. 1.6.6) and to Pope's Catholic faith and physical deformity. Although relatively affluent, neither came from a background of privileged status in their respective societies. I suggest that this is one of the reasons why Pope decided to imitate Horace in late life. In looking back on his early life and career, he sees parallels between Horace and himself, regarding his family, especially his father, and, as will be discussed in Chapter 3, the advancement of his career, particularly with regards to their choice of material in making their own name. This chapter will trace the eighteenth-century poet's early years, and it will highlight the similarities which Pope retained in his mind and which in later life were to find expression in the composition of the *Imitations*.

I. Birth and Family: "Parentibus Benemerentis Filius Fecit"[2]

[1] Erskine-Hill 2000, 374.
[2] This is part of the inscription placed on the family monument in Twickenham Church. The entire text, as printed in a footnote to the *Epistle to Arbuthnot* (381), is:

D.O.M.
ALEXANDRO POPE, VIRO INNOCUO
PROBO, PIO, QUI VIXIT ANNOS LXXV, OB. MDCCXVII.
ET EDITHAE CONJUGI INCULPABILI, PIENTISSIMAE,

Pope was born on 21 May 1688,[3] in Plough Court, near Lombard Street, in the commercial district of London. Pope's father Alexander Pope senior (1646-1717) came from a family in Oxfordshire.[4] By the time of the poet's birth he had become a successful merchant and was financially well established to provide for his family. With his brother William as his business partner, he was able to make considerable profit in international commerce. As Spence records, he "dealt in Hollands wholesale."[5] The brothers imported linen from Flanders and exported the finished goods as far as Virginia in the American colonies. Though the son of an Anglican vicar, he converted to Roman Catholicism as an adult, possibly in Flanders.[6] Although he had been married once, he was widowed in 1679 with a son named Alexander and a daughter Magdalen. The motherless children were put under the care of his sister who was married to an Anglican clergyman, but Alexander died while still an infant in 1682. Pope's father remarried around the year 1687 to Edith Turner (1642-1733), who was to become the poet's mother.

QUAE VIXIT ANNOS XCIII, OB. MDCXXXIII.
PARENTIBUS BENEMERENTIS FILIUS FECIT, ET SIBI.

The English translation of this epitaph was published in the 1744 edition of Pope's "Last Will and Testament:"
To God the Creator and best of Beings,
To *Alexander Pope*, a Gentleman of Honesty, Probity and
Piety, who liv'd LXXV. Years, died M.DCC.XVII.
And to *Editha*, his Excellent and truely Pious Wife,
who lived XCIII. Years, died M.DCC.XXXIII.
To his well-deserving Parents the Son erected this,
and to himself.

(Cited in *Prose Works*, 2:505).
Pope did not order that the words "et sibi" be added to the actual family monument until the year before his death in 1744, when he was drawing up his will and wished the continuation of the inscription to bear the year of his own death. However, Pope's intentions were made clear as early as 1720, around the time when the epitaph of his father was inscribed. He told the stone-cutter then to leave some space for other epitaphs – for his mother and himself – on the monument. See the letter to Francis Bird, speculatively dated 1720 (*Corr*., 2:26-27), and the photograph of Pope's own handwritten original inscription in the frontispiece of the above volume of *Works*. Pope had long before his death expressed his refusal, perhaps resulting from the implausibility of an actual realization, to be buried in Westminster Abbey. In a letter to the Earl of Strafford from 1725, Pope, in reply to the question of where he would like to be buried, writes, "Where-ever I drop, very likely in Twitnam" (*Corr*., 2: 309). See also *Prose Works*, 2:504-15 and Spence 1966, 1:259. Pope also marked on the tombstone that his father was seventy-five years old when he died, whereas he was only seventy-one. Similarly, thinking that his mother was born in 1640 instead of 1642, he put ninety-three as her age at the time of death; she was ninety-one years old. For the inaccuracy of his parents' ages, see: *Corr*., 3:117 and 278; Rousseau 1968, 12-13n. See Sherburn 1934, 30 for his conjecture that the father may have explained his age to be four years older, so as to make it appear that he did not marry an older wife.

[3] Spence 1966, 1:2.
[4] *Epistle to Arbuthnot*, 381n.
[5] Spence 1966, 1:7.
[6] Erskine-Hill 2000, 385.

Edith Turner was originally from Yorkshire. She was the daughter of William Turner, Esq., of York, and besides her sisters with whom she lived into adulthood and even after her marriage, she had three brothers, the eldest of whom became a general officer in Spain and left her much of the family fortune.[7] Many of her family members were engaged in trade. The Turner family long wavered between Roman Catholicism and conformity. At the time when Edith met her husband, she was over the age of forty and was living with her sisters in London. The eldest was Christiana, widow of the famed miniaturist Samuel Cooper. It is very probable that, being over forty years in age, she was resigned to a life of an aging spinster. While Alexander Pope senior may have sought a second wife to provide Magdalen with a caring stepmother, it may well have been an unexpected surprise for the couple that Edith gave birth at the age of forty-five.[8]

As Joshua Scodel has noted of Pope's "intensely humble attitude towards his parents,"[9] Pope revered them both, expressing gratitude towards his father and displaying constant affection for his mother. He remained very close to both throughout their lives, and following the sudden death of his father in October 1717, he took his mother to live with him on the leased estate at Twickenham. Pope's father rarely appears in his correspondence, but, like Horace, Pope certainly made references to his father in his poetry. Pope follows the Horatian precedent in focusing on the biographical aspects of his own father on two particular points: education and moral rectitude.[10]

Although Pope's father did not live to see the success and fortune that his son would accrue with his translations of Homer and beyond, he seems to have in all respects encouraged his son's early literary endeavors. In addition to literature and languages, Pope explained in a letter to Henry Cromwell from 1709 that his father also "recommended the Study of Physick."[11] Edith Pope spoke to Joseph Spence of her husband's ardor regarding his son's education:

> [Alexander Pope senior] was no poet, but he used to set him [his son] to make English verses when very young. He was pretty difficult in being pleased and used often to send him back to new turn them. 'These are not good rhymes' he would say.[12]

We can thus assume that Pope's early efforts at composition, and perhaps his habit of extensive revisions throughout his career, were instilled in him by his father's method of

[7] *Epistle to Arbuthnot*, 381n.
[8] Rumbold 1989, 25.
[9] Scodel 1988, 618.
[10] See Johnson 1993, 20 and 24-25.
[11] *Corr*., 1:66-67.
[12] Spence 1966, 1:11.

training. Pat Rogers also remarks that, far from objecting to his son's aptitude for the literary arts, Alexander Pope senior must have been content to see his crippled son flourishing:

[Pope's] father had been brought up strictly as a tradesman, although he was the son of an Anglican clergyman; and doubtless he felt considerable pride in witnessing the progress his sickly offspring made through self-education.[13]

The father's background, "brought up strictly as a tradesman," implies not only a lack of formal schooling, but also that he could not or did not learn through self-education either. In her conversation with Spence, Edith revealed that her husband was mistaken in using the term "rhymes" for verses.[14] Pope himself does not hesitate to state honestly in his poetry about his father:

Un-learn'd, he knew no Schoolman's subtle Art,
No Language, but the Language of the Heart. (*Ep. to Arbuthnot,* 398-9)

While admitting his father's lack of education, Pope does not forget to recognize his good moral character: "he knew… the Language of the Heart."[15] From all accounts, it seems that the poet's father, though "Unlearn'd" himself, took a keen interest in a gentleman's education, which at the time would have been a curriculum heavily concentrated in the classical languages. Owing to the family's Catholic faith which he never abjured, and coupled with the boy's physical restraints, he was not quite able to provide the ideal schooling for his only male offspring. It is understandable, then, that he was doubly proud of his son who became learned in the Latin, ancient Greek, French, and Italian languages.

No reader of Pope and Horace would fail to recognize that Pope's tale of an "Unlearn'd" father who provided the best education for his son echoes Horace's representation of his relationship with his father.[16] One of the attachments which he felt to Horace was based on the model of a non-elite father who prepared the best for his son's future. It has been noted by various scholars that Pope must have had the following famous passage in mind:[17]

... [pater] qui macro pauper agello
noluit in Flavi ludum me mittere, magni
quo pueri magnis e centurionibus orti,
laevo suspensi loculos tabulamque lacerto,
ibant octonos referentes Idibus aeris, (75)
sed puerum est ausus Romam portare docendum

[13] Rogers 2007, 107.
[14] Spence 1966, 1:11. Pope the poet does not seem to have made as severe a distinction between those terms, as he uses "rhymes" on occasion to indicate verses, such as in *Hor. Imit. Sat.* 2.1.146.
[15] See Chapter 2 for Pope's use of the same phrase, "the Language of the Heart," in describing Cowley.
[16] Horace states that his father told him that the *sapiens* (*Sat.* 1.4.115) will instruct him more and better on moral principles.
[17] See, among others, Howard Erskine-Hill 1983, 314; Weinbrot 1982, 265-68; Hotch 1980, 428-43.

artis quas doceat quivis eques atque senator
semet prognatos. vestem servosque sequentis,
in magno ut populo, si qui vidisset, avita
ex re praeberi sumptus mihi crederet illos. (80)
ipse mihi custos[18] incorruptissimus omnis
circum doctores aderat. (*Sat*. 1.6.71-82)

My father who was poor, with a meager field,
refused to send me to the school of Flavius,
where proud boys born of great centurions went,
with their satchels and writing tablet hanging from the left shoulder,
paying their eight bronze coins on the Ides.
But he dared to bring his boy to Rome to be instructed on the arts
which any cavalryman and senator would teach their own offspring.
If somebody was to see my attire and following slaves,
just as in a crowded city, the person would have taken it for granted in the assumption
that those luxuries were provided by my ancestral wealth.
He being my most irreproachable guardian
went about himself among all my teachers.

At first glance it may seem that Horace, and Pope who followed him, saw that the knowledge gained in learning the languages and works of other major literary predecessors, was a valuable asset, an indispensable prerequisite in pursuing a literary career, and hence they felt it natural to express their gratitude to their fathers in their poetical works. Eduard Fraenkel has stated about Horace: "The poet knows that he owes more to his father than to anyone else," and, on Pope's describing his father in the *Epistle to Arbuthnot*, Jacob Fuchs comments that he "surely was attracted by Horace's splendid tribute" to his father. However, W.R. Johnson has observed that it must have been somewhat uneasy for the young Horace to constantly have his father by his side (*Sat*. 1.6.81-82) and claims that the father used "Horace as his pawn" to achieve the dreams and ambitions that he himself had. W.S. Anderson reveals his surprise in *Sat*. 1.6 that Horace, instead of finding his dominant father repulsive, "amazes us by crediting his father not only for the skills by which he has advanced to success but also for the ethical quality of his success."[19]

I suggest that the age at which the two poets composed the poems is significant. Detailed descriptions of praise about his father appear in the first book of *Satires*, particularly in the fourth and sixth *Satires*, which was published in 35 B.C.E. Horace was barely a man of thirty, and while he had already joined Maecenas' elite circle, he did not receive the Sabine

[18] Anderson has indicated that *custos* is "a position usually assigned to an elderly and trusted household slave" but that the father "did so with a moral, not servile, attitude" (1982, 121).
[19] Fraenkel 1957, 5; Fuchs 1989, 63; Johnson 1993, 28-31, citation from 29; Anderson 1982, ix. Cf. also Anderson's claim that he was an "authoritarian parent" (1982, 52) and his observation: "What is unusual is the totally acquiescent role that Horace assigns himself" (ibid., 55).

farm until around 33 B.C.E.[20] The freedom which he sought as a young man was freedom from his father's domination, as W.S. Anderson states that after the first book of *Satires*, "Horace has no further need of the old man and does not refer to him again except momentarily in the final poem of his first collection of Epistles, which were published some fifteen years after these Satires."[21] The situation was different with Pope. He was forty-six years old when the *Epistle to Arbuthnot* was published in January 1735, in between ongoing work on the Horatian series. Let us take a look momentarily at the passage in *Ep*. 1.20 mentioned by Anderson:

me libertino natum patre et in tenui re
maiores pennas nido extendisse loqueris. (*Ep*. 1.20.20-21)

You shall speak that I was born with a freedman as my father, and in slight wealth
I spread my wings wider than my nest.

Horace claims that posterity should describe him as spreading his wings beyond his nest ("nido") – beyond his origins and beyond life with his father. Unlike in the first book of *Satires*, he has already achieved this. This is in fact closer to Pope's mindset as he was composing the Horatian *Imitations*. His father had already passed away some fifteen years earlier, and he is looking back on his parental influences from a distance. There is no sense of forced gratitude or resentment.[22] Pope's expression of admiration towards his father was genuine, and one such outlet which he found to express this was through Horace in his description of the father's emphasis on education.

Another way in which Pope echoed the Horatian model is the pride with which he depicts his father's moral character. Despite Horace's humble descriptions of a father as a freedman (*Sat*. 1.6.6) who lived on a "macro pauper agello" (*ibid*., 71), it is evident that he had the financial means to send his son to Rome and thereafter to Athens, like many of the offspring of the Roman ruling elite such as Cicero's son Marcus and Brutus' nephew L. Bibulus.[23] Yet Robin Nisbet rightly observes that although the father's prosperity is apparent, Horace in his poetry "describes his [father's] moral instruction rather than his commercial

[20] Fraenkel has argued for the date of the gift of the Sabine farm to be "some time before 31 B.C., presumably not long after the publication of the first book of his *Satires*" (1957, 15). Bowditch explains that Horace may have been given up to five pieces of property; see Bowditch 2001, 57 and references.
[21] Anderson 1982, x.
[22] Cf. W.R. Johnson on Horace when the poet composed *Sat*. 1.6: "though deeply submerged, …resentment was still molten. The humiliation of the newcomer, the constant reminders of his inferiority, the unending shame from the hypocrisy of having to pretend that he (and his father) was something he was not" (1993, 29).
[23] Cf. *Sat*. 1.10.86.

capacities."[24] This is indeed the attitude which Pope decides to adopt. He asserts that he was raised by a righteous father:

Born to no Pride, inheriting no Strife,
…
Stranger to Civil and Religious Rage,
The good Man walk'd innoxious thro' his Age. (395)
No Courts he saw, no Suits would ever try,
Nor dar'd an Oath, nor hazarded a Lye:
…
By nature honest, by experience wise, (400)
Healthy by Temp'rance and by Exercise;
His Life, tho' long, to sickness past unknown,
His Death was instant, and without a groan.
O grant me thus to live and thus to die!
Who sprung from Kings shall know less joy than I. (*Ep. to Arbuthnot*, 392-405)

Pope's portrait of his father, of his mixture of mild temperament and deep sense of honesty, makes it apparent that it is indeed the uprightness of character that Pope wishes to convey in his poetry regarding his father.

This passage, though not belonging to the Horatian *Imitations*, recalls the autobiographical sketches found in Horace's *Sat*. 1.4.105-29 in which his father warned and pointed out to him examples of faulty men ("exemplis vitiorum," 106) whom he should not follow: the callow Albius (109); poor Baius (110); and Scetanus (112) and Trebonius (114) indulging in illicit pleasures.[25] As R.L. Hunter has pointed out, "Horace's father is both father and schoolteacher."[26] Furthermore, the line "O grant me thus to live and thus to die!" is reminiscent of Horace's claim:

si neque avaritiam neque sordis aut mala lustra
obiciet vere quisquam mihi, purus et insons
(ut me collaudem) si et vivo carus amicis:
causa fuit pater his. (*Sat*. 1.6.68-71)

If truly nobody lays to my charge avarice, turpitude, or filthy lairs,
for let me praise myself as being free of faults and harm,
and if I live loved by friends,
my father is the reason for all this.

[24] Nisbet 2007, 8. W.R. Johnson states of Horace's description of his father's "pauper agello" (*Sat*. 1.6.71) as "reinventing the truth hugely" and reasserts that the father amassed a fortune from being a *coactor*, not a poor farmer (1993, 25and 28). Cf. Zetzel: "Autobiographical anecdotes are always suspect, and even more so in the *Satires*, in which every statement of almost any kind is suspect, owing to the constant irony and self-contradictions of the speaker's voice: it is quite apparent that 'Horace' is not – or at least is not consistently – Horace" (2002, 39).
[25] See Anderson 1982, 13-49 for Horace's style of moral instruction through the illustration of negative examples in the first book of *Satires*.
[26] Hunter 1985, 490.

Both poets express not only their desire to inherit, but also the hope that they have inherited as adults, the goodness of character which their fathers demonstrated.[27] The only difference, however, is that for Pope the exemplary model is his father, whereas Horace presents negative models pointed out by his father. I do not doubt that Horace thought very highly of his father. His statement, "Nil me paeniteat sanum patris huius" ("Never in my right mind would I regret having this man as my father") (*Sat.* 1.6.89), is a strong and clear declaration. There is no doubt either that his father treated him well. One advice which Horace gives is: "pater ut gnati, sic nos debemus amici | si quod sit vitium non fastidire" ("like a father towards his son, we must not despise the flaw of a friend, if there is any") (*Sat.* 1.3.43-44). It reveals his own view of a father-to-son relationship, one that he deems should be replicated in friendships as well, and he illustrates with examples that a father dismisses the imperfections of his child and even finds them special (*ibid.*, 44-48).

Finally, the line in Pope's poem, "Who sprung from Kings shall know less joy than I," recalls the close of Horace's *Sat.* 1.6:

... haec est
vita solutorum misera ambitione gravique;
his me consolor, victurum suavius ac si
quaestor[28] avus pater atque meus patruusque fuissent. (*Sat.* 1.6.128-31)

Such is
the life of men released from wretched and weighty ambition;
I console myself with these in mind, that I shall prevail in a more agreeable life than if
my forefather, father, or uncle had been a quaestor.

Although not descended from nobility, like Horace, Pope is convinced that he will lead a happier life than one who is burdened with high rank and ambition. However, we must note that by "ambitione gravi" Horace means political ambition.[29] We must not confuse this with poetic ambition which, as we shall see in later chapters, both Horace and Pope possessed.

In addition to the moral values of his father which he has taken on and is grateful for, Pope asserts his filial devotion in claiming that he has not disobeyed or broken any obligation to his father. Regarding his choice of profession, he writes:

Why did I write? what sin to me unknown
Dipt me in Ink, my Parents', or my own?

[27] Cf. Anderson on *Sat.* 1.4.105-21: "Horace is paying tribute to the authoritarian aspect of his father and claiming that, in his own moral poetry, he has inherited the same propensity" (1982, 52).
[28] In *Carm.* 1.1, Horace hints to Maecenas that he is not one who strives to be elected to "tergeminis honoribus" (8). Rudd 2004, 23n. explains that these refer to quaestor, praetor, and consul. See Johnson 1993, 22 for his view that Horace's father did wish his son to become a quaestor, and even a consul or senator.
[29] Cf. Anderson on the end of *Sat.* 1.6: "[Horace] ironically proves that his simple, non-political form of life releases him from all sorts of miseries so that he can enjoy what really counts… what the foolish regard as a grave disability, obscure birth, turns out to be the source of great moral strength" (1982, 39-40).

As yet a Child, nor yet a Fool to Fame,
I lisp'd in Numbers, for the Numbers came.
I left no Calling for this idle trade,
No Duty broke, no Father dis-obey'd. (*Ep. to Arbuthnot*, 125-30)

Here Pope avows that, although he was skilled in verse since childhood, he did not disgrace his father in choosing writing as his occupation. While Jacob Fuchs takes this to be Pope's declaration of poetry as his profession as a "God-given" destiny, I.R.F. Gordon suggests that lines 127-28 perhaps contain "some slight exaggeration" of his poetic talents, though he concedes that Pope did show an interest in literature from a very early age.[30] I believe that this "exaggeration" is in line with the poet's confident declaration in *Hor. Imit. Sat.* 2.1.100 ("I will Rhyme and Print"), that he feels no fear in expressing his thoughts in poetry, as well as his rather boastful affirmation in *Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.2.68-69 ("But (thanks to *Homer*) since I live and thrive, | Indebted to no Prince or Peer alive") that his gift for poetry has indeed earned him a fortune. The *Epistle to Arbuthnot* was published in 1735, the *Imitations* of *Sat*. 2.1. in 1733 and of *Ep*. 2.2 in 1737. We know that, contrary to his proclamation in 1733, Pope does begin to fear the libel laws (a clear manifestation of this being his incomplete *1740*) as he continues to compose the *Epistles* and the Horatian *Imitations* in the 1730s. There is a shift in Pope's development. In the declaration in 1733 (*Hor. Imit. Sat.* 2.1.100), he hoped and aimed for the public's approval of his audacity in publishing his thoughts. The gradual change occurs as he senses that his temerity may upset the authorities and ensue in his being summoned to Chancery. He switches his focus, or, rather, his basis of confidence, to the fact that he had an innate gift for poetry (*Ep. to Arbuthnot*, 127-28) and presents the success of his translations of Homer (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.2.68-69) as proof of such talent, the financial aspect also serving as evidence that it has been recognized by the public.[31]

The passage itself reinforces the idea of Alexander Pope senior's tolerance, first, in supporting his son's budding talent, and second, in such a way that his son, as a grown man and renowned poet, can declare with confidence that he has not "disobeyed" his father. Pope expresses his respect towards his father for his tolerance and flexibility. He deliberately recalls to the reader's mind this passage from Horace:

nec timuit sibi ne vitio quis verteret olim,
si praeco parvas aut, ut fuit ipse, coactor
mercedes sequerer; neque ego essem questus: at hoc nunc
laus illi debetur et a me gratia maior. (*Sat*. 1.6.85-88)

[30] Fuchs 1989, 94; Gordon 1976, 6.
[31] McLaverty 2001, 186 sees in this passage already Pope's waning desire to write.

He feared not, lest somebody regard as a fault,
if one day I followed, as he himself was, an auctioneer or banker,
living on meager income; nor would I have complained of it myself:
but at present I owe him all the more praise and gratitude.

Horace states that his father, always a wise and righteous man, would not have been ashamed of his son even if, despite all the efforts at education, he turned out to be no better than himself.

The truth of Horace's origin, "*libertino patre natum*" (*Sat*. 1.6.6) has been much debated.[32] Horace's father was most probably taken captive and thus was a slave at one point in his life.[33] Horace mentions "praeco" and "coactor," two professions which are linked to the business of auctions. Eduard Fraenkel defines the two: "Whereas the *coactor* is concerned with the financial side of the transaction, the *praeco*… is in charge of the actual auctioneering and the preceding advertisement."[34] Nicholas Rauh explains that while many *praecones* became wealthy, mostly by expanding their opportunities through business connections rather than from the actual service fees for auctions, most came from low social origins and they were never highly regarded in society.[35] There were reasons for this low social status. First, unlike farmers and artisans who contributed to society with their produce and products, *praecones* made profit only from their services as middlemen. Second, an auction at times meant that an aristocrat was financially ruined and had to sell all of his possessions. Auctioneers profited from the miseries of other people, and the social elite did not like being reminded that such a plight could befall them.[36]

Fraenkel has pointed out that scholia on Horace's mention of "coactor" indicate a *coactor argentarius*.[37] According to Jean Andreau, it was an occupation which arose during the first century B.C.E. The *coactores argentarii* were bankers, and many were freedmen.[38] While some became very wealthy, theirs was not a profession which they wished to pass on to

[32] W.S. Anderson 1982, 56n., for example, believes that his father was an imported slave from the Greek world. N. Terzaghi 1965, 66-71 claims that his father was originally a freeborn citizen, while his mother was a slave. W.H. Alexander 1942, 385-397 once hypothesized that his father was a Levantine Greek and his mother, a Levantine Jew.
[33] Gordon Williams (2009) questions the accuracy of Horace's account of his origins as described in *Sat*. 1.6. He further explains that Horace's origin as recounted by Suetonius is false, as, with no other source available, the historian himself took the information from the *Satires*. Williams's conclusion is that Horace's grandfather and father were native-born Sabellians who joined the rebel cause in the Social War in 90 B.C.E and were taken captive, and that they later regained their citizenships and wealth; this is how Horace's father became a *libertinus*. Williams' article originally appeared in 1995 in: *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration*, edited by S.J. Harrison, 296-313. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
[34] Fraenkel 1957, 5.
[35] Rauh 1989, 461 and 470. See also Gowers 2012, 240.
[36] Rauh 1989, 459-60.
[37] Fraenkel 1957, 4-5.
[38] Andreau 1999, 31 and 47.

their heirs. This was probably the case with Horace's father. While he never attained senatorial or equestrian rank, he made sure that his son received an education among the elite and that there was enough family fortune for his offspring to qualify as a knight.[39] Horace's father worked hard in the hopes that his son would be able to climb even higher on the social ladder.

While Pope's lines in the *Epistle to Arbuthnot* convey a defensive tone, one that is even somewhat truculent, Horace looks back in a placid manner on how his father would have been thinking of the future of his son – a freedman's son. I have already shown that Pope's father encouraged his son's literary interests and it seems safe to assume that, up until his sudden death in 1717, he must have been proud of the young Pope's early publications. As for Horace, the emphasis that he tries to make here is that his father, despite all the hopes and ambitions for his son, would have been ready to accept whatever outcome his son's future came to be: "praeco" or "coactor."[40] Doubt has been expressed about Horace's sincerity on this matter.[41] It was certainly not all fathers who wished their sons to become poets.[42] What matters is that his tender attitude towards his father is testament to his success. Despite his humble background and the defeat at the Battle of Philippi, by the time the first book of *Satires* was composed and published in 35 B.C.E., Horace knows that he is secure on his path to living a life among the elite.

Pope's *Epistle to Arbuthnot* (1735) is an autobiographical poem written during the period in which he worked on the Horatian *Imitations*. It thus contains passages about his father in which Pope most likely had in mind or even employed as models Horace's accounts of his upbringing. However, not all of Pope's descriptions of his father are based on models from Horace's poetry. For example, there exists a passage in *The Second Epistle of the Second Book of Horace Imitated* (1737) in which Pope inserts a reference to his father independently of Horace's original text.[43] In *Ep*. 2.2., Horace again describes his education in alluding to his days at Athens where he was sent to study:

> Romae nutriri mihi contigit atque doceri
> iratus Grais quantum nocuisset Achilles.
> adiecere bonae paulo plus artis Athenae,

[39] Peter White 1993, 6 states that to become an *eques*, one had to prove assets worth 400,000 sesterces or more. He (ibid., 12) and Armstrong 1986, 263 clarify that Horace must have become an *eques* before he met Maecenas.
[40] Anderson 1982, 58 suggests that Horace's father died at around the time of the Battle of Philippi and the confiscation of family property.
[41] Ibid., 57, 59, 72.
[42] Ovid's father saw no use in verse and attempted to dissuade his son from becoming a poet; see *Tristia*, 4.10. 21-26.
[43] Rumbold 1989, 17.

scilicet ut vellem curvo dinoscere rectum
atque inter silvas Academi quaerere verum. (*Ep.* 2.2.41-45)

I happen to be raised at Rome and schooled of
how much Achilles' wrath had caused damage to the Greeks.
Kind Athens added a little more art,
naturally as I wished to distinguish the straight from the crooked
and to seek out the truth in the woods of the Academy.

These lines are confined to a description of Horace's time in Athens and, unlike the description of his schooldays in Rome, there is no mention of his father. However, in Pope's version the poet writes:

Bred up at home, full early I begun
To read in Greek, the Wrath of Peleus' Son.
Besides, my Father taught me from a Lad,
The better Art to know the good from bad. (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.2.52-55)

Pope learned Greek not in Athens but in his own home. However, as his father did not know the "Schoolman's subtle Art" (*Ep. to Arbuthnot*, 398), the young Pope was taught from a "Lad," a priest named John Banister.[44] However, he adds that although his father did not receive a formal education, he had good judgment and moral sense, the "Art to know the good from bad." This corresponds to Horace's statement, "curvo dignoscere rectum" ("to distinguish the straight from the crooked") (*Ep*. 2.2.44), of what he learned in Athens. It is understandable that Pope mentions his father in these lines, though such a reference is not found in Horace. For, whereas we may assume that Horace must have traveled abroad to Athens on his own without his father, Pope was educated at home. This makes it natural to suppose that the image of his father was stronger in Pope's memories when recalling his education than in Horace's. Some twenty years after Alexander Pope senior's death, images of his father still linger strongly in the poet's mind as I will discuss at the end of this section.

If Pope follows Horace in his praise of his father, he departs from the ancient poet in his inclusion of his mother. We know very little, if at all, of Horace's mother, and much about her identity has been left to conjectures by scholars. Seeing the absence of the mother in any of his poetry, Niall Rudd has stated that "perhaps he never knew her."[45] Gordon Williams' hypothesis concerns only Horace's paternal grandmother, that she may have been a Sabellian woman whose status as a non-citizen may have accounted for Horace's father's lack of citizenship, as children of marriages between a citizen and a non-citizen were to be considered

[44] Gordon 1976, 5.
[45] Rudd 2004, 1.

non-citizens in accordance with the *lex Minicia*.[46] I am able to find only one instance in which Horace's mother is obliquely mentioned. It is when he describes himself as: "pauperum | sanguis parentum" ("descendant of poor parents") (*Carm*. 2.20.5-6).[47] It is the only mention of his parents in the plural, and, though her exact person and origins remain uncertain, it seems that she was certainly not of high birth. We are equally uncertain whether he knew or spent any time with his mother. As a child he was taken to Rome by his father (*Sat*. 1.6.76-80), but there is no account of his mother accompanying them. He had already been to study at Athens and had joined Brutus' forces by the autumn of 42 B.C.E. Horace was barely twenty-three years old when they were defeated at the Battle of Philippi. Thus, considering that much of his youth was spent at Rome and Athens and then at war, we may deduce that any interaction with or influence from his mother would have been slight.

Circumstances were different for Pope. Edith, who lived to the age of ninety-one, continued to live with her son until her death. Frequent references to her are made in his correspondence after the death of her husband in 1717 and especially during her final illness in the early 1730s. Nevertheless, his mother appears in only two of Pope's poems, and she is not mentioned in any of the Horatian *Imitations*. The two poems are *An Essay on Man* (1734) and the *Epistle to Arbuthnot* (1735). Although the *Epistle to Arbuthnot* was published after *An Essay on Man*, I wish to discuss this poem first as the following example relates to my earlier examination of the role of the father:

…that Father held it for a rule
It was a Sin to call our Neighbour Fool,
That harmless Mother thought no Wife a Whore. (*Ep. to Arbuthnot*, 382-84)

This is a continuation of Pope's description of his father's moral character, that he regarded it a "Sin" to deride a neighbor, and he adds a line about Edith as a mother and a wife. Although I may not go so far as to say that Edith's character is featured "negatively,"[48] the adjective "harmless" hardly bears comparison with the long earlier praise of his father. Edith is described as a good mother only in the way that she did no harm. Furthermore, as a wife she is commended only for remaining faithful and being no "Whore." There is another subtle mention of her as a wife later in the poem:

Nor marrying Discord in a Noble Wife. (*Ep. to Arbuthnot*, 393)

[46] Williams 2009, 155.
[47] Other references to mothers are found in *Carm*. 3.6.39-40 and *Ep*. 1.1.22, but they depict a strict one and a freeborn, respectively, and connote no personal connection to the poet.
[48] Rumbold 1989, 35.

Although John Butt indicates other possibilities, I believe that this belongs to the passage in which Pope describes his father (*Ep. to Arbuthnot*, 392-403).[49] Again, although she is described as a "Noble" wife, there are no specific examples of the uniqueness of her character which reveal anything about her. She is a "Noble" wife only in that she did not quarrel or contest her husband's ways ("Nor marrying Discord").[50] One may be led to suppose that Pope privileges his father, while his mother tends to be of secondary importance, occupying a subordinate position next to her husband. This, however, is not the case.

In fact, one of the striking features about the mother-and-son relationship is the deep devotion which Pope showed towards his mother. Towards the end of the poem he describes the days of her final illness:

Me, let the tender Office long engage
To rock the Cradle of reposing Age,
With lenient Arts extend a Mother's breath, (410)
Make Languor smile, and smooth the Bed of Death,
Explore the Thought, explain the asking Eye,
And keep a while one Parent from the Sky! (*Ep. to Arbuthnot*, 408-13)

Fragments of this passage are found in a letter to Aaron Hill which Pope wrote on 3 September 1731. Since Edith died in 1733, it then makes sense that, although the poem was published after her death, Pope had written the lines during her final illness. In the letter he describes that his mother is in "constant and regular Decay" and claims that "she is now on her last Bed."[51] What Pope termed "soft Cares" in the verses in the letter have been replaced in the *Epistle to Arbuthnot* with "tender Office." He must have unhesitatingly assumed it his duty to put himself in the position of caretaker. There is gentleness in Pope's words ("tender," "Cradle," "lenient," and "smooth"), but as the illness worsens and yet lingers, he begins to regard his duty as an "Office," as if it was a rigorous, full-time occupation. He is worn out. That is no surprise considering that, at the time when the fragments of poem were written in the letter in 1731, Pope was already forty-three years old himself. In as much as his "Office" requires him "to rock the Cradle of reposing Age," meaning his mother, he senses his own mortality.[52] However, it is not yet quite the time for Pope to contemplate his own end. For

[49] See Butt: "Horace Walpole and other critics have supposed that this refers to Dryden's marriage with Lady Elizabeth Howard, and Addison's with the Countess of Warwick" (*TE*, 4:126n.). More recent scholars, such as Rumbold 1989, 35, assumes that the passage refers to Pope's father and his wife.
[50] Despite noticing on occasion her husband's lack of learning in calling verses "rhymes," she let her husband take charge of their son's training; see Spence 1966, 1:11.
[51] *Corr*., 3:226. In the letter Pope explains to Hill that he is sharing some verses – later to become the *Epistle to Arbuthnot* - which he plans to send to "a particular Friend;" this "Friend" has not been identified.
[52] The "Friend" to whom Pope originally wrote the verses is also a "successful Youth" (*ibid*., 226), and part of the affinity which he felt for Horace is the shared vision of aging and mortality, in particular of the waning

now, facing the approaching departure of his beloved mother, he seeks to "keep a while one Parent from the Sky!"

The fourth and final epistle of *An Essay on Man* was published on 24 January 1734. The exact dates of composition of the four epistles are uncertain, but we may assume, from Bolingbroke's letter, that Pope had completed the first three epistles and had begun the fourth by the summer of 1731.[53] It is important to keep in mind that Edith died on 7 June 1733 and that, though not published until 1734 and 1735, Pope had begun working on the poems before her death. As Paul Baines has noted,[54] the early 1730s for Pope was a time of loss and grief, as he saw several of his intimate friends and family pass away. Lamenting of "ills or accidents that chance to all" (*Essay on Man*, 4.98), he writes of his mother:

Or why so long (in life if long can be)
Lent Heav'n a parent to the poor and me? (*Essay on Man*, 4.109-10)

These lines come at the end of a list of those who died in "accidents," namely those who were slain in battle, and those by "illness," including his friend Robert Digby (104) who died at the age of forty. In providing the list Pope attempts to illustrate that even those who live courageous and exemplary lives are sometimes subject to abrupt and unexpected ends, and he cites his own mother as the final example in such a list. However, there is a discrepancy to be noticed. The earlier examples which he cites are those who died prematurely, on a battlefield or by disease. Thus the question is: why does God sometimes make brave, good men die at a relatively young age? Pope's question regarding his mother is quite different: why has "Heav'n" "lent" him "a parent" for "so long"? Edith indeed lived a long life. I believe that Pope here is wondering why such a good, generous mother as Edith was made subject to a long life caring for a crippled offspring: "the poor and me."[55] Although there is no formal apology or excuses presented, Pope's tone is apologetic, as if he feels that Edith should have been granted, long or short, an easier life than the one she endured. We shall see another instance of Pope's sentiments of gratitude mixed with feelings of sorrow in the letter to Mrs. Newsham.

While the *Essay on Man* and the *Epistle to Arbuthnot* are the only two poems in which he makes mention of his mother, much of Pope's tender feelings for his mother are in fact expressed elsewhere than in his poetry. On his mother's deathbed it was Pope who assumed

---

motivation to write and the increasing feeling that it is time to hand the baton to the younger generation; see Chapter 9 for details on these aspects in Pope and Horace.
[53] *Ibid*., 213-14.
[54] Baines 2000, 35. See also Chapter 9.
[55] See Section II in this chapter on Pope's deformity.

the "tender Office" of caring for her, but it was as if the roles were reversed, since, for many decades leading up to her final illness, it was the mother who had to tend to her disabled son. Pope's career took off at a fairly young age and there was no need for him to be diffident about his poetic talent, but he had many reservations when it came to his physical condition. Hesitation regarding intimacy with women made Pope turn to his mother as a substitute companion of the opposite sex. In the autumn of 1724 he writes a letter to Mrs. Newsham in which he explains:

I am so unfashionable as to think my Mother the best friend I have, for she is certainly the most partial one. Therefore as she thinks the best of me, she must be the kindest to me. And I am morally certain she does that without any difficulty, or art, which it would cost the devil and all of pains for any body else to do.[56]

While it may be true that his deformity drained his confidence in relations with women, the sentiments which the adult Pope felt for his mother in calling her his "best friend"[57] is evidence of a somewhat disproportionate attachment of a son to his mother. This may explain in part why Pope's descriptions of Edith were rather curt; as a mother she did no harm and as a wife she was faithful and did not argue with her husband. The role which Edith plays in Pope's life goes beyond that of a mother. She is his "best friend," and in some respects one may even dare say that in later years it is as if she plays the role not of the wife of Alexander Pope senior but of Pope himself.

The possibility of marriage, which Pope shunned throughout his life, was in reality not as inconceivable a prospect as the poet himself thought. In 1717, Pope wrote a letter to Teresa and Martha Blount in which he recounts how a friend proposed marriage on his behalf to a woman whom he was fond of:

Here, at my Lord Harcourt's, I see a Creature nearer an Angel than a Woman, (tho a Woman be very near as good as an Angel) I think you have formerly heard me mention Mrs Jennings as a Credit to the Maker of Angels. She is a relation of his Lordships, and he gravely proposed her to me for a Wife, being tender of her interests & knowing (what is a Shame to Providence) that she is less indebted to Fortune than I. I told him his Lordship could never have thought of such a thing but for his misfortune of being blind, and that I never cou'd till I was so: But that, as matters were, I did not care to force so fine a woman to give the finishing stroke to all my deformities...[58]

The truth of how "grave" or serious Lord Harcourt was in the proposal may be debatable; such a marriage proposal, with a friend acting as a kind of proxy, may have been a joke. However, what this passage reveals is that in Pope's social circle, his friends did not necessarily think that Pope was completely divorced from the possibility of marriage. Lord

[56] *Corr*., 2:265-66.
[57] Pope also refers to his mother's forthcoming end as "the Loss of one's best Friend" in the letter to Hill mentioned earlier (*ibid*., 226).
[58] *Ibid*., 1:430-31.

Harcourt thought that Pope was marriageable. By this time the contract with Bernard Lintot for the Homer translations was signed, and Pope's career was rapidly on the rise. Financially, his prospects were certainly looking good. Rather, it was the lady, Mrs. Jennings, who was "less indebted to Fortune." Nonetheless, it was Pope himself who could not be convinced, as he was perpetually hindered by his preoccupation with his "deformities." The diction in the letter reveals that in Pope's mind such a marriage would not mean his *marrying* a woman, but his *forcing* a woman to live with his deformities. One can assume that a part of the reason why Pope never married was not because he could not find a consenting wife. His deformity instilled in Pope a deep sense of inferiority, and it interfered with his self-consciousness to such an extent that he shunned the possibility of marriage.

From as early as 1729, his Catholic friend John Caryll time and again hinted at the possibility of his betrothing Martha Blount, his life-long female friend. As Martha was Caryll's goddaughter and the reason for the Blount sisters' lack of marriage prospects was their father's fallen fortune, Caryll even offered to supply the dowry, if that would convince him to marry her. However, Pope replied:

> I have no tie to your God-daughter but a good opinion, which has grown into a friendship with experience that she deserved it. Upon my word, were it otherwise I would not conceal it from you, especially after the proofs you have given how generously you would act in her favour; and I farther hope, if it were more than I tell you that actuated me in that regard, that it would be only a spur to you, to animate, not a let to retard your design. But truth is truth. You will never see me change my condition any more than my religion, because I think them both best for me.[59]

He adamantly clarified to Caryll that the dowry was not the issue, but that his relationship to Martha was only one of "friendship." Pope's *An Epistle to A Lady*, the "Lady" being undoubtedly Martha Blount, was published many years later in 1735, but it was circulating in manuscript form as early as 1733. Caryll, who read the end of this poem, supposed that Pope had finally made his decision to wed Martha. The lines which caught his eye were:

> The gen'rous God, who Wit and Gold refines,
> And ripens Spirits as he ripens Mines,
> Kept Dross for Duchesses, the world shall know it,
> To you gave Sense, Good-humour, and a Poet. (*Epistle to A Lady*, 289-92)

"You" most probably refers to Martha, and the "poet" could well indicate Pope himself. Caryll naturally read that God gave Martha a poet, Pope, and thus interpreted it as Pope's declaration of marriage to his Catholic female companion. Having learned of this, Pope denied dropping such a hint, and he laughed off the possibility of marriage with her: "Your other question about intending marriage made me laugh; for if that line [in the poem] meant

[59] *Ibid*., 3:75.

any such thing, it must be over."[60] Pope did do his best to provide for Martha. In addition to his sustained efforts to give her an independent life and to free her from the ill influences of her mother and sister, he approached his friends William Fortescue and George Arbuthnot to give her legal advice and helped her to start banking with Slingsby Bethel.[61] Seeing all the cares he took for Martha, not to mention the fact that he made her the chief beneficiary of his will upon his death, it is in a sense surprising that Pope did not join her in wedlock. Again, despite the irresolution stemming from his deformity, it was not that Pope could not marry. It was by his own choice that he did not marry.

I mention the topic of matrimony here because, in addition to the reason of his deformity, it seems that his mother was a major factor in Pope's refusal of marriage. Following his mother's death in 1733, rumors spread that Pope was finally to wed Martha. As Pope was no longer burdened with the duties of caring for his ill mother and had lost both parents, those in his surroundings assumed that marriage would be the natural course to take. His half-sister Magdalen told Jonathan Richardson that it was "thought by many [that Pope] would declare his Marriage with her [Martha] on his Mother's Death."[62] Despite such rumors, Valerie Rumbold argues that Pope's devotion to his mother was too strong for him to wish to marry:

> A strong reason for rejecting the secret marriage theory lies in its implication – at least as recounted by Magdalen – that in some sense Pope saw his mother as an impediment. In fact, his letters breathe no hint of relief at her death: rather they show him insisting on her continued importance. As he contemplated her corpse, he found her moral beauty captured in 'such an expression of Tranquillity nay almost of pleasure, that far from horrid, it is even amiable to behold it', and he asked Richardson to preserve in a drawing this 'finest Image of a Saint expir'd' (*Corr*., III, 374).[63]

That his mother occupied an important place in his life has already been made clear. However, it was not only her physical presence which occupied his life when she was still alive and was a companion and caretaker, but her spiritual existence dominated his mind and heart as well, so much so that it would not be an overstatement to say that his mother was the most important female figure in the whole of his life. Perhaps there never was any room for a wife.

[60] *Ibid*., 451.
[61] Rumbold 1989, 255-56; for more on Pope's insistence on Martha's need for independence, see Rumbold's chapter, "I love you upon unalterable Principles."
[62] Sherburn 1958, 348.
[63] Rumbold 1989, 46.

The obelisk which was completed two years after her death further testifies to his filial devotion. The words "Matrum Optima, Mulierum Amantissima"[64] inscribed on the obelisk which Pope erected in her memory in his garden at Twickenham attests well to the ever tender regard he held for his mother. Malcolm Kelsall states that, despite the Latin inscription referring to his mother, the monument commemorates both parents.[65] While it is a convincing theory that it was on account of both of his parents that the poet built the obelisk, thereby also reasserting the family's Catholic faith, Rumbold insists on Pope's overflowing affection for his mother. The obelisk was not constructed until after Edith's death, but Rumbold points out that Pope had set aside a specific spot when planning the Twickenham garden so as to erect in the future such a monument for his mother. She notes that the entire scheme of the planned layout and erection of the obelisk "goes beyond the obligations of filial piety."[66] Considering the fact that Edith outlived her husband by more than fifteen years, during which time she continuously lived with her son, it is by all means natural to see that she occupied a significant place in the poet's life and perhaps was of a larger presence than his father. The bond shared between the mother and son was certainly strong.

Nonetheless, in his poetry Pope attempted to remain faithful to Horace, that is, to maintain his emphasis on the humble training and moral integrity of his father, and not his mother. As stated above, the filial obligation which Pope believed in and fulfilled was one of the primary connections which drew him to Horace. In both poets, the gratitude and tribute expressed are sincere. However, just as clear as the similarities which Pope found in Horace are the discrepancies. The prime difference between Pope and Horace in the depictions of their parents is that Pope includes both his father and mother whereas Horace never mentions his mother. Rumbold states: "Horace had set a precedent for praising one's father, but there was no such precedent for praise of a mother. The very fact that Pope tries to include both shows his awareness that the Horatian model is inadequate."[67] This was due to the fact that Pope found it inconceivable to neglect his mother when given occasion to profess his thanks as a son.

The difference from Horace is then first that Pope insists on expressing gratitude towards *both* his parents. Secondly, it is Pope's unusually strong filial piety, which perhaps

[64] See Maynard Mack's *The Garden and the City: Retirement and Politics in the Later Poetry of Pope* (1969, 28-9, plates 11, 19, 21); Peter Martin's *Pursuing Innocent Pleasures: The Gardening World of Alexander Pope* (1984, 59-60, plates 26, 31); and Mack 1985, 366.
[65] See Kelsall 2007, 166.
[66] Rumbold 1989, 46-7; quote from 46.
[67] Ibid., 34.

even borders on codependency, particularly with his mother, which sets him apart from Horace. It is not a question of inadequacy then, as Rumbold argues, because Pope is writing an imitation and not a translation. As Fuchs has stated, the whole purpose of an imitation is that it "depends on contrast" and that it "must make outright departures" from the original.[68] It is the lack of an equivalent in the original Latin that draws the reader's attention. The deviation from the original in mentioning his mother stands out in Pope's version. Pope knew that this difference would be conspicuous and his devotion to his mother is what he wished to highlight. It is an important instance in which he deliberately ceases to follow the Horatian model in order to ensure that a personally significant subject – his mother – would be recognized by his audience.

That Pope composed the Horatian *Imitations* in late life is a key factor to notice. The passages on his family and origins date from his mid-forties. He is looking back on them. It is certain that he loved his mother dearly and that he was devastated after her death. He wrote to Swift in September of that year:

> The habit of a whole life is a stronger thing than all the reason in the world. I know I ought to be easy, and to be free; but I am dejected, I am confined: my whole amusement is in reviewing my past life, not in laying plans for my future.[69]

In the months following her death he traveled to Bolingbroke's at Dawley, at Oxford's in London, at the Carylls at Ladyholt, and in October he paid a visit to Lord Peterborough. He confided to Bethel about his constant travelling: "my home is uneasy to me still, and I am therefore wandering about all this summer."[70] The "dejected" and "confined" feelings understandably took a toll on his work, as he confided to Swift in September: "I have written nothing this year."[71] Yet as early as the next month, Pope indicated in a letter to Caryll that he has resumed work on his poetry again.[72] Pope gradually grows accustomed to his newly gained independence, and he learns "to be easy, and to be free." By the next summer, he is actively travelling and writing again, as Bolingbroke explains to Swift:

> He is now att Cirencester, he came thither from my Lord Cobhams; he came to my Lord Cobhams from Mr Dormers; to Mr Dormers from London, to London from Chiswick; to Chiswick from my Farm, to my Farm from his own Garden, and he goes soon from Lord Bathursts to Lord Peterborows, after which he returns to my farm again. The Daemon of verse sticks close to him.[73]

---

[68] Fuchs 1989, 17. Details of the defining characteristics of translation and imitation are discussed in the next chapter.
[69] *Corr*. 3, 384.
[70] *Ibid*., 381.
[71] *Ibid*., 384.
[72] *Ibid*., 390.
[73] *Ibid*., 413.

Pope's own health is good, and he has the time and peace of mind to make progress on his poetry.

Pope had consecrated many years to devoted care of his ill mother. The habits and attachment which he had developed turn into devastation at her death. However, I suggest that, after his period of bereavement and as he grows accustomed to her absence, he finally finds the time and composure to think back to his father. The passage discussed earlier about his mother in the *Epistle to Arbuthnot* was written in or by 1731. The exact date of composition of the passages on his father remains uncertain, but as the poem was published in January 1735,[74] it is not impossible that they were written after Edith's death. Arbuthnot himself was on his deathbed, and Pope managed to publish the *Epistle* just eight weeks before he passed away. *The Second Epistle of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated by Mr Pope*, the other poem cited in this section, did not appear until 1737. I suspect that the loss of older, fatherly figures such as Atterbury and Arbuthnot led Pope to recall memories of his long-gone father. It seems that he rarely if ever discussed his father with his friends, as there is scarce mention of his father in his correspondence especially after his death in 1717. His subsequent shared life with his mother, as well as her prolonged illness, gave him no time to look back. The verses which contain mention of his father were written around or a few years after Edith's final illness. Although there is no doubt of his love for his mother, the poet must have felt worn out, and this may also have contributed to his idealizing the image of his other parent, the father. It was in Horace that he found an appropriate vehicle to reflect on his father and, gathering scraps of memories decades old, to put them down in words for publication.

Regarding Pope's family, I wish to mention briefly one other member, his half-sister Magdalen. Although Magdalen accompanied her father in the new marriage and household, Pope did not live long under the same roof with her. At least ten years his senior, Magadalen was married to Charles Rackett of Hammersmith by 1694 and gave birth to her first child in 1695. While the Pope's and Rackett's were neighbors in Binfield and it was she who carried the manuscripts of the Homer translations to and from her half-brother's copyist,[75] Pope's relations with his half-sister Magdalen remained strained for much of their lives. The reasons for the tension were mostly due to pragmatic circumstances. In 1723 Magdalen's husband became the victim of Walpole's Black Act (9 Geo. I, c. 22),[76] and in most likelihood fled the

[74] The title page bears the year 1734.
[75] Rumbold 1989, 30.
[76] Here and throughout the thesis statutory laws may be referred to by their shorter citations. 9 Geo. I, c. 22 means that the statute received Royal Assent in the 9th year of King George I's reign and its chapter number is

country.[77] When Rackett died in 1728, Magdalen had to rely on half-brother Pope to support her as well as to pay off her husband's debts. It is also natural to suppose that, had it not been for her father's second marriage, she would have been the principal inheritor of his fortune and not her half-brother.[78] Accounts tell us that she did get along with her stepmother, as Edith was requested to come to aid Magdalen on the death of one of her infants[79] and Magdalen attended her ill stepmother in her widowhood.[80] However, unlike his mother and father, Magdalen is never mentioned in Pope's poetry, neither by her actual name nor under a pseudonym. The only oblique connection that we can find in his works is his mention of Sir Francis Page (*c.* 1661-1741), who sentenced the Berkshire Blacks, one of whom was Charles Rackett. There are two possible references to Page: "Or *P-ge* pour'd forth the Torrent of his Wit?" (*Dia.* 2.159); and "Hard Words or Hanging, if your Judge be *Page*"[81] (*Hor. Imit. Sat.* 2.1.82). As indicated in the latter line, Page was notorious for the rough manner of his speech as well as severity.[82] Pope is said to have received a clerk whom Page sent to complain of the appearance of his name in a negative light; Pope only replied that the blank could be filled

22. The Act went into effect on 1 June 1723. It was extended for five years in 1725 (12 Geo. I, c. 30). Amendments were made in 1754 (27 Geo. II, c. 15), and in 1758 the law became permanent (31 Geo. II, c. 42).

[77] Pat Rogers (1974) lists many specific cases of assault and property crime related to the Waltham Blacks, as well as the individuals who were arrested and brief descriptions of their ages and background. These included, among others, fishermen, innkeepers, and servants to farmers. Record is presented of the dates of arrest and bail of Pope's brother-in-law. Listed as "Mr Ragget" and "Gentleman" under the occupation column, he is the only person arrested, in the list of Berkshire Blacks, for whom a precise and accurate identification is possible. See Eveline Cruickshanks and Howard Erskine-Hill (1985) for another very insightful introduction on the origin of the Waltham Black Act. They explain that the Waltham Blacks were a gang who were originally smugglers who traded brandy and other goods between England and France, yielding huge profits yet often risking their lives in the extremely dangerous, illegal ventures. John Broad (1988) presents interesting observations from a political perspective. Listing incidents reported of deer-stealing by Blacks in the strongly Tory Berkshire and comparing them to the nearby yet more politically neutral Buckinghamshire where there were hardly any such reports, he explores the reasons why the Blacks were deemed as being involved in the Jacobite Conspiracy of 1722, led by the Tory Francis Atterbury. Broad claims that the overlap in the period in which the Black Act was introduced in Parliament in the spring of 1723 and the decision of Atterbury's exile in May 1723, as well as executions of other outspoken Jacobites, was no coincidence. He concludes that "it is most unlikely that links between Blacks and Jacobites were more than fantasies fed to the court of the Pretender" but that Walpole manipulated the "possibility" of the link in order to aggrandize the national fear of Jacobites (hence the unprecedentedly harsh penalties in the Black Act) as well as to advance his position in politics for successfully suppressing the two grave threats to the nation.

[78] See Rumbold 1989, 33 and 287-94 for the bitter sentiments and complications of the execution of Pope's will following his death on May 30, 1744. Magdalen, incensed to find that Martha Blount and not she, the closest blood kin, was the principal beneficiary of his will, attempted to revoke the purchase of the poet's Berkeley Street house (still incomplete at the time of Pope's death) and threatened to bring the case to court. Martha Blount herself, who never married, left everything to her nephew Michael and his wife Mary Eugenia upon her death.

[79] *Corr*., 2:4-5.

[80] Sherburn 1958, 348.

[81] A variation of this line was "… *J-ge be* –" (*TE*, 4:12n.).

[82] "Hanging" refers to the sentence Page gave Richard Savage for murder.

with any other name.[83] Although this may be taken as a quiet tribute to Magdalen, in most likelihood Page's name was just another in a long list of the men of vice whom Pope wished to criticize in contemporary England. The relation to Magdalen was usually strained and was tied up with formal property and legal issues. There was no place for her in his poetry.

II. Barred from Education: Catholicism and Deformity

Two important factors, Pope's religious faith and physical deformity, became the sources of significant hardships in his life. As Helen Deutsch remarks: "Alexander Pope seemed destined for the margins." [84] These two factors were later to become the defining characteristics of his self-representation as an outsider, a theme to which the poet himself was to allude to rather frequently in his literary works and career. What I wish to point out in this section is that these were matters which did not concern Horace. Pope was born into a family of persecuted faith, and, though not from birth, his deformity was not of his own choice either. While taking sides in politics or choosing a patron involves voluntary will, both choices which Pope compared with Horace, the dual burden of religion and deformity was a solitary destiny.

Still, he does his best to relate his circumstances to Horace's:

But knottier Points we knew not half so well,
Depriv'd us soon of our Paternal Cell;
And certain Laws, by Suff'rers thought unjust, (60)
Deny'd all Posts of Profit or of Trust:
Hopes after Hopes of pious Papists fail'd,
While mighty WILLIAM's thundring Arm prevail'd.
For Right Hereditary tax'd and fin'd,
He stuck to Poverty with Peace of Mind; (65)
And me, the Muses help'd to undergo it;
Convict a Papist He, and I a Poet. (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.2.58-67)

The original lines in Horace are:

dura sed emovere loco me tempora grato
civilisque rudem belli tulit aestus in arma
Caesaris Augusti non responsura lacertis.
unde simul primum me dimisere Philippi,
decisis humilem pennis inopemque paterni (50)
et Laris et fundi paupertas impulit audax
ut versus facerem. (*Ep*. 2.2.46-52)

But hard times forced me out of pleasant circumstances
and the tide of the civil war drove me, untrained, into the army,

[83] *TE*, 4:12-13n. and 374.
[84] Deutsch 2007, 15.

though no match for the strengths of Caesar Augustus.
Whence, as soon as Philippi discharged me for the first time,
as though with wings clipped, I was poor
and despoiled of my paternal home and farm.
Reckless poverty impelled me to compose verses.

Here Pope presents his life before he became a renowned poet in the Horatian manner. However, unlike the civil war in which Horace fought against the future victor Octavian and returned to find that his estate and farm had been confiscated ("inopemque paterni | et Laris et fundi"), the circumstances which led Pope to be "Depriv'd" of his "Paternal Cell" were quite different. Much of the sufferings described in Pope's version were caused because of his faith. Indeed, the religion of his family, the Catholic faith which Pope never renounced despite several well-meaning friends who advised him to do so,[85] was to have a substantial impact on the poet's life. To begin with, Catholics were by far a minority in England:

> [Pope's] co-religionists constituted a small percentage of the national population. They formed a conspicuous block of society in only a few parts of the country, notably Lancashire and Cheshire, although there was an important group of recusant gentry in the Thames Valley. …Some humbler folk in the provinces retained an allegiance to the old faith, but as yet there had been no large-scale immigration from Catholic countries to major centers, so that the urban poor were Protestant for the most part.[86]

Although Alexander Pope Senior had a successful business in London, Pope's family eventually settled in the Catholic community in the outskirts of London along the Thames. Religion was the cause of the major political disturbances in Pope's time, and Catholics, being a minority, were often targets of persecution. Socially, they were confined to small, cooperative Catholic neighborhoods and legally they were stripped of their property rights and were burdened with double taxation. In later years, it would also become a source of malicious criticism in Pope's literary career. As J.V. Guerinot has remarked, "Pope's religion constitutes the next [after his deformity]… most shocking object of attack."[87]

Pope's father retired in the year of his son's birth in 1688, apparently as a result of the "Glorious Revolution" when King James II was dethroned in favor of his daughter Mary and

[85] Jonathan Swift made a "Proposal" to Pope to give him twenty guineas for him to renounce his Catholicism and convert to the Anglican church. For Pope's reply on 8 December 1713, see *Corr*., 1:198-201. Another instance of attempts at persuasion occurred after the death of Pope's father on 23 October 1717. Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester, had suggested to Pope that it would be a wise decision to convert to Protestantism. For Pope's intransigent attitude, see his reply on 20 November 1717 (*ibid*., 454). I.R.F. Gordon has stated that the very fact that he gave his friends hope that he may agree to convert is evidence that, though practicing, he was "never a fervent Catholic" (1976, 116).
[86] Young 2007, 118.
[87] Guerinot 1969, xxx.

her Protestant husband William of Orange (William III).[88] Yet Pope is being ironic when he states that "mighty WILLIAM's thundring Arm prevail'd" (63). Although William was an advocate of religious freedom and had wished to secure a repeal of penal laws that infringed on religious liberty, upon his arrival in England he was met with fierce opposition by Parliament.

Earlier, the restoration of Charles II in 1660 had brought a conclusion to the Civil War, but England itself was in an unstable state in the aftermaths of the war. Howard Erskine-Hill outlines the different political theories which arose in the aftermath of the Revolution:

> [Some] theories of the [Glorious] Revolution were that James had abdicated, deserted, or "fallen from" the crown; that he had broken "the Original Contract" with his people; and that he had been overthrown and William enthroned by divine Providence. Variations of the first (*Abdication*) were highly popular.[89]

The idea of desertion by the king or a violation of contract would have roused a sense of betrayal among the people, and the Revolution of 1688 once again revived significant political unrest as the people sought, for example through these different theories, a rational explanation for the intermittent bursts of disorder in the nation. Moreover, since these were the days in which religion and politics were still inseparable, tumult over religious matters remained in England.[90]

The Popish Plot of 1679, when rumors spread of a supposed plan to assassinate Charles II, provoked a resurgence of antipathy toward Catholics, the influence of which dragged well into the 1680s. The accession of James II in 1685 caused once more an upheaval. In 1688, shortly after the birth of James II's son, a Catholic heir,[91] the king was ousted from the throne and subsequently fled to France. However, despite the recurring turbulences within England, Geoffrey Tillotson remarks:

> As England recovered itself in 1660 and set its face toward a safer kind of society, the parliamentary system developed as a mechanism for compromising differences in a civilized way: the concept of the *via media* spread out from ethics to color politics and social theory.[92]

The concept spread at the religious level as well, as Erskine-Hill reminds us:

> Since the Civil War England had taught itself renewed lessons of loyalty to the throne. Perhaps a majority of Anglican clergy, between 1660 and 1688, considered Passive Obedience "the distinguishing Character of the Church of England."[93]

---

[88] See Erskine-Hill 1996, 1-2 on Mary's death in 1694, the Peace of Ryswick in 1697, and the Act of Settlement of 1701, which led the throne to be passed from William III to Anne, and then to a member of the House of Brunswick.
[89] Erskine-Hill 1979, 16.
[90] See Grell et al. 1991 for more complete and comprehensive accounts of the history and religion in this era.
[91] Charles Edward Stuart.
[92] Tillotson et al. 1969, 2.
[93] Erskine-Hill 1979, 15.

Thus the invasion of England by William of Orange and James II's escape to France came at a precarious time when England as a nation was trying to find a balance of peace as well as religious tolerance, or "Passive Obedience." The dethronement of James II and the accession of King William and Queen Mary took place a mere few months after Pope's birth, and for a while it seemed as though "mighty WILLIAM's thundring Arm prevail'd," for, though he was ultimately not successful in reversing the penal laws, in the beginning of his reign he did prevent many persecutory measures from becoming new law.

But this did not continue for long. Brian Young gives a summary of the severe punitive laws which were introduced against Catholics:

> Catholics had to take oaths of loyalty, on pain of losing most civic rights. At the same time they were precluded from living within ten miles of the center of London,[94] and from becoming members of the legal profession. Out of fear that insurrection would break out, they were likewise forbidden to keep arms, ammunition or, bizarrely, a horse worth more than ten pounds. A particularly fierce law passed in 1700 incapacitated all Roman Catholics from inheriting or purchasing land, unless they formally abjured their religion. If they refused, their property was legally transferred for life to their next of kin in the Protestant faith. They were even prohibited from sending their children abroad, to be educated in their own faith. Finally, the measure laid down that any Catholic priests caught exercizing their vocation should be imprisoned for life, and it set a reward of one hundred pounds for informing against priests who said mass.[95]

As Pope describes, "Hopes after Hopes of pious Papists fail'd," as gradually rigid regulations began to be imposed one after another on the papist community ("certain Laws"). To remain a Catholic in one's own country became once again increasingly difficult and onerous.

Pope in fact owned a horse, a gift from Caryll. He wrote to his Catholic friend from Binfield on 14 August 1714:

> The greatest fear I have under the circumstances of a poor papist is the loss of my poor horse; yet if they take it away, I may say with the resignation of Job, tho' not in his very words, Deus dedit, Diabolus abstulit, I thank God I can walk. If I had a house and they took it away, I could write for my bread (as much better men than I have been often suffered to do); if my own works would not do, I could turn writing master at last and set copies to children. I remember what Horace said of fortune –
>
> Si celeres quatit
> Pennas, refigio quae dedit, et mea
> Virtute me involve,o probamque
> Pauperiem sine dote quaero.
>
> (If [Fortune] shakes her swift wings,

[94] The queen's proclamation was set against Catholics over the age of sixteen to remove ten miles outside of London and Westminster. The royal proclamations were issued and renewed in 1696, 1715, and 1744. This was in direct consequence of a Jacobite scare which occurred in the spring of 1708. Cf. Pope's letter to the Reverend Ralph Bridges dated 11 March 1708: "I am so suddenly Proclaimed out of Town that I have but just Time to pack up and be gone" (Erskine-Hill 2000, 17). Paul Davis has described Dryden and Pope as two "Roman Catholic 'internal emigrés'" (2008, 22). Dryden was a converted Catholic but, largely due to his established status, continued to reside in London; see Winn 1987, 436-37.

[95] Young 2007, 118. See also Aden 1978, 3-33 on the early religious and political challenges which Pope faced as a Catholic.

I give up what she gave me,
I wrap myself up in my own virtue,
and I ask for honest poverty with no endowment.)[96]

Pope is sentimental about the loss of his horse, but he remains realistic about economic matters. Though concerned about his uncertain future, Pope finds solace in reminding himself that Horace held similar views in his indifference to wealth and the courage to face adverse circumstances.

It is very probable that the anti-Catholic measures were the principal reasons which prompted Pope's father to give up his business in 1688.[97] He is said to have been worth £10,000 at the time, a considerable fortune which enabled him to provide well for his family despite the early retirement, but his assets were diminished to a sum between £3,000 and £4,000 at the time of his death in 1717.[98] It was also due to concern over the increasingly threatening regulations that Pope's father decided to relocate his family in 1692 to Hammersmith, where Magdalen had joined her husband upon their marriage. It seems that the Pope family's move to Binfield was a decision that sprung partly from the two families' desire to remain close to one another. Charles Rackett had purchased Whitehill House and put it out on lease. Following the departure of the tenant in 1698, Pope's father bought from his brother-in-law the estate which included some nineteen acres of land. Rackett subsequently bought Hall Grove,[99] and he settled his own family at this nearby house. Alexander Pope senior established his family in residence at their new home by 1700, and the family would remain there until 1716, when they would be forced to make a decision to relocate once more, this time to Chiswick, to the west of London.

[96] *Corr*., 1:241-42; quote from Horace, *Carm*. 3.29.53-56. "Refigio" is a scribal error made by Pope for "resigno;" see *ibid*., 242n. Translation is mine.
[97] Prospects of an impending war with France also made the outlook of future cross-channel trade bleak; see Mack 1985, 21-24.
[98] Erskine-Hill 2000, 385. Pope throughout his career was aware of the fact that he would need a constant cash flow in order to keep the standards of living for himself and his family.
[99] Matters became complicated for the Pope-Rackett household in the late 1730s as Michael Rackett, Magdalen's son, in addition to remaining a Catholic, had incurred debts. In a letter to Michael, Pope wrote: "As to the particular Estate of Hall-Grove we have the misfortune to find, (notwithstanding the Deed you formerly executed to your Mother) that the Laws here against Papists, render it Ineffectual to Secure that Estate from being taken possession of and Seized upon by Compares Executors for your Debt. We also find upon Enquiry, that the said Executors have taken out an *Outlawry* against you: by which means, the Moment my Sister Dyes, they will inevitably Enter upon the Estate and Receive the Rents in your Stead, till all the Debt is pay'd. As tis now near 800l. principal and Interest you would not now, receive any thing in *Twelve years*: The House will every year be worth less and less, (being in a Decaying State) and the Whole Land without it, is let but at 55l. a year: So that if my Sister lives ten years more, the Debt will increase to the *whole Value* your Father gave for the purchase.… I would Advise you to joyn with my Sister to sell Hall Grove, after her Death, to a protestant" (*Corr*., 4:160-61). It is significant that Pope reminds him to sell the estate to a protestant and not a Catholic.

The move to Chiswick, assisted by Lord Burlington, was a direct consequence of the Jacobite Rising of 1715. However, even before the uprising life had become difficult for Catholics again, due to the death of Queen Anne in 1714 and the accession of the new Hanoverian king George I. New laws were implemented, one of which required Catholics to take an oath of loyalty. This was one of the measures which, Pope describes, "Suff'rers thought unjust" (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.2.60), and Pope's father refused to do this.[100] Next, they had to register their real estate,[101] on which unjust taxes would later be levied in accordance to its value. This was what Pope refers to in his poem as: "For Right Hereditary tax'd and fin'd" (64). It was in order to avoid this that the Pope family decided to renounce their property. Upon their fleeing, it was Edith's nephew Samuel Mawhood, a Protestant, who eventually agreed to take the Pope family's Binfield estate in trust for them. Valerie Rumbold suggests that it was most likely Samuel, the son of Edith's married sister Alice Mawhood, who had introduced Edith to Alexander Pope senior. Samuel had left his native Yorkshire to become an apprentice draper in London, and as Pope's father was a successful linen merchant, the youngster may very possibly have been the initial link between the couple.[102] By all accounts, the departure from Binfield in 1716 was much lamented by Pope, as he wrote to Caryll with sorrow and regret: "I write this from Windsor Forest, which I am come to take my last look and leave of. We here bid our papist-neighbours adieu."[103] In addition to the loss of property, the numerous changes of residence by the Pope family truly concord with Pope's claim that they were "Depriv'd…of our Paternal Cell" (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.2.59), and not only once, but many times.

Horace was not afflicted by such circumstances. He did not belong to a persecuted minority who had to bear restrictions and punitive laws. It was on account of the civil war which broke out in 49 B.C.E. that his studies were put to a halt and that in 42 B.C.E. he suffered defeat while fighting on Brutus' side at the Battle of Philippi on the Via Egnatia in Macedonia. That is when he returned home to find that his land had been confiscated (*Ep*. 2.2.50-51). Pope's case was then different. From the beginning of his life, Pope as a Catholic

[100] See Erskine-Hill 1981, 132.
[101] Cf. Letter from Edward Blount to Pope, dated 23 June 1716: "Yesterday the Bill to oblige Papists to Register their names and Estates pass'd the Lords with many amendments, and this day was sent to the Commons for their Concurrence" (*Corr.*, 1:344).
[102] Rumbold 1989, 24.
[103] *Corr*., 1:336.

was debarred from enrolling in official schools or studying at a university.[104] I have drawn the contrast earlier that while Horace attended school among the Roman aristocracy and even went on to study at Athens, such opportunities, to receive an elite education ("To hunt for Truth in *Maudlin*'s[105] learned Grove," *Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.2.57), did not exist for Pope. And the reasons were not financial either. Horace may have been lucky to receive an education with aristocrats, but Pope, whose father retired with a fairly handsome fortune, was not able to do the same.

In addition, as an only child, Pope spent most of his time in relative isolation even before he reached school-age. That is, he did not have other children, particularly boys of his own age, to play with. As Valerie Rumbold explains, "[Pope] suffered many of the disadvantages of the only child, exacerbated by the preponderance of the elderly in his immediate circle, and by his exclusion from the masculine peer group of school and college."[106] Pope had no male siblings, and he never had the chance to become acquainted with his uncles.[107] Rumbold remarks of his father: "He was an impressive character; yet he was far removed from any arbitrary and overbearing model of paternal authority."[108] Pope's father may not have been strict with his only and disabled son, but more significantly it is clear that there was almost no other male influence in the poet's early years. Pope's entourage consisted largely of female figures in the household, women who were, moreover, generations older than himself. These included his mother, his maternal aunts Elizabeth Turner and Christiana, who was a childless widow, and his nurse Mary Beach.

Although as a young adult Pope was to befriend the Catholic families in his neighborhood, especially the Caryll's and the Blount sisters of Mapledurham, and later as a

[104] Pope once made a journey from Stonor to Oxford. In a letter addressed to Teresa and Martha Blount, written around September 1717, Pope gaily describes his visit to one of the libraries at Oxford University: "I wanted nothing but a black Gown and a Salary, to be as meer a Bookworm as any there. …For I found my self receivd with a sort of respect, which this idle part of mankind, the Learned, pay to their own Species; …Indeed I was so treated, that I could not but sometimes ask myself in my mind, what College I was founder of, or what Library I had built?" (*Ibid*., 430). Aware of Pope's restricted life as a Catholic, Erskine-Hill comments, "Pope seems to have arranged to stay at St John's College, with Dr Abel Evans. It is pleasing that Oxford treated well one who could never have worn 'a black Gown' and earned a 'Salary' there" (2000, 118). Although never a scholar there, it may be worthwhile to note that, with the assistance of Dr. Evans (1697-1737), ten colleges at Oxford subscribed to Pope's translation of the *Iliad* in 1714-1715; see *Corr*., 1:294 and notes.
[105] Magdalen College in Oxford, where he spent many pleasant days with his friend Robert Digby.
[106] Rumbold 2007, 199.
[107] His maternal uncle, though he may still have been living, had left for Spain, and Pope's father and his only brother had become estranged after a dispute. See Rumbold 1989, 26 and Mack 1985, 21.
[108] Rumbold 1989, 25. See also Mack 1985, 48 and 829.

celebrated poet to partake in a large social circle,[109] his family's faith may indeed have been a contributing factor in the poet's passing the greater part of his youth isolated from others. However, far from passing a childhood in exasperation at isolation, Pope seems to have spent the early years of his life in happiness. That he lived in relative isolation may have steered him towards this intense studying. However, one could almost argue that the fact that Pope displayed such a keen aptitude for the literary arts may have been regardless of his isolation from other youngsters.

George Rousseau, co-author of an extensive medical history on Pope, *"This Long Disease, My Life": Alexander Pope and the Sciences* (1968), describes the consequences:

> The accident he sustained as a child may also have contributed to genital difficulties he suffered from throughout his life: difficulty in urinating, painful testicles, and urethral pain so bad that he begged the surgeons for frequent operations to ease it.[110]

Suspicion about his sexual capacity was to become one of the favorite targets of ridicule by his enemies and critics in his career, but the cause of his deformity for which he would receive many unpleasant remarks and attacks throughout his life was not due to an isolated incident. Some time in childhood, Pope contracted a grave illness. He suffered from what later came to be called Pott's disease, a tubercular infection of the bone.[111] Rousseau explains:

> His deformity sprang from an incurable tuberculosis of the spine, later called Pott's Disease, which produces curvature of the spine and a markedly humped back. By the time he entered puberty, he began to shrink rather than grow tall, eventually dwindling to no more than four and a half feet tall as an adult, and the fact that one leg was significantly shorter than the other caused him to develop his humped back. The protrusion was painful as well as noticeable, and in time forced him to walk with a stick (cane) and to wear specially fitted shoes.[112]

Although Maynard Mack, Helen Deutsch, and Valerie Rumbold suspect that Pope contracted the illness from his wet nurse, Rousseau makes a note that it is not possible that the illness was contracted from the nursing milk of Mary Beach, as Pott's disease cannot be transmitted from human to human.[113] In all probability Pope contracted it from cow's milk, as neither sufficient knowledge of hygiene nor adequate systems of sanitation were available. Nor was

[109] Baines observes of Pope's social activities: "Pope was almost the reverse of a recluse; despite his personal discomforts and the inconveniences of travel, he envisaged his network of friends as a sort of guarantee of proper social values and as a source of potential regeneration against the corruption he increasingly saw at national level" (2000, 24). More generally, Tillotson explains the socialite-like status which poets enjoyed in society in Pope's time: "The eighteenth-century poet and artist was conceived of as a member of society, not a special creature withdrawn from it. …Unheard of yet was the Romantic conception of the artist as a retired and sensitive soul, working only as he is moved by the spirit" (1969, 5-6).
[110] Rousseau 2007, 210.
[111] Named after Dr. Percival Pott (1714-1788), for his observation and treatment of the illness.
[112] Rousseau 2007, 210.
[113] Mack 1985, 153; Deutsch 2007, 14; Rumbold 2007, 198; Rousseau 2007, 220.

pasteurization of dairy products a current practice in Pope's time.[114] While Pott's disease was in existence since ancient times, neither Pope nor anyone in his vicinity would have had accurate knowledge of the nature of the illness or been able to predict its malicious symptoms and progress.

These physical limitations were also a factor in excluding him from the possibility of a formal education outside of England. Unlike many of his Catholic compatriots, Pope never ventured to study abroad. Notwithstanding the interdiction which forbade Catholics to send their children abroad to receive a religious education, the laws were not put into strict effect under Queen Anne and families who could afford to do so continued, clandestinely, to send their children to Continental Europe. This continued until the accession of George I in 1714, when more severe laws were introduced and such practices became less common.[115] Pope's Catholic neighbors and dear female friends, Teresa and Martha Blount, had studied in France as young girls. A major reason why Pope did not was because of his frail physical condition. In fact, he was never physically strong enough to travel abroad his entire life.[116]

On the political level, it is true that Pope belonged to a minority, persecuted on account of his faith. However, though a minority, he was not alone in this persecution. By contrast, his deformity was a solitary battle. Unlike, for example, the suspicions circulated of his possibly being a Jacobite, his deformity was an undeniable fact, palpable to all in his presence. And despite the sympathies from friends, he could not turn to anyone for complete understanding or a common experience. Helen Deutsch suggests that the ethical and moral "Epistles to Several Persons" (1731-1735) and *An Essay on Man* (1733-1734) were produced in a subtle attempt to justify the vicious personal attacks he made in satiric pieces, and she accurately captures the dynamic in play in Pope's career when she states that "the larger currents of Pope's poetic progress were put into motion by a dynamic of insult and

[114] Cf. Rousseau: "[Tuberculosis of the bone]… was widespread in Europe and America down to the early years of this [twentieth] century, when pasteurization began to be practiced, though almost unknown in tropical countries where milk was boiled for preservation" (1968, 15).
[115] Young 2007, 118.
[116] Dryden was another rare exception of famed poets who never traveled outside England. The farthest Pope ever traveled was to his mother's native Yorkshire, in the company of the Earl of Burlington; Burlington may have shown his estate of Londesborough to Pope. While in his twenties he nourished plans to visit Italy (*Corr*., 1:221-22), including one in which he expressed the hope to see Lady Mary Wortley Montagu: "If you pass thro Italy next Spring, … It is very possible I may meet you there" (*ibid*., 370), but the plans were not realized. In 1734 he visited the Isle of Wight with the Earl of Peterborough on his yacht (*ibid*., 4:179-80), and he made another sea voyage in 1743 when he crossed the Bristol Channel with George Arbuthnot to Wales. Pope was evidently prone to seasickness (Rousseau 1968, 116-18), which accounts for the reason why he refused Swift's countless invitations to visit him in Ireland ("I would go a thousand miles by land to see you, but the sea I dread," *Corr*., 3:383), and his proposal that they should meet in France never materialized, as he feared that "sea-sickness might indanger my life" (*ibid*., 4:62-64).

response."[117] It is thus necessary to understand that both his religious faith and his disability played major roles, not only in his literary career, but also earlier in his education. They certainly imposed limitations, the Catholicism excluding him from formal schooling in his own country and the disability preventing him from the opportunity of studying abroad. The two factors were possibly what steered the young poet to delve ever more into his books and devote his time to study.

Pope's situation stands in stark contrast to the situation of Horace who was accompanied by his father to one of the best schools in Rome, and who later studied abroad at Athens, and who, though eventually defeated, was physically fit to be recruited to participate in the civil war. Nevertheless, it is impressive that Pope does successfully align his life story with Horace's, tying them together through the common feature that they both conquered adverse circumstances and eventually rose to fame with their poetry. We now turn to the content of Pope's education.

III. A Precocious Child: Literary Exposure and First Publications

In the eighteenth century, Horace's poems were widely read and were regarded as an integral part of a formal education, as Penelope Wilson states: "Any educated man would have been expected to know large parts of Horace's works, including entire odes, by heart in the Latin." [118] Pope, though schooled at home, was certainly not an exception. In the correspondence from his early twenties, he quotes passages from Horace and sends to his mentor Henry Cromwell a fragmentary translation of Horace, requesting feedback. The variety of Horace's poems mentioned in these letters suggests that Pope was very familiar with probably the entirety of Horace's works. However, it should not be assumed that those of a gentleman's rank who underwent formal education in privileged schools and circumstances always studied the classics extensively or thoroughly. Greek and Latin were compulsory, yet concentration lay on learning the grammar and language. Thus the texts were often presented in clipped fragments, hardly compelling students to comprehend the wider scope of an ancient author's thoughts and intentions or to conduct an analysis of the content.[119] It proved to be an

[117] Deutsch 2007, 19.
[118] Wilson 2005, 174. The same was true of Cicero: "Cicero's literary greatness and his personal qualities were, however, often better appreciated in the original than in translation. In the eighteenth century, educated readers did not need translations of their 'Tully'" (Winnifrith 2005, 264).
[119] Jacob Fuchs claims that "Gentlemen studied Greek and Latin" but that both languages were "very badly taught" (1980, 31).

advantage for Pope, as he told Spence,[120] that exclusion from mainstream education actually enabled him to immerse himself in a careful reading of Horace, which in later life he would find an outlet for in the *Imitations*.

Nevertheless, the impression which we receive when looking at his early correspondence and works is that Horace was not quite Pope's "favorite" classical author. This finds support in the fact that Pope did not embark on the Horatian *Imitations* until 1733, shortly before his forty-fifth birthday. The subjects treated in the *Imitations* include politics, independence, and aging. Concerns over growing old and mortality were certainly not on Pope's mind as a youth of twenty. Therefore, while the quotes from Horace scattered in his correspondence and the sporadic attempts at translation of his works serve as evidence that the ancient poet was indeed a part of his educational curriculum, the young Pope's passions and aspirations were clearly focused on other classical authors, particularly Homer and Virgil.

Pope most likely learned to read from his maternal aunt Elizabeth Turner, and he first encountered the classical languages around the age of eight when he began to take lessons in Latin and Greek from John Banister. It was also at the age of eight that Pope first read the translations of *The Iliad* (1660) and *The Odyssey* (1665) by John Ogilby, one of the most distinguished translators of the late seventeenth century. Considering that Pope was only a child of eight at the time, his initial reaction may have been awe at the grandeur of the highly decorated volumes with engravings. This is hinted at by Spence who recorded: "[Pope] spoke of the pleasure it then gave him, with a sort of rapture only on reflecting on it."[121] This was his first encounter with the ancient Greek poet, and his passion for Homer's epic would continue well into adulthood. In fact, if we were to include the *Episode of Sarpedon* (1709), which is taken from books 12 and 16 of the *Iliad*, we can say that Pope spent more than fifteen years of his life devoting himself to producing translations of Homer.

The fact that he wrote a play based on the *Iliad* is another indication of the keen literary interest that Pope as a boy found in Homer's epic. It was a production he staged with his classmates as actors, and a feeble-looking school gardener was jokingly cast as the stalwart warrior Ajax. The play must have been a success, for he wrote one more script, this time based on the "legend of St Genevieve."[122] A precocious schoolboy, he also wrote an epic

[120] Spence 1966, 1:13.
[121] Ibid., 14. See also David Foxon's comment: "I find it hard to believe that the initial to book I of the *Iliad*, which echoes Ogilby's plate to that book (Figure 40) [1991, 80], is not a deliberate tribute by Pope to his predecessor; some of the other borrowings may also be due to Pope's affectionate recollection of Ogilby" (1991, 78).
[122] Spence 1966, 1:15-16.

titled *Alcander*. He told Spence that he had written four books, about a thousand lines for each. But this he subsequently burned, though not without regret, he would later admit.[123] These first attempts at writing took place at the Catholic schools which Pope attended before the family's move to Binfield in 1700. In fact Pope attended two schools, both of them unauthorized. He enjoyed his time as a pupil, but the duration of his stay at each school was rather brief. He is said to have been expelled from the school in Twyford, for writing a satire about his schoolmaster. The second school he attended was situated near Hyde Park Corner, which proved to be a convenient location to visit the theater.[124] All in all, even if he did build some fond memories, it seems that Pope did not regret his school education, as he casually remarked once: "God knows, it extended a very little way."[125]

Pope's years in Binfield from 1700 to 1716 mark an important stage in his development towards becoming a published poet. In his poetry Pope would refer to Binfield more often as Windsor Forest, and this is where the young boy cultivated his interests against an idyllic backdrop of the forest and castle of Windsor and the river Thames. Paul Baines describes it as the place where the poet willingly imbibed "the twin influences of reading and nature," and Pat Rogers claims, "It was here that the essential Pope came into being: here that he forged his *literary* identity – both as writer and, logically and temporally prior, as reader."[126]

Following the family's move there in 1700, Pope from early adolescence acquired some of his literary sources and influences from his father's library, which was mostly stocked with Christian theological treatises. Pope once wrote to Francis Atterbury:

> Your Lordship has formerly advis'd me to read the best controversies between the Churches. Shall I tell you a secret? I did so at fourteen years old, (for I loved reading, and my father had no other books) there was a collection of all that had been written on both sides in the reign of King James the second.[127]

One cannot deny the slight tone of disparagement in his comment that "my father had no other books," but he also makes it clear that he appreciated what he read. It was from this selection of treatises on the religious controversies of the previous centuries that Pope first read Erasmus and Montaigne, his follower, and learned of their preaching of humanistic tolerance. For his own library Pope acquired the 1652 edition of Montaigne in French as well as John Cotton's translation. On the back of this copy Pope wrote:

[123] Ibid., 16-18.
[124] Pope remembers one of his masters at this school, Thomas Deane (1654-1735) and writes disapprovingly of him in his letter to Caryll on 28 March [1727] (*Corr*., 2:428-29).
[125] Spence 1966, 1:8.
[126] Baines 2000, 7; Rogers 2007, 107.
[127] *Corr*., 1:453.

> This is (in my Opinion) the very best Book for Information of Manners, that has been writ. This Author says nothing but what every one feels at the Heart. Whoever deny it, are not more wise than Montaigne, but less honest.[128]

Both Erasmus and Montaigne were Catholic, but it does not appear that the belonging in the same religion was the source of Pope's admiration. Instead, Pope upheld the humanist values ("Manners") preached by the author, the exposure of personal thoughts which are in fact common to all humanity ("what every one feels at the Heart"), and the qualities of being "wise" and "honest." David Fairer comments on Pope's tastes:

> Readers of Erasmus and Montaigne felt themselves part of a European-wide culture rather than a court coterie. …It is evident that many Renaissance ideas were more congenial to Pope: they spoke to him at a deep level about things essential to human nature. He valued humanist argument with its skeptical wit and its respect for individual experience and intelligent conscience.[129]

The principal appeal to him in these religious writings was the preaching of tolerance. However, though a proud and professed Catholic, Pope did not show a penchant for religious writings in his literary career.[130]

From an early age he expressed keen interest in classical and British literature. Along with John Ogilby's translations of Homer, he had studied Statius' epic, *Thebaid*, and like the Homer volumes he relished George Sandys' illustrated *Ovid's Metamorphosis Englished* (1626).[131] In a letter speculatively dated from 1707, Pope asks his mentor Sir William Trumbull if he could "borrow for a day or two Sir H. Sheer's Polybius,"[132] an English translation published in 1693. Sir Henry Sheer was one of the writers who commended Pope's *Pastorals* when he read it as a circulating manuscript before its publication.

Among British poets he respected the works of Waller, Shakespeare, Milton, and Dryden.[133] He first read *The Faerie Queen* at around the age of twelve[134] and "throughout his life he loved Spenser."[135] Knowing his appreciation for the Elizabethan author, his friend John Hughes sent him his new six-volume edition of Spenser's *Works*, published in 1715, to which Pope replied in a letter: "Spenser has ever been a favourite poet to me, he is like a

[128] Citation found in Erskine-Hill 2000, 380.
[129] Fairer 2007, 107.
[130] Cf. Gordon: "It would be absurd to call Pope a religious poet in the sense that one calls George Herbert or Gerard Manley Hopkins religious poets. Religion is not the main concern or subject matter of his poetry" (1976, 116).
[131] Spence 1966, 1:14.
[132] Erskine-Hill 2000, 14. Cf. His comment: "It is notable that Pope requests to borrow the chief ancient historian [*c*. 202-120 B.C.E.] to have studied the rise and fall of states" (ibid., 14n.).
[133] Sowerby comments on Pope's appreciation of Waller: "In… allotting him [Waller] an honoured place, Pope in this as in so much else is following in Dryden's footsteps" (2006, 83).
[134] Spence 1966, 1:182.
[135] Rogers 2007, 89.

mistress whose faults we see, but love her with 'em all."[136] In his later career he pays homage to Spenser by inserting the lines:

That not in Fancy's Maze he wander'd long,
But stoop'd to Truth, and moraliz'd his song. (*Epistle to Arbuthnot*, 340-1)

This recalls Spenser's opening invocation to *The Faerie Queene*:

Fierce warres and faithful loves shall moralize my song. (1:9)[137]

Pope in the *Epistle* apparently wishes to assert that, like Spenser, he too is a moral poet. He looks back on his early days in which he simply wrote, swayed by his likings and attractions ("not in Fancy's Maze… wander'd long"). However, he describes that he changed course to become a poet who would advocate truth and morality.[138] In his youth, Pope was presented with copies of other British writers. In 1701, at the age of thirteen, he was given a copy of the 1598 edition of Chaucer, a volume which remained in his library until his death. In 1704 he also received Samuel Butler's 1689 edition of *Hudibras* from his elderly Catholic friend Sir Anthony Englefield, grandfather of Teresa and Martha Blount. His love of literature must have been well known among his friends and neighbors. Pope also purchased of his own accord early editions of Herbert and Milton.

At some point in 1703 or 1704, against the wishes of his parents who were concerned about his fragile health, he left Binfield to study French and Italian in London.[139] French criticism, drama, and other works were of immense interest to the educated English, and here too Pope followed the contemporary trend in gaining familiarity with French writings. Among others, he told Spence that he was already acquainted with the works of Rapin and Le Bossu in youth.[140] Pope was rather humble about his abilities in French, as he once wrote in 1724 to Lord Bolingbroke to thank him for sending him Voltaire's *League* (1723; it was not published in England until 1728, under the title of *La Henriade*): "I cannot pretend to judge with any exactness of the beauties of a foreign Language, which I understand but Imperfectly: I can only tell my thoughts in Relation to the design and conduct of the Poem, or the sentiments."[141] Voltaire (1694-1778) and Pope were introduced to each other by Lord Bolingbroke when the French poet spent time in England from 1726 to 1729. Later in Pope's life, relations were strained between Pope and Louis Racine (d. 1763), son of the French dramatist. Racine had

[136] *Corr*., 1:316.
[137] Bear (1995) .
[138] See *TE*, 4:120n.
[139] Spence 1966, 1:12-3.
[140] Ibid., 193-94.
[141] *Corr*., 2:228.

challenged Pope in the poem *La Religion* (1742) regarding Pope's orthodox religious sentiments expressed in *An Essay on Man*. Bitter feelings ensued, and the Chevalier Andrew Ramsay (d. 1743), a protégé of François Fénelon (1651-1715), intervened. Pope subsequently wrote a letter of forgiveness to Racine in September 1742.[142] However, when this letter was published in France, Voltaire publicly denounced it as a forgery written by another hand, his argument being that with Pope's limited knowledge of French he could not have composed a letter in that language. The French letter was indeed written by Pope.[143] The foreign languages which he mastered in his younger days enabled him to read contemporary works in their original languages as well as in English translation and allowed him to gain access to the literary trends flourishing across continental Europe.

Of the days spent in Binfield, Magdalen once remarked to Joseph Spence that her half-brother "did nothing but write and read".[144] During this "great reading period"[145] before the age of twenty-one Pope thus absorbed the literatures of Antiquity, his native Britain, and continental Europe. Upon his first attempts at producing writings of his own, he had a number of elderly gentlemen who became his mentors[146] and corrected and advised him on his early pieces. They include: William Wycherley (1640-1716), John Caryll (1667-1736), William Walsh (1663-1708), and Sir William Trumbull (1638-1716).[147] The earliest correspondence we have is a letter which Pope wrote to Wycherley at the close of 1704. Pope was introduced to Wycherley by John Caryll, who, as already mentioned, acknowledged Pope's ardor for literature. Caryll also introduced Pope to his friend Thomas Betterton (1635-1710). Betterton was an actor and dramatist of the Restoration stage, and although it is doubtful whether Pope and Betterton shared a close friendship, Pope in a letter to Englefield asked that he send his greetings "to that honourable Gentleman Sr William Trumbull, and to Mr Betterton" on his behalf.[148] Wycherley was a comic dramatist and a poet. Known for *The Country Wife* (1672) and *The Plain Dealer* (1674), he saw his career flourish under Charles II.

[142] *Ibid*., 4:415-16.
[143] Erskine-Hill explains that the original letter written in English was discovered in modern times by Emile Audra in the Bibliothèque nationale and comments on Voltaire's attitude towards Pope: "Voltaire was perhaps reluctant to think Pope so orthodox as the letter professes" (2000, 334), suggesting that the French writer may have been more skeptical of Pope's religious stand than his language abilities.
[144] Spence 1966, 1:12.
[145] Ibid., 20.
[146] Mack 1985, 88-117.
[147] The first three pastorals were dedicated to Trumbull ("Spring"), Garth ("Summer"), and Wycherley ("Autumn").
[148] Erskine-Hill 2000, 16.

Both dramatists coaxed Pope to write for the stage, but the young poet was not keen on drama. This is in fact another common point which Pope shared with Horace. Horace refused to write for the stage. It was not only that he did not appreciate the loud spectators. He wished to focus on literary art, and he thought that the ornamentation which playwrights put on stage to attract more attention was simply unnecessary.[149] In 1717 Pope, along with John Gay and Arbuthnot, writes *Three Hours After Marriage*, but his experience with the theater is short-lived. Similarly, in the 1720s, he produces an edition of Shakespeare's plays, but his treatment of the works reveals that he is interested in them more as texts to be read than plays to be performed.[150]

In his youth Pope resisted Wycherley's lavishing praise upon him for his promising talent,[151] but agreed to revise Wycherley's works. The seriousness with which the teenage Pope took on this task is illustrated in his letters:

> By yours of the last Month, you desire me to select, if possible, some Things from the first Volume of your Miscellanies, which may be alter'd so as to appear again. I doubted your meaning in this; whether it was to pick out the best of those Verses, (as that on the *Idleness of Business*; on *Ignorance*; on *Laziness*, &c.) to make the Method and Numbers exact, and avoid Repetitions? For tho' (upon reading 'em on this occasion) I believe they might receive such an Alteration with Advantage; yet they would not be chang'd so much, but any one would know'em for the same at first sight. Or if you mean to improve the worse Pieces, which are such as to render them very good, would require a great addition, and almost the entire new writing of them? Or, lastly, if you mean the middle sort, as the Songs and Love-Verses? For these will need only to be shortned, to omit repetition; the Words remaining very little different from what they were before. Pray let me know your mind in this, for I am utterly at a loss. Yet I have try'd what I could do to some of the *Songs*, and the *Poems* on *Laziness* and *Ignorance*, but can't (e'en in my own partial Judgment) think my alterations much to the purpose.[152]

In addition to his father's repeated instructions to rewrite lines that were "not good rhymes," we see that the tasks given by Wycherley developed Pope's attitude that any work, whether before or after publication, was always worthy of revision and improvement. Pope is heedful of form, "to make the Method and Numbers exact, and avoid Repetitions," and content, "to improve the worse Pieces, which are such as to render them very good, would require a great addition, and almost the entire new writing of them." John Sitter observes that Pope as a professional poet indeed revised more than other authors and adds that "he never (I think) revised without intensifying."[153] Citing *The Rape of the Lock* which was first published as a

[149] Cf. Friedrich Klingner: "In preferring poetry meant for reading to poetry performed on stage, Horace has no other concern than art. To him, what matters is not subject or attitude, but art itself. This explains his rejection of mass spectacles in the theatre as well. For in matters of art, he holds to the belief that all that is loud and overstuffed and crude is hostile to art" (2009, 356). For Horace's criticism of the Roman theater, see *Ep*. 2.1.139-65 and 177-207; see also Chapter 8.
[150] See Chapter 8 for *Three Hours After Marriage* and Chapter 4 for the Shakespeare edition.
[151] *Corr*., 1:9.
[152] *Ibid*.,15-16.
[153] Sitter 2007, 45.

two-canto version in 1712, later expanded in 1714 and 1717 to the five-canto poem which we are familiar with today, he comments, "Pope also revised the poem at the micro level, for purely stylistic reasons."[154] The publication of his collected *Works* in 1717 and 1735 further prompted him to revise his previously published pieces, and he was known to rewrite his letters before publication, after requesting his addressees to return them, though this was more probably to protect his personal image.

In one of the letters to Wycherley, Pope compares revising to natural processes. Poetry represents interventions of art on nature, and the image of nature reminds us of the peaceful environment in Binfield in which the poet spent some of his happiest years. Pope describes his method:

> I send you a Sample of some few of these... I have done all that I thought could be of advantage to them: Some I have contracted, as we do Sun-beams, to improve their Energy and Force; some I have taken quite away, as we take Branches from a Tree, to add to the Fruit; others I have entirely new express'd, and turned more into Poetry.[155]

The metaphor which compares a completed poem to a fruit produced from a tree, with much time and labor, is found in another early letter of Pope's: "Writers in the case of borrowing from others, are like Trees which of themselves wou'd produce only one sort of Fruit, but by being grafted upon others, may yield variety."[156] The use of such a metaphor testifies to the young Pope's budding talent as a poet, and the content of the metaphor represents Pope's own youthful hope. He sees "Energy" and "Force" in words. This gives us a hint of Pope's positive ambition, and perhaps even a quite innocent belief that writing has the potential to influence and convey a message to the public. We do not sense the bitter resentment of his later years, in which any work, or luscious "Fruit," he produced would be met with fierce attacks and malevolent criticism. In his mind he sees "Sun-beams," not darkness, and there is room for improvement, not hopelessness. The image is in keeping with Pope's frequent treatment of nature in his early works, such as the *Pastorals* and *Windsor-Forest*, which are in contrast to his later works, including the Horatian *Imitations*, which are filled with political overtones, contemporary crimes in England, and responses to critics and enemies.

It should be noted, however, that it did not take long for Pope to develop a cautious side, perhaps even bordering on paranoia. Pope made many enemies over the course of his literary career. Some were prominent writers like himself, such as Richard Dennis and Joseph Addison. Others included booksellers, the most notable being Edmund Curll and even one

[154] Ibid.
[155] *Corr*., 1:16.
[156] *Ibid*., 19-20.

with whom he worked on the Homer translations, Bernard Lintot. On the political level, he feared exile himself when, after testifying on behalf of his friend in the Atterbury trials, Francis Atterbury was sent to the Tower and then exiled to France. He was constantly aware of the agents of censorship under Robert Walpole. His sister Magdalen once commented that she thought her brother should be more careful of his safety than going out for walks with only his dog Bounce as his companion.[157] Pope later developed a habit of carrying a pistol with him for self-defense.[158]

As early as 1707, he instructs Wycherley not to make public his assistance in revising the distinguished poet's works:

> I take it… as an opportunity of sending you the fair Copy of the *Poem* on *Dulness*, which was not then finish'd, and which I should not care to hazard by the common Post. Mr. *Englefyld* is ignorant of the Contents, and I hope your prudence will let him remain so, for my sake no less than your own: Since if you should reveal any thing of this nature, it would be no wonder Reports should be rais'd, and there are those (I fear) who would be ready to improve them to my disadvantage…. I give you this warning besides, that tho' your self should say I had any way assisted you, I am notwithstanding resolv'd to deny it.[159]

From this it seems that Wycherley himself was rather inclined to boast of the young rising talent who was under his employment, but Pope evidently expressed stern disapproval. As a professed Catholic in adulthood, he and Swift were indeed aware that any correspondence sent by post was under the surveillance of Walpole's officials. As an established poet, he would be enraged by the scandal caused by the notorious publisher Curll and quite severely humiliated when news of his having hired the assistants Elijah Fenton and William Broome for the *Odyssey* translation was leaked to the public. It is surprising, though, to see Pope's extreme precaution in the treatment of any written material, even before he published his first piece, as though already at the age of nineteen he could foresee the world which he was about to enter, one rife with envy and animosity. His concern for safety persisted throughout his life, and it is one of the reasons for which Pope abandoned his poem *1740*. The poem hints at a continuation of the Horatian *Imitations* and contains many blanks which Pope would have filled with personal names, but it remained unpublished until after his death.[160]

It was in 1706 that Pope received a letter from the leading bookseller Jacob Tonson the Elder, expressing interest in publishing his works. Tonson wrote:

[157] Spence 1966, 1:365.
[158] Mack 1985, 487-88.
[159] *Corr*., 1:31.
[160] See Chapter 10.

Sir, - I have lately seen a pastoral of yours in mr. Walsh's & mr Congreves[161] hands, which is extreamly ffine & is generally approv'd off by the best Judges in poetry. I Remember I have formerly seen you at my shop & am sorry I did not Improve my Acquaintance with you. If you design your Poem for the Press no person shall be more Carefull in the printing of it, nor no one can give a greater Incouragement to it.[162]

This marked the first breakthrough in Pope's literary career. Pope was barely eighteen years old. He submitted three pieces to Tonson's *Poetical Miscellanies, The Sixth Part*: the *Pastorals*, *January and May; or, the Merchant's Tale: from Chaucer*, and the *Episode of Sarpedon*, which were published on 2 May 1709. Tonson's miscellany volumes, which included works by the already prominent Jonathan Swift, appeared through a period spanning a quarter of a century in 1684, 1685, 1693, 1694, 1704, and 1709. Jacob Tonson was the leading bookseller of this period who had obtained the rights to the works of great literary figures including Milton, Shakespeare, and Dryden. Pope may have met Tonson in London while in the company of Wycherley, as he was often seen roaming about town with the elderly gentleman.[163] However, while Wycherley trained Pope in the task of revising, Sir William Trumbull and William Walsh were perhaps the two mentors who were most engaged with Pope's early attempts at writing verses of his own. In fact Pope, during the period between 1700 and 1710, experimented with many translations and imitations, using as models the English and classical authors whom he had studied in his days of voracious reading at Binfield.

In classical literature Pope showed a predilection for translating short tales from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.[164] Although the work was not published until 1712, he had translated in heroic couplets the first book of Statius' *Thebaid* around the year 1703, when he was only fifteen years old. He also began translating parts of Homer as early as 1707. The *Episode of Sarpedon* was published in 1709, and the entire Homer translations were published in installments from 1715 to 1726. Nonetheless, the young Pope turned frequently to his mentors for advice and correction.

William Walsh of Abberley in Worcestershire had served as a Whig M.P. under King William III and Queen Anne, and in literary society he was praised by Dryden as "the best Critic of our nation in his time."[165] At the same time as he was working on revising and editing Wycherley's pieces, Pope had begun composing writings of his own. Pope turned to

[161] William Congreve (1670-1729) was a dramatist and friend of Dryden. Pope dedicated his *Iliad* translation to him.
[162] *Corr*., 1:17.
[163] Spence 1966, 1:35.
[164] See Baines 2000, 10.
[165] Spence 1966, 1:32.

Walsh on several occasions to correct drafts of the *Pastorals*, and in a letter dated 2 July 1706, Pope opens with an expression of gratitude to his mentor: "I cannot omit the first opportunity of making you my acknowledgements for reviewing those Papers of mine".[166] Walsh not only corrected Pope's early drafts, but he also served as a guide, suggesting for instance that Pope write in certain genres.

In 1706, around the time when Pope received his offer from Jacob Tonson the Elder, or perhaps even earlier, Walsh had recommended that Pope might write a pastoral comedy. He advised the young poet that he might use as models the *Aminta* of Torquato Tasso (1544-1595), the *Pastor Fido* of Guarini (1537-1612), and the *Filli di Sciro* by Guidobaldo Bonarelli (1563-1608). Yet Pope did not show a penchant for the pastoral comedies of late Renaissance Italian authors. His explanation is as follows:

> I have not attempted any thing of Pastoral Comedy, because I think the Taste of our Age will not relish a Poem of that sort. …There is a certain Majesty in Simplicity which is far above all the Quaintness of Wit: insomuch that the Critics have excluded it from the loftiest Poetry, as well as the lowest, and forbid it to the Epic no less than the Pastoral. …I am inclin'd to think the Pastoral Comedy has another disadvantage, as to the *Manners*: Its general design is to make us in love with the Innocence of a rural Life, so that to introduce Shepherds of a vicious Character must in some measure debase it; and hence it may come to pass, that even the virtuous Characters will not shine so much, for want of being oppos'd to their contraries.[167]

Pastoral comedy had enjoyed much success up until the Renaissance yet the genre was beginning to fall out of popularity by Pope's time. The pastoral mode which was favored by Spenser, Sidney, Shakespeare, and Milton gradually gave way to the georgic, in accordance with what Paul Davis describes as the social transition which was taking place in England and which valued "socially productive agricultural work [georgic] rather than arcadian idling [pastoral]."[168] Pope was attentive to trends, and his budding entrepreneurial skills as well as his desire to succeed in the literary market are clear in the statement: "I think the Taste of our Age will not relish a Poem of that sort." However, his classical training, as well as admiration for his fellow English poets, nevertheless steered him towards pastoral. Pope's *Pastorals* are heavily indebted to both Theocritus and Virgil, as well as to Moschus and Bion.[169] In addition to Theocritus' *Idylls* and Virgil's *Eclogues*, standard classical models of bucolic verse, his poem was influenced by English works such as Jonathan Swift's *The Battle of the Books* (1704) and Edmund Spenser's *Shepheardes Calendar* (1579). Pope's pastoral thus became a hybrid of classical and British influences.

---

[166] *Corr*., 1:18.
[167] *Ibid*.,19.
[168] Davis 2008, 99. See also Lindenbaum (1986) and Low (1985).
[169] See Rogers 2007, 108.

As Pope challengingly asserts in the opening of the *Pastorals*, "First in these Fields I try the Sylvan Strains" (1.1), the major reason for his turning to pastoral was that it was the genre with which many eminent writers whom he admired, Virgil, Spenser, and Milton, first began their career. "In these fields" indicates England, as Pope sets out to establish his fame as the leading English poet. The *Pastorals* mentions many landmarks in his native surroundings including Windsor and the River Thames. This is also true in his *Windsor-Forest* (1713), which Baines describes as being "a more localised and personal a vision of rural England than the *Pastorals*."[170] Although Pope drew from several works and authors in composing this piece, it was chiefly Virgil whom he had in mind. That is, he is moving, as Virgil had moved on from his *Eclogues*, then to the *Georgics*. This is evident in the closing line of *Windsor-Forest*: "First in these Fields I sung the Sylvan Strains" (434). This recalls the first line of his *Pastorals*. Pope follows the model of Virgil who closed his *Georgics* by recalling the opening of the *Eclogues*. Following the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, Pope steadily climbs his way to epic.

As mentioned earlier, Pope had begun his translation of the first book of Statius' *Thebaid* around 1703, and the work was published in 1712. However, it was his translation of Homer, fragments of which he had begun working on in 1707, which was to secure him a publishing contract with Bernard Lintot. The contract was signed on 23 March 1714, and the first installment, a volume containing the first four books of *The Iliad*, was delivered to his subscribers in the summer of 1715.

At times Pope, proud man that he was, assumed an attitude of nonchalance and feigned that he was able to accomplish translation speedily. He recounted to Spence: "I wrote most of the *Iliad* fast – a great deal of it on journeys, from the little pocket Homer on that shelf there, and often forty or fifty verses on a morning in bed."[171] Yet however much he may have wished to project the image of translating swiftly and with ease, to produce a complete translation of the *Iliad* was no lightweight task. He confesses to Spence later:

> What terrible moments does one feel after one has engaged for a large work!... In the beginning of my translating the *Iliad* I wished anybody would hang me, a hundred times. It sat so heavily on my mind at first that I often used to dream of it, and do sometimes still.[172]

It took him a while before he found a routine that worked for him:

[170] Baines 2000, 15.
[171] Spence 1966, 1:45.
[172] Ibid., 84.

When I fell into the method of translating thirty or forty verses before I got up, and piddled with it the rest of the morning, it went on easy enough, and when I was thoroughly got into the way of it, I did the rest with pleasure.[173]

It was not only the translation which he had to do. As we will see in Chapter 4, Pope was also actively issuing advertisements and soliciting his aristocratic friends to gather the hundreds of subscriptions required to make this a profitable venture. It is no wonder that he thought of engaging assistants for the *Odyssey*, to reduce the dual burden of translating and promoting which he had carried in the case of the *Iliad*. Moreover, his punctilious attention to detail can be observed in some of the letters which he wrote to his mentors. To Henry Cromwell, he requests that he continue with his revisions of the translation:

If you will please to begin where you left off last, & mark the Margins as you have done in the pages immediately before, (which you will find corrected to your sense since your last perusal) you will extreamly oblige me, and improve my Translation. Besides those places which may deviate from the Sense of the Author, it wou'd be very kind i[n] you to observe any Deficiencies in the Diction or Numbers. The Hiatus in particular I wou'd avoid as much as possible, which you are certainly in the right to be a professed Enemy to; tho I confess I cou'd not think it possible at all times to be avoided by any writer, till I found, by reading the famous French Poet Malherbe lately, that there is but one throughout all his Poems.[174]

His striving for perfection is evident, and he clearly struggled to produce a work of the highest quality. There is even a sense of urgency, as this was an important business transaction for Pope. Baines describes Pope's financial concerns: "Though never exactly indigent, Pope's paternal fortune was always under threat of sequestration, and he needed money on his own account," and he further explains concerning Pope's publication by subscription:

Pope's [Homer translation] was to be a subscription venture: that is, a number of purchasers would subscribe in advance of publication and would be listed in the prefatory matter to the book. It was a kind of diffused patronage, replacing a nobleman's responsibility to fund publication of a book in return for a fawning dedication with a notion of belonging to a more widespread élite. It meant that the publication costs of especially lavish books, such as the Homer was to be, could be defrayed in advance, but equally it meant that subscribers were being asked to buy something on the grounds of reputation alone; it says something about the esteem in which Pope's relatively modest output to 1714 was held, that he was able to get the venture going at all.[175]

Although, and perhaps because, his reputation was on the rise, he could not afford this enterprise to be a failure. Each volume of his translation contained four books of the *Iliad*, and Pope published one volume more or less in regular annual installments between 1715 and 1720, thus completing the twenty-four book epic. His translation of the *Odyssey* was completed and published between 1725 and 1726.

[173] Ibid., 85.
[174] *Corr*., 1:57.
[175] Baines 2000, 18 and 17, respectively.

I have thus traced Pope's path from his childhood education to his early literary career. That his youthful ambition lay in epic is evident. It was with this scheme that he first tried his hand at pastoral, as it was the genre by which Virgil and other eminent English authors of epic began their career and eventually consolidated their position as major poets. Pope practiced writing epic by translating fragments of Homer as early as 1707. Having secured a book contract seven years later, he agreed to translate the entirety of Homer's *Iliad* and *The Odyssey*. One thing that seems apparent is that Horace was not on Pope's agenda in his early career. As I have shown in Section I, Horace's reverence towards his father is echoed in Pope towards his parents in the *Imitations*, but it was not a theme that Pope as a young aspiring poet was particularly interested in. It will not be until the 1730s, when Pope himself is in his forties, that it will strike a chord. In Section II, I discussed Pope's Catholicism and deformity. I showed that while these are not factors which are comparable to Horace, Pope still manages to link his own hardships to the adverse circumstances which Horace faced. In Section III, I explained that, unlike Homer, it is somewhat difficult to locate an exact moment and circumstance of Pope's first encounters with Horace. Nonetheless, we do know that Pope was thoroughly familiar with Horace's works, alongside Homer, Virgil, and others. The next two chapters will be consecrated to the poet's choice of form and of author, respectively. They will serve to explain the development, both in English literary history and in Pope's career, of why and how the poet composed the Horatian *Imitations*.

Chapter 2

Imitation: "How far the liberty of *Borrowing* may extend"[1]

For those who are not familiar with the literary assumptions of Pope's era, imitation may carry a negative connotation, as an act of copying and repeating, bordering on plagiarism.[2] The modern reader, when faced with a literary work, often anticipates something fresh and new, innovative ideas previously unheard of. However, such emphasis on originality is a relatively new phenomenon which was cultivated by the Romantics in the last decades of the eighteenth century and became widespread only in the nineteenth century.[3] It must not be mistaken, however, that originality in the sense of creative or imaginative writing - material that is not based on a previous work – does not connote that there was no originality involved in imitations. The diction, style, and the overall method of transformation with which Augustan poets composed imitations were all aspects in which the poets displayed their originality.

Of the eighteenth century, Frank Stack has claimed that "all forms of imitation were profoundly respected."[4] Nonetheless, Pope in his youth also expressed doubt about the practice of "borrowing" in writing:

> I wou'd beg your opinion… It is how far the liberty of *Borrowing* may extend? I have defended it sometimes by saying, that it seems not so much the Perfection of Sense, to say things that have *never* been said before, as to express those *best* that have been said *oftenest*; and that Writers in the case of borrowing from others, are like Trees which of themselves wou'd produce only one sort of Fruit, but by being grafted upon others, may yield variety. A mutual commerce makes Poetry flourish; but then Poets like Merchants, shou'd repay with something of their own what they take from others; not like Pyrates, make prize of all they meet.[5]

---

[1] *Corr*., 1:19.

[2] See, for example, Richard Peterson on Ben Jonson (1572-1637): "in our own time, when the classics are no longer second nature and imitation as a method has become increasingly remote, Jonson has often been read with less sympathy… than he deserves" (1981, xiii). Cf. also Robin Sowerby on *De Arte Poetica* (*c*. 1517) by Mario Girolamo Vida: "Throughout the *De Arte Poetica*, as throughout the classical tradition generally, the stock of existing poetry is held to be common property. There is no worry about charges of plagiarism. The golden treasury is there for the taking" (2006, 47).

[3] See I.R.F. Gordon: "One thing that should be clear… is that Augustan wit, and hence Augustan poetry, has nothing to do with originality. The true poet should say things in a new way, but the idea that he can say things that have never been said before, that he can be totally original, is a post-Romantic one" (1976, 100). In referring to the pre-Romantic period, Terry Eagleton also states: "In eighteenth-century England, the concept of literature was not confined as it sometimes is today to 'creative' or 'imaginative' writing" and "It was, in fact, only with what we now call the 'Romantic period' that our own definitions of literature began to develop. The modern sense of the word 'literature' only really gets under way in the nineteenth century, Literature in this sense of the word is an historically recent phenomenon: it was invented sometime around the turn of the eighteenth century, and would have been thought extremely strange by Chaucer or even Pope" (Eagleton 2008, 15 and 16, respectively).

[4] Stack 1985, 25.

[5] Pope's letter to William Walsh dated 2 July 1706. (*Corr*., 1:19-20).

This is one of the earliest surviving correspondences, a letter written to an older mentor at the age of eighteen. Despite his youthful hesitation, Pope throughout his long career remained faithful to his belief that writers "shou'd repay with something of their own what they take from others." Pope's originality and creativity are prominent features of many of his works which used literary creations from both Antiquity and English predecessors as models.[6]

However, Pope was by no means an exception in the literary practice of his time. Like many other celebrated contemporaries, Pope "borrowed" heavily from classical sources. In the realm of translation, it was not only the topics and themes of the original which an English author "borrowed," but an author was also allowed to "borrow" English phrases from the translations of his predecessors. Penelope Wilson comments: "Translation in this period is, of course, essentially a traditional activity, with borrowings from one's predecessors allowed, recognized, and often acknowledged."[7] The composition of imitations was a hallmark though ephemeral trend of the 'Augustan' period in England which saw its peak during Pope's time and thereafter quietly faded away from the literary scene.[8] Imitation as a vogue in English literature was also closely linked to the education of the era:

> The education in the Latin classics… until late in the century, was all but universal… [For exceptions such as Chatterton, Burns, and Blake who did not receive formal and traditional study of the classics]… Their susceptibility to the appeal of native ballad or song forms and styles is the result, in part, of their having access to no other tradition to imitate. All the others began by studying at school the works of the Roman rhetoricians and oratorical theorists, especially Quintilian and Cicero, and then proceeded to apply the devices of Roman argumentation and persuasive description as they wrote their own Latin school poems; only after this careful groundwork did they essay the composition of their own poems in English.[9]

This was not only true in the study of rhetoric and oratory but in virtually all areas of classical literature. Imitation arose in part from a natural progression of many poets who first received a classical education, with a heavier concentration in Latin than Greek, who were given exercises to write their own Latin compositions, and who then produced original writings of their own in English. That their years of classical education had significant influences on their English poems and at times furnished explicit models for their works is by all means natural and understandable.

---

[6] See Selden 1984, 115-26 for Pope's "borrowing" of ideas in "Winter" in the *Pastorals*, the *Temple of Fame*, Horatian *Imitations* including *Sat.* 2.1 as well as *Dialogue 2*, *An Essay on Man*, *Epistle to Arbuthnot*, and *The Dunciad*.

[7] Wilson 2005, 183.

[8] I.R.F. Gordon explains the concept of borrowing in the eighteenth century: "The Augustan poet, then, sees imitation as more important than originality. But this does not mean that he feels in duty bound simply to copy earlier writers. …True imitation involves both borrowing and recasting" (1976, 100). Sowerby 2006, 161 states that imitation was originally imported from France and that it spread in England under the influence of the Earl of Rochester and John Oldham.

[9] Tillotson et al. 1969, 11.

Imitation has its roots in translation. As Gillespie and Sowerby explain, "The rise of the 'imitation,' the object of which was usually but not always a classical text, may… be said itself to result from developments in translation."[10] Translation was an accepted and popular form of publication, as will be discussed in Chapter 4. As we shall see, the eighteenth-century literary culture did not always expect a strict word-for-word translation. Nevertheless, the idea still remained that, as Jacques Derrida has put it, "all translation implies… an oath of fidelity to a given original."[11] This aspect of translation posed certain barriers for poets like Pope. The development of imitation is related to Pope's and other translators' desire to disengage themselves from the confinements of faithfulness to the original and to exercise their freedom and imagination. Paul Davis describes the dilemma which writers like Pope faced:

> The degrading images of the translator widely current in their time challenged [writers] to find new answers to questions integral to their understandings of themselves and the standing of the poet in their culture: questions about vocation and career, fame and happiness, responsibility and freedom.[12]

Translation required studying and understanding the ideas and perceptions of the original author, but it allowed no room for the translator to share their discoveries and their responses to the original. Imitation, on the other hand, permitted writers the freedom to respond to the ideas of ancient authors as well as to write about their own reflections through the themes present in ancient texts. Imitation became the ideal vehicle for Pope to mediate his own society, life, and views through the writings of a favored ancient poet.

Pope's Horatian *Imitations* both compare and contrast his own views and ideals with those of the ancient Roman poet. The opening words in the Advertisement to his first *Imitation* are:

> *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*.

Pope's feelings of allegiance to Horace are made manifest, and Pope here actually makes Horace a substitute for his own voice. In addition to comparing himself with Horace, Pope compares his era to Horace's at the opening of a later *Imitation*:

> *THE Reflections of* Horace, *and the Judgments past in his Epistle to* Augustus, *seem'd so seasonable to the present times, that I could not help applying them to the use of my own Country*.[13]

[10] Gillespie and Sowerby 2005, 24.
[11] Derrida 2001, 183.
[12] Davis 2008, 7. The reputation of a translator, which Davis describes as being associated with "degrading images," will be discussed in Chapter 4.
[13] Advertisement to *The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace Imitated* (*TE*, 4:3) and Advertisement to *The First Epistle of the Second Book of Horace Imitated* (*ibid*., 191).

Throughout his Horatian series, Pope compares and contrasts. A major theme of contrast is patronage: Horace became an *amicus*, the status of poet-client which Pope refused. Pope knew that an independent path was not accessible to Horace. Horace was already an *eques* and, despite the confiscation of property, it is reasonable to assume that he still maintained some of his wealth. However, what a poet in ancient Rome needed was an audience, and for this, one needed to be dependent on an aristocratic patron.[14] Pope recognized that Horace, though keeping himself within the system and within safe boundaries, nevertheless essayed to stretch his freedom to its limits and struggled to maintain a certain amount of independence. Pope contrasts his own situation to Horace's, but he also detects the search for freedom in the ancient poet which he found comparable to his own aspirations. Another main topic, as seen in the passage above, is politics. In the face of potentially lethal dangers such as censorship and libel laws, Horace maneuvered his way skillfully and even managed to turn the personal letter to Augustus into a lecture instructing the emperor on proper appreciation of the literary arts.[15] As Chapter 9 on aging and mortality will demonstrate, Pope sought similarities and, in many ways, advice on how to confront the issues he faced in later life. He would, unfortunately, fall out with Horace eventually, as will be discussed in the final chapter, but, for all their obvious differences, he admired the freedom which the ancient poet managed to negotiate in various aspects of his career and life. Freedom, or the search for freedom, was indeed the key issue in the comparisons and contrasts which the English poet made with Horace.

Freedom in this chapter is represented by the creativity Pope pursued in his writings. Scholars have noted the correlation between imitation as a literary form and the creativity and freedom allowed in it. Frank Stack explains: "Imitation as a form was wholly compatible with genuinely creative expression, and the freer the Imitation, the more this was so." James McLaverty states that Pope's "main aim… was to claim… dignity and freedom." Paul Davis calls Pope's Horatian *Imitations* "richly creative endeavours" as opposed to translation which imposed certain restraints on the poet.[16] Imitation presented for Pope a perfect medium, allowing creativity in drawing comparisons and contrasts and, based on them, the freedom to

[14] White 1993, 22.
[15] For ancient libel laws, including the Twelve Tables, see Chapter 6 and for Horace's letter to Augustus, *Ep*. 2.1, see Chapters 7 and 8.
[16] Stack 1985, 19; McLaverty 2001, 149, in referring to the first two Horatian *Imitations*; Davis 2008, 6.

express perceptions about the contemporary English society in which he lived as well as about his own life.[17]

The first section of this chapter will look into the history of imitation in English literature. Sir John Denham (1615-1669) and Abraham Cowley (1618-1667) helped set the vogue in motion in the seventeenth century, and Dryden analyzed and provided definitions for different types of translations, one of which was imitation. All of these predecessors, and others, influenced Pope. In the second section of this chapter I intend to introduce the plans which Pope drew up in composing a work based on Horace and the forms of publication which he considered. The final section will be a discussion of parallel texts. It will discuss the trend of providing original texts alongside translations or imitations, and it will continue with the discussion of the poet's motives in including the Latin text according to his publication plans of the *Opus Magnum*, a project that never materialized.

I. Origin of Imitation: Dryden's Metaphrase, Paraphrase, and Imitation

The exact moment in English literary history at which imitation came to be practiced and, still more, when it became a popular literary trend is hard to trace. On the beginnings of imitation, Richard S. Peterson explains:

> The concept of imitation had been in ferment throughout the European Renaissance. The idea of returning to ancient sources and models was almost universally appealing; the great debate was over precisely how this should be done. Should there be strict adherence to one model, as the Ciceronians (and the thoroughgoing Petrarchans) believed, or should writers seek out a variety of models – and if so, how or to what degree should they be followed, assimilated, and acknowledged? Brought to English shores in a large-spirited and flexible version in the works of Erasmus and Vives, and partly domesticated in rhetoric by Thomas Wilson and in educational theory by Ascham, the doctrine of imitation was sporadically discussed and practiced by sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century love poets such as Wyatt, Sidney, and Drummond, by satirists such as Hall, Marston, and the epigrammatists, and by essayists such as Cornwallis.[18]

While Peterson here dates the rise of imitation as early as the sixteenth century, other scholars, referring to the style of imitation which Pope practiced, have traced the tradition to the mid-seventeenth century.[19] The difficulty in determining a date of origin also lies in the fact that it was not always common practice to indicate the original on which an imitation was based. In the case of Horace, Howard Erskine-Hill has noted that, while English poets of Jonson's time

[17] Cf. Stack: "imitation seemed to endorse ideas of general nature and general truth, the conviction that human nature and human experience, despite changes of time and circumstance, had always been the same" (1985, 18).
[18] Peterson 1981, 4-5; see also his references.
[19] See, for example, Brooks (1949) and Weinbrot (1966 and 1969).

and beyond wrote imitations based on both Horace's *Odes* and hexameter verse, early seventeenth-century poets did not always point out their source.[20]

Imitation is closely connected to translation. Sir John Denham and Abraham Cowley stand out as the chief figures who promoted a more liberal manner of translation in the last half of the seventeenth century. It perhaps makes more sense to borrow Dryden's famous definition of the different types of translation which were recognized around this time:

> All Translation I suppose may be reduced to these three heads.
> First, that of metaphrase, or turning an author word by word, and line by line, from one language into another. Thus, or near this manner, was Horace his *Art of Poetry* translated by Ben Johnson. The second way is that of paraphrase, or translation with latitude, where the author is kept in view by the translator, so as never to be lost, but his words are not so strictly followed as his sense; and that too is admitted to be amplified, but not altered. Such is Mr. Waller's translation of Virgil's Fourth *AEneid*. The third way is that of imitation, where the translator (if now he has not lost that name) assumes the liberty, not only to vary from the words and sense, but to forsake them both as he sees occasion; and taking only some general hints from the original, to run division on the groundwork, as he pleases. Such is Mr. Cowley's practice in turning two Odes of Pindar, and one of Horace, into English.[21]

Dryden's metaphrase seems to be close to what we would call a literal translation. He cites as example Ben Jonson's translation of Horace's *Art of Poetrie* (*c.* 1605). Jonson contributed to the development of imitation in English poetry, but, as Dryden's description indicates ("word by word, and line by line"), his rendering of Horace is extremely literal.[22] Dryden commented on Jonson's version of Horace:

> We see Ben Johnson could not avoid obscurity in his literal translation of Horace, attempted in the same compass of lines: nay Horace himself could scarce have done it to a Greek poet.[23]

When a translator strove for a literal, word-for-word translation, it only served to produce "obscurity," as the expressions and thoughts of an author in one language simply cannot be rendered faithfully into another language. It is impossible to produce a translation from Latin to English that is literal and yet of high caliber, just as it would be difficult for Horace to compose an exemplary Latin translation of a Greek work.

---

[20] Erskine-Hill 1983, 169-74.
[21] Dryden 1900, 1:237.
[22] For Jonson and imitation, see Peterson (1981), who argues that Jonson understood that "the ultimate triumph of the good imitator is the synthesis of inherited fragments into a new and original whole" (ibid., xv). His views on Jonson seem to influence his dating of the beginnings of imitation to the sixteenth century. I do not wish to discount his argument, but other scholars see Jonson and the dating of imitation differently; see Stack 1985, 19, on Jonson, and I.R.F. Gordon: "imitation was more than just a frame of mind for the Augustan poet. It was also an accepted form, or literary 'kind,' that grew out of the great interest and activity in verse translation that took place in the seventeenth century. During the first half of the century most English verse translation tended toward a fairly close adherence to the original, for example Ben Jonson's translation of Horace's *Ars Poetica*, but during the second half of the century verse translators increasingly took more freedom with their models. It became more important for a translator to catch the spirit of a work than to give a word-for-word rendition" (1976, 101).
[23] Dryden 1900, 1:238-39; he also cites the Latin from Horace's *Ars Poetica* (24-25): "brevis esse laboro, | obscurus fio" (ibid., 239) ("I take pains to be concise, I become obscure," my translation).

Cowley and Denham were contemporaries and friends, and both advocated freedom in translation.[24] Like Cowley, Pope greatly admired Denham. Among other works, his *Cooper's Hill* (1642) was one of the poems which served as a model for *Windsor-Forest* (1713), and Pope commended the "Strength" of Denham's poetry in *An Essay on Criticism*.[25] Denham had first-hand experience of translation. Like Waller, who translated one book and Dryden who made a complete version, he produced a translation of the fourth book of Virgil's *Aeneid*, which was published under the title *The Destruction of Troy* (1656). Earlier in 1648, Sir Richard Fanshawe (1608-1666), a Royalist who became Latin Secretary to Charles II, translated into English *Il Pastor Fido* by Giovanni Battista Guarini. Denham wrote a commendatory poem on Fanshawe's English translation, in which he expounds on the task of translation:

That servile path thou nobly dost decline
Of tracing word by word, and line by line.
Those are the labour'd births of slavish brains,
Not the effects of Poetry, but pains;
Cheap vulgar arts, whose narrowness affords
No flight for thoughts, but poorly sticks at words.
A new and nobler way thou dost pursue
To make Translations and Translators too.
They but preserve the Ashes, thou the Flame,
True to his sense, but truer to his fame.[26]

The "servile path" refers to literal translation. Several decades later, Dryden will use the same term, "servile," in describing a literal rendering into English.[27]

There is another echo of Denham which we see in Dryden and which bears a slight relation to Horace. Denham teaches that one must "decline" the practice of "tracing word by word, and line by line." This corresponds exactly to Dryden's definition of metaphrase, a translation that is done "word by word, and line by line."[28] It recalls in fact Horace's famous instruction from the *Ars Poetica*: "nec verbo verbum curabis reddere fidus | interpres" ("Prudent translator, you will not take pains to render word for word") (*AP*, 133-34). These words by Horace, along with a translation, are provided by Dryden in his *Preface to the*

[24] Between the two it is considered that Denham showed more reserve in his works. See Dryden: "As they [Denham and Cowley] were friends, I suppose they communicated their thoughts on this subject to each other; and therefore their reasons for it are little different, though the practice of one [Denham] is much more moderate" (ibid., 239); and that "Sir John Denham… advised more liberty than he took himself" (ibid., 240-41).
[25] See *An Essay on Criticism*, 361. Other models for *Windsor-Forest* include, of course, Virgil's *Georgics*, as well as native works such as William Camden's *Britannia* (1586) and Michael Drayton's *Poly-Olbion* (1622).
[26] Denham 1969, 143-44.
[27] Dryden 1900, 1:239.
[28] Ibid., 237.

Translation of Ovid's Epistles.[29] We must keep in mind, though, that if Dryden cited copiously from Horace in his critical works, he often quoted lines from memory and some, which he claimed to have been Horace's words, are not found in the texts of Horace. It seems that, whichever words he believed to be Horace's and were a good fit to support his argument, were sufficient for him to quote and attribute to Horace.[30] Thus, although the words in the passage above are cited accurately from a Horatian text, Dryden is not attempting to enter into a discussion of Horace's and other Latin poets' views and practice on translation or to compare ancient theories of translation with those of his day. For him it suffices to use Horace's words to support his claim that a word-for-word translation into English, from ancient texts and often from the Latin, does not render a work of high quality in English. This is what Denham points out as well, when he denounces literal translation for its "narrowness" that yields "No flight for thoughts" and only concentrates on the number of words and the strict meaning of each word: "poorly sticks at words." Different styles of translation other than the literal must be permitted.

The second type which Dryden introduces is paraphrase. This "translation with latitude," he explains, permits more freedom for the translator in language, so long as the meaning of the original is not lost or modified entirely: "his words are not so strictly followed as his sense; and that too is admitted to be amplified, but not altered." For this he gives as model Edmund Waller (1606-1687), who translated the fourth book of the *Aeneid* in 1658. It was a work which was originally undertaken by Sidney Godolphin (1610-1643) yet was left incomplete at his death in the Civil War. Both Waller and Dryden translated Virgil's masterpiece from the Latin, the former partially and the latter in whole. In his *Imitation* (1737) of Horace's *Epistle to Augustus*, Pope names both poets as contributors to the development of English literary culture:

Britain to soft refinements less a foe,
Wit grew polite, and Numbers learn'd to flow.
Waller was smooth; but Dryden taught to join
The varying verse, the full resounding line,
The long majestic march, and energy divine. (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.1.265-9)

Waller and Dryden were poets whom Pope respected from his youth. As early as 1711 in his *Essay on Criticism*, Pope commended Waller, along with Denham:

And praise the *Easie Vigor* of a Line,

[29] Ibid.
[30] See Hammond 1993, 127; he also notes that there are discrepancies between editions of Horace from the Renaissance and the seventeenth century, which Dryden would have had access to, and twentieth century editions; see also ibid., 138, for another example of Dryden citing Horace to defend his arguments on poetry.

Where *Denham*'s Strength, and *Waller*'s Sweetness join. (*Essay on Criticism*, 360-61)

Pope especially appreciated Waller's "Sweetness,"[31] and he imitated Waller's poems in his youth.[32] Although Waller was a court poet who served under Charles I, Oliver Cromwell, and Charles II, Pope regarded Waller as a model and held positive views towards him regarding his poetic style.

The third mode in Dryden's definition is imitation. It diverges considerably from translation, and Dryden himself doubts whether the writer should still be called a translator: "if now he has not lost that name." The imitator is allowed to take "liberty," "vary" the language and even "sense," retains "only some general hints" from the original, and, in short, may do "as he pleases." It seems as if there could exist no freer form of translation than what Dryden terms as imitation. There were also some practical barriers which assisted the move to accept liberal, instead of literal, translations. Calling Latin "a most severe and compendious language," Dryden explains the difficulties in rendering what could be expressed in one word in Latin faithfully into English in the same number of words. In addition to this, there is what Dryden terms "the slavery of rhyme." The structure of Latin poetry which demands different metrical measures for different topics, such as the hexameter for epic, and for which each syllable could either be long or short, posed insurmountable difficulties when one tried to match them to the nature of poetry in English, for instance translating them into couplets.[33] Dryden voices his conclusion on the matter:

> For thought, if it be translated truly, cannot be lost in another language; but the words that convey it to our apprehension (which are the image and ornament of that thought,) may be so ill chosen, as to make it appear in an unhandsome dress, and rob it of its native lustre. There is, therefore, a liberty to be allowed for the expression; neither is it necessary that words and lines should be confined to the measure of their original.[34]

Liberty in words had to be accorded in English translations in order to keep fidelity to the sense of the original.

In addition to eliminating the difficulty owing to the different structures of the Latin and English langauges, imitation also yielded freedom in content and length. Writers sometimes exercised their creativity to such an extent that there even appeared imitations twice removed. In 1704, Joseph Addison produced an imitation entitled "Milton's Stile

[31] See Sowerby 2006, 82.
[32] See *TE*, 6:7-11.
[33] Although ardent classicists such as Gabriel Harvey, a friend of Spenser, advocated the hexameter in English poetry, Dryden was not the only poet to note the incompatibility of Latin meters in English. See Sowerby 2006, 62-78 on the history of rhyme in poetry which was first introduced in the Latin of Church hymns in the early Middle Ages.
[34] Dryden 1900, 1:242.

Imitated, in a Translation of a Story out of the Third Aeneid."[35] Likewise were Pope's two imitations of John Donne's satires. Pope's *The Fourth Satire of Dr. John Donne, Dean of St. Paul's, Versifyed* (1733) is an imitation of Donne's fourth satire, which in turn is an imitation of Horace's *Sat*. 1.9. *The Second Satire of Dr. John Donne, Dean of St. Paul's, Versifyed* (1735) is based on Donne's second satire and, although not drawing on Horace, Pope inserted the same citation from Horace's *Sat*. 1.9 on the title page, which is found on the title page of *The Fourth Satire* two years earlier.[36] On the other hand, some imitations had multiple classical sources. James Miller's *Seasonable Reproof* (1735) was based on two poems by the same author, *Sat*. 1.3 and 1.4 by Horace. Paul Whitehead's *State of Rome Under Nero and Domitian: A Satire* (1739) used as sources works from two ancient poets, Juvenal and Persius.[37]

As we shall see shortly, modern scholars offer different theories on the defining characteristics of imitation. Most point out the significance of the original and the change of setting, and I believe that the common thread to be found in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century English imitation is recognition of the original text and its transformation into a contemporary setting. While it may be true that a reader may still be able to enjoy an imitation without knowledge of the original, familiarity with the source text undoubtedly adds depth to the imitation. A deeper understanding of the differences and their significance is what any imitator would wish from his audience, albeit the fact that he may not be able to demand knowledge of the source text from his readers.[38]

Describing Ben Jonson's imitations, Richard Peterson states:

> [Imitation] yields at the very least an intriguing resonance, and ideally – for those readers who recognize the allusions and hence the resourcefulness with which they have been turned and deployed – a rich harmony of implications. Those who participate fully in the discovery of Jonson's meaning, whether readers or recipients, must be alert to his habits of playing upon various ancient traditions concerning a single historical or mythological figure; of layering different classical responses to a single situation; of playfully omitting from the

[35] See Sowerby 2006, 131.
[36] Pope originally composed this poem around the year 1713, though it differed considerably from the version which was published in the *Works* of 1735; see *TE*, 4:xli-xliii and 130.
[37] See Stack 1985, 22.
[38] As will be shown in the next section, Gordon 1976, 102 agrees that the imitations were meant for an audience who were familiar with the original, and he cites this as the reason why imitations, particularly from Latin poetry, had parallel texts. Cf. also Stuart Gillespie who reminds us that, "reading of the original in the Greek or Latin would have been going on throughout this period [late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries], even after an English translation became available." However, noting Pope's "complex intertextual play" of printing the original Latin as well, he explains: "not all readers experienced or were expected to experience this effect, since, as an anonymous reviewer noted in 1767, 'Pope well knew, the number of those who read a translation to be diverted, greatly exceeds those who read it to compare with the original' (*Critical Review* 23: 364). On some occasions, such as for instance with a large-scale Greek prose work like Plutarch's *Lives*, we can be confident that few readers used the source text as well as the translation" (2005, 132).

classical nexus of ideas a single term that bears vitally on the expressed meaning; and of evoking an ancient figure by an attribute or an attribute by a figure.[39]

Imitation had its full effect when the reader could recognize the imitator's "playing upon" ancient figures, his interpretations of "classical responses to a single situation," the omission of certain ideas in the original, and the replacement, or juxtaposition, of ancient figures to contemporary ones. Of Pope and his Horatian *Imitations*, Howard Weinbrot explains that "no reader innocent of Latin would turn to Pope's *Epistle to Augustus* (1737) to understand Horace's poem of that name; and no reader of Pope's *Epistle* can fully understand it without Horace in mind."[40] Geoffrey Tillotson expresses a similar opinion:

The eighteenth-century reader… was expected to take pleasure in recognizing the way new poems worked certain significant changes on the traditional – and ultimately Roman or Greek – originals…. The pleasure offered by Pope's *Epistle to Augustus* (1737) depends largely on the reader's familiarity with Horace's original.[41]

Thus, one of the agreed preliminaries as to what constitutes an imitation seems to be recognition of the original text. Frank Stack states that, "Pope seems to invite not mere recollection of the original… but an active re-reading of those well-known poems," and that imitation, particularly one which is accompanied by a parallel text, concerns both "involvement with" and "divergence from" the original.[42] Jacob Fuchs claims that, "both the imitation and its source have to be read" and has stressed as his reason that the audience must be able to compare: "For the imitation to keep its life, the gaps must be treated as persisting opportunities for dialogue, invitations to participate."[43] In order to be able to "participate" and enjoy an imitation, a reader must be familiar with the original work.

Transformation to a contemporary setting is another chief characteristic of an imitation. Harold F. Brooks has argued that, stemming from free translation, it was "the right to modernize the settings" which led to the widely recognized practice of imitations. I.R.F. Gordon has also stated that the differences accounted for in the change of setting were what

[39] Peterson 1981, 3-4.
[40] Weinbrot 1966, 435.
[41] Tillotson et al. 1969, 12.
[42] Stack 1985, 24. He divides imitation into one for those who has no familiarity with the source and one in which the imitator changes the meaning of the original so as to produce an entirely different poem; see the examples of works which he provides in ibid., 19-20. Both types involve modernization of setting. He does, however, acknowledge that the "boundaries between these two types of Imitations are… very fluid, and individual works often defy classification" (ibid., 20).
[43] Fuchs 1989, 21and 19.

served to invite comparisons between the past and present.[44] Let us return once again to Dryden's interpretation of what a writer of an imitation should do:

I take imitation of an author, in their sense, to be an endeavour of a later poet to write like one who has written before him, on the same subject; that is, not to translate his words, or to be confined to his sense, but only to set him as a pattern, and to write, as he supposes that author would have done, had he lived in our age, and in our country.

Dryden insists on composing an imitation as if the original author was writing "in our age, and in our country." Similarly, he states in his own translation of Virgil:

I have endeavoured to make Virgil speak such English as he would himself have spoken, if he had been born in England, and in this present age.[45]

Dryden had expounded the duties of an imitator in the first passage in 1680. Nearly two decades later in 1697, he still holds this view and confirms it in the *Dedication of the AEneis*, as in the passage above.

To illustrate how Pope managed the change of setting in his Horatian *Imitations*, I shall provide here a fairly straightforward example. In *Sat*. 2.2, Horace embarks on a discourse in which he preaches on simple living,

... quare
templa ruunt antiqua deum? cur, improbe, carae
non aliquid patriae tanto emetiris acervo? (*Sat.* 2.2.103-5)

Why
do the ancient temples of the gods lie in waste? Why, shameless man,
do you not measure out something for your beloved country from so big a pile?

Horace points out that, instead of hoarding individual wealth only to indulge in extravagance and to feel superior to others, there are public building projects which require capital and which will be of benefit to all Romans. Although never explicitly mentioned, *Sat*. 2.2 contains descriptions of Rome in the aftermaths of the recent civil war. In the concluding portion of the poem Horace names Ofellus,[46] who was once a landowner but lost his land. He has been reduced to a tenant farmer (112-36). Ofellus is, of course, a figure whose circumstances overlap with the poet's.[47] Besides Horace, Virgil, Propertius, and Tibullus were all supposedly victims of expropriation and redistribution of land by Octavian and Mark Antony

[44] Brooks 1949, 127. Citing Oldham's *Satire in Imitation of the Third of Juvenal*, Gordon explains that this was "used to add emphasis to the condemnation of the present," as Oldham sought to present London as "not only bad but as bad as Juvenal's Rome." Similarly, he cites Pope's *The First Epistle of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated* as being "used ironically to undercut the present by creating a contrast with the past and explains that here "the compliments sincerely paid by Horace to Augustus are ironically paid by Pope to George Augustus Hanover" (1976, 102).
[45] Dryden 1900, 1:239 and 2:228. See also a similar statement in Denham's Preface to *The Destruction of Troy*.
[46] See also Chapter 9 for a discussion of this figure.
[47] See *Ep.* 2.2.49-51. On the character of Ofellus, Bowditch states that, "As an emblem of diminished status, Ofellus serves as a mirror image showing the reverse of Horace's upward mobility" (2001, 147).

after the Battle of Philippi.[48] However, the extent of Horace's loss remains uncertain,[49] and as such, one should keep in mind that this may be an instance of Horace's posturing. By the time of the publication of the second book of *Satires* in 30 B.C.E., the major battles had already taken place, but political and military leaders had not been able to maintain and improve the infrastructure in Rome. Horace points out that the temples of Roman deities lie in ruin ("templa ruunt antiqua deum," 104) and that there is need for restoration of important public buildings which were destroyed ("tanto… acervo," 105).[50] Such is the situation of Rome as Horace depicts it.

Pope changes the setting from ancient Rome to contemporary London:

Shall half the new-built Churches round thee fall?
Make Keys, build Bridges, or repair White-hall. (*Hor. Imit. Sat.* 2.2.119-20)

Projects for building new churches in London and Westminster were implemented. Construction began in 1713, but they were built on marshy ground, the result being that some of them sank and tilted to one side. Pope also calls for the need to build more bridges across the Thames. At the time of the publication of this poem in 1734 there was still only London Bridge. An Act was finally passed in 1736 to build Westminster Bridge, but the project was not completed until 1750. Whitehall Palace was purchased by Henry VIII in 1530 from Cardinal Wolsey and had since become the king's residence. It was destroyed by a series of fires in the 1690s, in which ultimately only the banquet hall survived. Plans to rebuild surfaced but were never carried through.[51] The need to "Make Keys" refers to a river embankment for Whitehall.[52] Pope makes use of Horace's pleas to rebuild Rome after the civil war to voice his opinions on the various building projects in the capital of his native England.[53]

The change to a modern setting and recognition of the original by his audience were key components of an imitation. The definition of an imitation, however, was never clear-cut. That is, no matter how much we may search for defining characteristics and conditions as to what constitutes an imitation, it is difficult to delimit a certain type of poem as an imitation because seventeenth- and eighteenth-century poets themselves did not make a careful

[48] See Virgil, *Ecl*. 1.3-4 and 67-72, 9.3-4; Tibullus, *Eleg*. 1.1.41-42; Propertius, *Eleg*. 4.1.127.
[49] White 1993, 12.
[50] See *Ep*. 2.1.16.
[51] See *Windsor-Forest*, 380 and *The Dunciad*, 3:327-38 with Pope's notes.
[52] Although there were other terraces and quays along the Thames, one for Whitehall was never built. For the churches, keys, bridge, and Whitehall, see *TE*, 4:62-63n.
[53] Cf. McLaverty who interprets Pope's reference to the carelessness on public works as criticism of "the abuses of private wealth" (2001, 172).

distinction. Abraham Cowley called his rendering of the city mouse and country mouse of Horace's *Sat*. 2.6, first published in 1663, *The Country Mouse: a Paraphrase upon Horace, 2 Book, Satire 6*.[54] The poem does seem to fit the definition of paraphrase given by Dryden; the poem has been "amplified" from Horace's thirty-nine verses (*AP*, 79-117) to Cowley's ninety-five, yet the sense "not altered," and the setting, at least of the dwelling of the city mouse, has been changed to London. Perhaps Dryden also had this poem in mind when he wrote his definitions some two decades after Cowley's publication, but, while *The Country Mouse* is a "paraphrase," or "translation with latitude," it is hard to confirm that there is no overlap with other definitions.

Pope also used many terms interchangeably. The individual titles of his Horatian series are:

- *The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace Imitated*
- *The Second Satire of the Second Book of Horace Paraphrased*
- *Sober Advice from Horace, to the Young Gentlemen about Town. As deliver'd in his Second Sermon. Imitated in the Manner of Mr. Pope*
- *The First Ode of the Fourth Book of Horace*
- *The Second Epistle of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated by Mr. Pope*
- *The First Epistle of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated*
- *The Sixth Epistle of the First Book of Horace Imitated*
- *An Imitation of the Sixth Satire of the Second Book of Horace*
- *The Seventh Epistle of the First Book of Horace. Imitated in the Manner of Dr. Swift*
- *The First Epistle of the First Book of Horace Imitated*.

While he uses "Imitated" in most of his titles, he also uses "Paraphrased," and there is one for which he gives no categorization.[55] Aside from titles, Pope as the author does not always clearly distinguish how to call his poems. Referring to his *Second Satire of the Second Book of Horace Paraphrased* in a letter to Swift, he writes, "this week… I have translated, or rather

[54] See Hopkins 1993, 105.
[55] The titles are taken from *TE*, 4. I have omitted from this list: *Part of the Ninth Ode of the Fourth Book of Horace*, which is incomplete and was published only posthumously for the first time in Warburton's *Works* of 1751; *One Thousand Seven Hundred and Forty*, again incomplete and never published in his lifetime; and *One Thousand Seven Hundred and Thirty Eight. A Dialogue Something like Horace* and *One Thousand Seven Hundred and Thirty Eight. Dialogue II*, which, though they conclude the Horatian series, are not directly based on any of Horace's poems. Note also that for his works based on Donne, he calls them "Versifyed:" *The Fourth Satire of Dr. John Donne, Dean of St. Paul's, Versifyed* and *The Second Satire of Dr. John Donne, Dean of St. Paul's, Versifyed*.

parodied, another of Horace's."[56] While the published title reads "Paraphrased," in the letter to his friend he wavers between calling his poem a translation or a parody. The public was not much different. The title of Pope's version of Horace's *Epistle to Augustus* (1737) is *The First Epistle of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated*, but, according to Howard Weinbrot, "The administration *Gazetteer* for 3 January 1740 quotes approvingly some lines from 89-127 and says that 'Mr. *Pope* has beautifully paraphrased them' from Horace."[57] Pope's Horatian *Imitations* were certainly not the only works which were referred to in such an ambiguous manner. A partial translation of Sarpedon's speech from Homer's *Iliad* by Peter Motteux from 1707, a work which Pope knew and used for his own *Episode of Sarpedon* in 1709, was entitled *The Speech of Sarpedon to Glaucus. Translated, or rather Imitated, from Book XII. of Homer's Iliads*. The nineteen Greek lines by Homer are expanded to fifty-four lines in English by Motteux, and the poem acknowledges its two possibilities of categorization: *Translated, or rather Imitated*.[58] The author inclines towards calling his work an imitation more than a translation, but his ambivalence remains. These ambiguous and interchangeable labels by both the author and general public blur the distinctions of what exactly one should consider an imitation or other types of free translation.

In his definition of imitation, Dryden cites as example Cowley's *Pindarique Odes*. In the preface to the *Pindarique Odes* (1656), for which he is best known, Cowley calls for the need for "invention" in translation.[59] Dryden commented on this work by his predecessor:

> A genius so elevated and unconfined as Mr. Cowley's, was but necessary to make Pindar speak English, and that was to be performed by no other way than imitation. …there is something new produced, which is almost the creation of another hand.[60]

Dryden thought highly of Cowley's *Odes*, and Pope called him "a fine poet."[61] A passage from one of his Horatian *Imitations* describes the author of the *Pindarique Odes*:

> Who now reads Cowley? if he pleases yet,
> His moral pleases, not his pointed wit;
> Forgot his Epic, nay his Pindaric Art,
> But still I love the language of his Heart.[62] (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.75-78)

[56] *Corr*., 3:366; it is generally agreed, on account of lines 161-64 of the poem in which Swift takes speech, that this refers to the *Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.2, but Sherburn expresses slight concern over Pope's unreliability when he writes of days and time (*ibid*., 366n.). Cf. also Stack who explains: "Pope's practice [of imitation] is more like 'metaphrase', paraphrase' and 'imitation' rolled into one" (1985, 24).
[57] Weinbrot 1978, 243; the underline is my emphasis.
[58] Motteux's text is presented in *TE*, 10:572-73. See Ferraro (1993) for Motteux's *Speech of Sarpedon to Glaucus* and other works which influenced Pope's *Episode of Sarpedon*.
[59] Cowley 1905, 155.
[60] Dryden 1900, 1:240.
[61] Ibid., 186; Spence 1966, 1:189.
[62] Cf. Chapter 1; although Cowley and Pope's father differ in origin and career, Pope in his poetry employs the same phrase in describing of his father as one who knew "the Language of the Heart" (*Ep. to Arbuthnot*, 399).

Pope laments that his predecessor is already sliding into oblivion (75). David Hopkins suggests that "the language of his Heart" may refer to Cowley's autobiographical *Essays*, which were written in the poet's late life and published posthumously in 1668.[63] Like Pope, Cowley admired the *Essais* of Montaigne, and he modeled his work on the confessional style of the French author. This revelation of personal reflections bears importantly on both Pope and imitation.

A precocious child whose poetic talents were recognized early and who attended Trinity College, Cambridge, Cowley, like many others of his era, was engulfed by the tides of the Civil War. He took the Royalist side and, through the contacts of his patron Henry, Lord Jermyn, became a secret agent to Queen Henrietta Maria. Having followed her in her exile to France in the 1640s, he embarked on intelligence missions throughout England and other parts of Europe for over a decade. Paul Davis suggests the reason why free translation appealed to Cowley:

> Quite as much as an opportunity to settle their political scores, it was the prospect of friendly intimacy that drew proscribed poets to translation during the troubled middle decades of the seventeenth century. Free translation recommended itself to these poets as a literary form of the 'civil shrift or confession'… which friends make to each other.[64]

In what Davis compares to a friendship ("friendly," "friends"), for those who led a secret life like Cowley, free translation became the medium which satisfied the need for confession of inner thoughts. Wentworth Dillon (1663-1685), the fourth Earl of Roscommon, wrote a treatise on translation titled *An Essay on Translated Verse* (1684). Composed in couplets, the *Essay* presents the Earl's view on the duties of a translator and one of the pieces of advice which he gives is: "chuse an Author as you chuse a Friend."[65] It was important for the English translator to feel a personal connection to the author of the original, as if he were an intimate friend.

Cowley also produced a partial English rendering of Horace's *Sat.* 2.6, on the fable of the city mouse and the country mouse, which corresponds to the last third of Horace's poem. Like the *Pindarique Odes*, Hopkins has commented that Cowley's English version of *Sat.* 2.6 represents "a voyage of self-discovery."[66] He has also noted that Charles Tomlinson once employed a phrase by T.S. Eliot from the Introduction to *The Selected Poems of Ezra Pound* (1928) when commenting on Cowley, that in his rendering of *Sat.* 2.6 the poet was "giving the

[63] Hopkins 1993, 106-7.
[64] Davis 2008, 80.
[65] *An Essay on Translated Verse*, 96.
[66] Hopkins 1993, 126.

original through himself and finding himself through the original."[67] This may be applied to Pope, as he recognized that free translation could be a suitable medium through which one could reveal one's "heart," and this is what he set out to do in the Horatian *Imitations* in sharing his opinions on the contemporary society in which he lived as well as in disclosing his reflections and agony as he confronted his own mortality in later life.

II. "In Horace's Manner:"[68] *Opus Magnum* and the Horatian *Imitations*

As we have seen, Horace was one of Pope's favorite authors from youth. Aside from allusions in his poetry and short Latin phrases quoted in his correspondence, we can detect other possible influences. One such may be the traces of Horace's *Satires* on voyages – his famed travel to Brundisium of *Sat*. 1.5 and his walk through the streets of Rome with the persistent parasite in *Sat*. 1.9 – which Howard Erskine-Hill points out in Pope's letter to Burlington in 1716 in which he recounts a fictional trip to Oxford by carriage with his publisher Bernard Lintot.[69] To this, I may add Pope's lengthy letters to Teresa and Martha Blount in 1717 on his trip to Oxford in which he describes the landscape as well as the different people whom he met and the activities in which he was engaged.[70] While influence from Horace was thus already present in his works, it was in the late 1720s that active plans to work on Horace began to brew in Pope's mind.[71]

The translations of Homer were published between 1715 and 1726. During this time, Pope also completed his edition of Shakespeare, which appeared in 1725. The long and exhaustive projects of translating and editing came to a conclusion, and with it Pope found that his finances were more than secure. Fenton and Broome, his collaborators on the translation of the *Odyssey,* talked of a plan which Pope was nourishing. In a letter from Fenton to Broome on 24 June 1729, Pope's two assistants discuss the poet's intentions:

> The war is carried on against him furiously in pictures and libels… He [Pope] told me that for the future he intended to write nothing but epistles in Horace's manner, in which I question not but he will succeed very well.[72]

[67] Ibid.; from Charles Tomlinson's *Poetry and Metamorphosis* (Cambridge 1983), 84.
[68] In a letter from Fenton to Broome (*Corr*., 3:37).
[69] Erskine-Hill 2000, xiv; Pope's voyage is described in *Corr*., 1:371-75.
[70] *Ibid*., 426-31.
[71] Cf. Leranbaum's statement: "Pope's full commitment to Horace comes in 1729" (1977, 5).
[72] *Corr*., 3:37.

Later in the same year, Pope disclosed in a letter to Swift his scheme to work on "a system of Ethics in the Horatian way."[73] Accordingly, the early 1730s saw a series of epistles published by Pope, whether or not explicitly marked as written "in the Horatian way."

It must be made clear that Pope had two plans at work: the *Opus Magnum* and the Horatian *Imitations*. Pope had long been interested in presenting his views on the significance of morality in his poetry.[74] Robert W. Rogers has suggested that in Pope's later career the poet may also have felt the need "to correct the portrait of his moral character," after publishing such works as the *Dunciad* of 1728 and following the perpetual flood of pamphlet attacks which threatened to mar his person and reputation.[75] It was thus that he decided to produce a series of moral epistles "in the Horatian way." However, it was not until 1734 that he disclosed an Index, a carefully wrought outline of the project, to be included in the folio edition of *An Essay on Man*.[76] However, for all the years and effort which Pope poured into this project, the *Opus Magnum*, unlike the Horatian series, never materialized, or, at least, not in the voluminous form which he had initially envisioned.

The "Index to the Ethic Epistles" indicates that there will be two books. The first book was to consist of four epistles, and James M. Osborn explains:

> The term 'Ethic Epistles' was employed in 1734 when the four books of the *Essay on Man* were republished as one poem, with the explanatory subtitle, 'Being the First Book of Ethic Epistles'.[77]

The outline for the second book is more difficult to decipher, as it is not divided by markers such as "Epistle I" and "Epistle II," as in the first book. Osborn expresses his confusion stating that it "raises one important question – was the second book to consist of nine epistles, or five?"[78] Pope later withdrew the Index, apparently because his writing could not keep up with his plans. It was never printed.[79] Osborn has flatly stated: "In any case, much of Pope's plan never got beyond the outline."[80] In 1734, whilst he was still composing more of his *Epistles*, he comments to Spence: "I have drawn in the plan for my Ethic Epistles much narrower than it was at first" and later refers to his indecisiveness as to direction: "I don't know whether I shall go on with the Epistle on Government or that on Education." By the end of the year, although he had not yet abandoned his scheme of the *Opus Magnum* entirely, he

[73] *Ibid*., 81.
[74] See Rudd 1994, 86 and Tillotson 1946, 1-2.
[75] Rogers 1955, 30.
[76] The Index is found in Spence 1966, 1:132, as well as Leranbaum 1977, 28 and Foxon 1991, 125.
[77] Spence 1966, 1:133.
[78] Ibid. See also Leranbaum 1977, 27-30, although the question remains largely unresolved.
[79] See ibid., 30.
[80] Spence 1966, 1:133.

certainly hints at it, as he confesses to Swift: "I am almost at the end of my Morals, as I've been, long ago, of my Wit; my system is a short one."[81] Osborn explains the outcome:

> Pope's grand design changed when he began to put it into practice. Thus it went through various stages, and finally ended up as the *Essay on Man* in four epistles plus the four 'Epistles to Several Persons', often called the 'Moral Essays'. Other passages were later incorporated in the *Dunciad* and some in the *Imitations of Horace*.[82]

Pope penned and published the *Epistle to Burlington* (14 December 1731), *Epistle to Bathurst* (15 January 1733), *Epistle to Cobham* (2 January 1734), *Epistle to Arbuthnot* (2 January 1735), and *Epistle to a Lady* (8 February 1735), which are referred to collectively as either the *Epistles to Several Persons* or *Moral Essays*. Then there was *An Essay on Man*, comprised of four epistles. The first three epistles were published on 20 February 1733, and the fourth followed on 8 February 1735. It must be noted, however, that Pope never forgot the project. In April 1744, a few weeks before his death, he relates to Spence:

> I had once thought of completing my ethic work in four books. The first, you know, is on the nature of man. The second would have been on knowledge and its limits. Here would have come in an Essay on Education, part of which I have inserted in the *Dunciad*. The third was to have treated of government, both ecclesiastical and civil – and this was what chiefly stopped my going on. I could not have said what I *would* have said without provoking every church on the face of the earth, and I did not care for living always in boiling water. This part would come into my *Brutus*, which is all planned already, and even some of the most material speeches writ in prose. The fourth would have been on morality, in eight or nine of the most concerning branches of it, four of which would have been the two extremes to each of the cardinal virtues.[83]

Although the *Moral Essays* and *An Essay on Man*, epistles which he did complete and publish, received high praise, the *Opus Magnum* scheme was never carried out in its entirety, as he could not produce as much material as he had wished.

The significance of the ethic epistles for Pope is made manifest in the first Horatian *Imitation* in 1733:

> *Libels* and *Satires!* lawless Things indeed!
> But grave *Epistles*, bringing Vice to light. (*Hor. Imit. Sat.* 2.1.150-51)

Here Pope groups satires with libels as "lawless," and "grave *Epistles*" take precedence over both. Pope was working concurrently on two distinct Horatian projects in the early 1730s, and as Miriam Leranbaum has noted, "he consistently distinguishes them [the Horatian *Imitations*] from those epistles that are within his 'system'."[84] His concern to bring "Vice to light" had already been expressed earlier, in a letter which he wrote to Caryll in 1730/1:

[81] Ibid., 132; ibid., 133; *Corr*., 3:445.
[82] Spence 1966, 1:130. See also McLaverty: "The plan was for a series of ethic epistles; the epistles were to fall into two books, the second illustrative of the general principles of the first. The two books were finally to be combined with *The Dunciad* in a second volume of collected works" (2001, 144).
[83] Spence 1966, 1:134.
[84] Leranbaum 1977, 129.

Your recommendation of Pascal's *Pensées* is a good one, (tho' I've been beforehand with you in it) but he will be of little use to my design, which is rather to ridicule ill men than to preach to 'em. I fear our age is past all other correction.[85]

Pope apparently wants to bring "Vice to light." However, by this time in his life and career, he has no hope of achieving this other than through ridicule, as he states: "I fear our age is past all other correction." His resolve is "to ridicule ill men" in satire than "to preach to 'em" in ethic epistles.

There were thus several factors which eventually led Pope to begin his Horatian *Imitations*. As early as the late 1720s and certainly with intensity in the early 1730s, he was interested in Horace, he wished to write moral epistles, and he wished to expose the vices of the men in his society. His desire to write ethic epistles turned into the *Opus Magnum* project, a plan which seems, at least initially, to have interested and motivated Pope more than composing satirical poems to "to ridicule ill men." However, as we know, it was this scheme which expanded as a series and which he continued well into the late 1730s. They were the Horatian *Imitations*.

As Lerenbaum has remarked, Pope may not have been serious about composing the Horatian *Imitations* in the beginning:

What for Pope appears to have begun as a kind of *jeu d'esprit* to provide relaxation from the greater moral seriousness demanded by the *opus magnum* project came in turn to possess its own moral earnestness and intensity.[86]

The *Imitations* may well have been "a kind of *jeu d'esprit* to provide relaxation," and Pope did not immediately consider them as a serious priority in his literary endeavors. Moreover, the famous comment made by Pope to Spence in 1744 certainly attests to the unanticipated circumstances which drove him to first compose an imitation of Horace:

Lord Bolingbroke came to see me, happened to take up a Horace that lay on the table, and in turning it over dipped on the First Satire of the Second Book. He observed how well that would hit my case, if I were to imitate it in English. After he was gone, I read it over, translated it in a morning or two, and sent it to the press in a week or fortnight after. And this was the occasion of my imitating some other of the Satires and Epistles afterwards.[87]

At first glance, it may almost seem as if Pope had previously never given any serious thought to imitating Horace's poetry. He had, after all, imitated various authors, ancient and modern, but that was in his youth when he did not yet possess a style and topics of his own. In addition, he had finally been relieved of the grand project of the translation of Homer only a few years earlier. It would be understandable to presume that Pope would not have been interested in

[85] *Corr*., 3:173.
[86] Leranbaum 1977, 130.
[87] Spence 1966, 1:143.

imitation which, though in certain respects a freer kind of translation, was nevertheless still translation. It may appear as if the scheme of an imitation of Horace's poem was instigated by one friendly suggestion. However, Sherburn has pointed out that Pope also told Spence:

> Before this hint from Lord Bolingbroke, I had translated the first satire of the first book. But that was done several years ago, and in quite a different manner. It was much closer, and more like a downright translation.[88]

Around 1730, "several years" before his first Horatian *Imitation*, Pope had then worked on a translation of Horace.

In addition, the "first satire of the first book" was not the only translation of Horace which he had attempted. He published a partial translation of Horace's *Sat*. 1.4 in the *London Evening Post* of 22-25 January 1732. While this poem was never expanded and included in the Horatian series, hints were taken from the themes treated in Horace's *Sat*. 1.4 and were incorporated in the later *Epistle to Arbuthnot*, one of which was the expression of appreciation for his father. James McLaverty has pointed out that Pope for some time had been harboring a project based on Horace's poetry: "although the first Horatian satire may have come out of a happy conjunction of circumstances – the speech of composition and the apparent casualness of publication are both remarkable – it can also be seen as the development of an existing plan."[89] The "existing plan" is apparently, not the Horatian *Imitations* but, the *Opus Magnum*. However, it was certainly by a "happy conjunction of circumstances," through Pope's interest in Horace which he initially projected in the *Opus Magnum* and his friend Boligbroke's suggestion, that steered Pope to produce the Horatian *Imitations*. In this section, though centered around Pope's interest in Horace, I concentrated more on Pope's publishing plans than on the content. This will be presented in Chapter 9, with an emphasis on the themes of aging and mortality in Horace's poetry which Pope found congenial to his own career and life in the 1730s.

III. Parallel Texts: "Let me be Horace"[90]

A chief characteristic of Pope's Horatian *Imitations*, which has been the object of many studies and interpretations as will be seen in this section, is the presentation of the Latin

[88] Ibid., 298. Sherburn notes that the manuscript of this Horatian "translation" has not been found and offers his conjecture: "Possibly it is the poem referred to by the author of *A True Character of Mr Pope, and His Writings* (1716), who rated his 'present Imitation of *HORACE*' as the most execrable of all his performances" (*TE*, 4: xxvi).
[89] McLaverty 2001, 144.
[90] *Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.2.144.

original on the facing pages of each *Imitation*. While translation, and free translation including imitation, became a fairly widespread literary activity, the inclusion of parallel texts was not altogether common. Stuart Gillespie and Penelope Wilson explain that only about 16 percent of classical translations included the original text. Latin texts were provided more often than Greek ones, and the original lines were given either on the facing page or at the foot of each page. Translations from modern languages very rarely provided the original text.[91] As we shall see in the next chapter, parallel texts were sometimes given for translations which were to serve as textbooks. Charles Hoole's translation of Terence of 1663, a highly successful edition which was published as teaching material, is an example.[92] Frank Stack explains that it was not common practice in Restoration imitations to provide the original text but that exceptions were to be found in Restoration parodies, such as Charles Cotton's *Scarronides* (1664). He claims that the first "formal Imitation" which was presented with a parallel text, printed at the bottom of each page, was Thomas Wood's *Juvenal Redivivus, or The First Satyr of Juvenal Taught to Speak Plain English* (1683).[93] The trend continued well into Pope's era and later in the eighteenth century. Thomas Nevile's edition of 1758, comprised of four *Satires* and ten *Epistles*, was accompanied by Horace's Latin original printed on the facing page.[94] Samuel Johnson's famous *London* (1738), based on Juvenal's third satire, provided significant passages from the original at the foot of the page. Similarly, footnotes indicating the corresponding line numbers in Juvenal's tenth satire appeared on the pages of his *Vanity of Human Wishes* (1749).[95] Although, according to the statistics given by Gillespie and Wilson, editions with parallel texts belonged to a minority of classical translations, they would not have been a novelty either for Pope or his readers.

There were, of course, a number of translations of Horace prior to Pope which were published with parallel texts. The French scholar André Dacier's edition, *Œuvres d'Horace en latin et en françois, avec des remarques critiques et historiques*, was published in 1709. In English, there was Charles Carthy's *A Translation of the Second Book of Horace's Epistles, Together with Some of the Most Select in the First* (1731), which, like Pope, printed the Latin original on the facing page. Other immediate precedents for Pope include James Braston's

[91] Gillespie and Wilson 2005, 48; their study covers the period from 1660 to 1790.
[92] Kewes 2005, 244.
[93] Stack 1985, 20.
[94] Wilson 2005, 177.
[95] Kelly 2005, 68.

The Art of Politicks, James Miller's *Harlequin-Horace: Or, The Art of Modern Poetry*,[96] and Walter Harte's *Essay on satire, particularly on the Dunciad*. Pope knew the above and appreciated them all, as he writes to Caryll on 6 February 1730/1:

> *The Art of Politicks* is pretty. I saw it before 'twas printed. There is just now come out another imitation of the same original, *Harlequin Horace*: which has a good deal of humour. There is also a poem upon satire writ by Mr Harte of Oxford, a very valuable young man.[97]

Around this time in his career Pope was certainly interested in Horace, imitation, and parallel texts. Accordingly, except for the first editions of *The Second Epistle of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated by Mr. Pope* and *The First Epistle of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated*, Pope provided parallel Latin texts in their entirety on the facing page or, in a few of the later editions, at the bottom of each page.[98] However, it would be inaccurate to conclude that Pope was only following a fashion, however minor, in providing parallel texts.

Pope's principal aim was to draw parallels with Horace. By the 1730s, he is well settled in his poetic career, as McLaverty points out:

> Horace wrote two books of satires and two books of epistles. Pope, who had written his *Ars Poetica, An Essay on Criticism*, early in his career, and was currently engaged in writing two books of epistles, had written one satirical book, the mock-epic *Dunciad*, and now really was beginning a second group of satires. Like Horace, he could look back on his earlier career and try to assess his position.[99]

This is why I have stressed that Horace appealed more to Pope in middle age and in his later career than he did in the early years. Secure in fame and fortune, Pope realizes that in many ways his poetic career as a self-made man mirrors Horace's.

There were also other reasons for furnishing the original Latin. David Foxon has argued that the parallel texts provided a convenient means of filling up the pages for the *Works* of 1735, in order to compensate for the space set aside for the ethic epistles which Pope had originally planned to include yet never composed.[100]As we shall see in Chapter 4, Pope was always keen to make profit. Printing the Latin text doubled the number of pages. It would thus be a more voluminous product, and Pope may have thought that he could charge

[96] James Miller's *Seasonable Reproof* (1735) also contains parallel texts printed in italics on the facing page and in Roman type, for words which he wishes to emphasize. Stack 1985, 22 sees Miller's choice as being influenced by Pope's.
[97] *Corr*., 3:173.
[98] Stack 1985, 23.
[99] Ibid., 149.
[100] See Foxon: "Pope was beginning to doubt his capacity to fill his half of that volume [*Works* of 1735] with the *Opus magnum*, and was looking for alternative materials. Imitations, whether of Horace or Donne, were well adapted to filling space, for by printing the original text on facing pages one doubled their bulk" (1991, 123). But see McLaverty, who argues: "Pope's agreement with Gilliver did not oblige him to contribute half the material for the *Works* and he and Jonathan Richardson could easily have filled up the volume with notes" (2001, 152).

more per copy. While it is difficult to deny entirely that such an idea may have crossed Pope's mind, it was not his principal motive in providing parallel texts.

As a publication, one must also take into account readership. Would Pope's readers have been able to understand Horace's Latin which was printed alongside Pope's version? An educated eighteenth-century reader, who was also wealthy enough to afford new works of literature such as Pope's, would almost certainly have learned the Latin language in school. It may also be assumed that they were familiar with the Roman poet Horace. However, with the possible exception of those who were particularly avid readers of Horace, it may be difficult to expect anyone to remember exactly what they learned in their schooldays. Providing the original Latin served to refresh the readers' memories and to recall the content. While it may have still prompted some to search for an English translation, others may have been able to compare almost word for word, the Latin in Horace and the English version by Pope on each facing page. Pope knew that his readers would have at least some familiarity with Horace and his works.

The major significance, though, of the parallel texts is that Pope assumes a sense of authority that is equal to Horace. The fact that Pope's text is presented alongside Horace's produces a powerful visual effect. Pope's work occupies the same amount of space as Horace's. It is as if to say that what Pope writes is just as important and respectable as what Horace expresses in his poems.[101] This rather haughty, albeit implicit, attitude did not go unnoticed by his usual critics.

Immediately following the publication of the first *Imitation*, Lord Hervey and Lady Mary, in their *Verses Address'd to the Imitator Of The First Satire Of The Second Book of Horace* (1733), expressed their opinions on Pope's use of parallel texts:

Whilst on one side we see how *Horace* thought;
And on the other, how he never wrote.[102]

The pair deny any significant similarity between Pope and Horace which would entitle Pope to place himself in parallel to the great ancient poet. Likewise, Thomas Bentley, nephew of the scholar Richard Bentley, wrote in *A Letter To Mr. Pope, Occasioned By Sober Advice from Horace* (1735): "An admirable Expedient, and worthy of your Sagacity, *to get upon the*

[101] McLaverty also suggests that Pope's positioning of himself in parallel with Horace was: "a claim to status: the status enjoyed by Horace as an independent citizen with a voice of equal weight to those of the aristocrat and official, and also, implicitly, the status of the great poet" (ibid., 142).
[102] Cited in Guerinot 1969, 225.

Back of Horace."[103] This evokes a rather violent image of Pope forcefully climbing and clinging on to Horace's back and, by extension, his reputation. It is far from an image of two venerable poets of equal renown and recognition.

Pope was the object of the largest number of pamphlet attacks in his career in 1733, the year in which his first Horatian *Imitation* was published.[104] Despite this, he continued for the next half decade with his Horatian series, composing by 1738 nine poems and two concluding *Dialogues*. Pope thus persisted in his object of demonstrating parallels with Horace in both status and ideas, and his Horatian *Imitations* indeed proved to be successful. Nevertheless, a perfect correspondence of circumstances and opinions is not possible between any two people, and, as I have mentioned earlier, imitation did not solely involve comparison. Imitation invited room for contrast as well. As will be discussed in detail in Chapter 8 on politics, there were sections of *The First Epistle of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated* (1737) in which Pope did not provide parallel texts because he could not find any parallel to what Horace expressed. Balanced between comparison and contrast, the scale gradually tips more towards contrast. That is, Pope begins to detect more differences than similarities, until he feels that the analogy no longer works and eventually renounces the series.

[103] Cited in ibid., 251.
[104] Ibid., xxiv.

Chapter 3

Classical Authors in Eighteenth-Century England: Pope's Choices

As a preliminary to understanding Pope's relationship with Horace, or rather the development of his growing attachment to the ancient poet, it is important to examine more generally the popularity of classical authors in Pope's time. In this chapter I attempt to demonstrate the process by which Pope arrived at his choice of author for the *Imitation* series. I will present recent statistics concerning classical translations in England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as well as the translations which Pope possessed or used as references for his own translations. While Pope was a poet who wrote and published in the first half of the eighteenth century, it is worth making a survey of the translations of the late seventeenth century, as they were the editions which helped develop Pope's interests in and knowledge of the classical world. For "translations" in this chapter, I include translations as we conceive of the term today, as well as imitations, paraphrases, and hybrids of the above mentioned categories. What is common to them all is that they are renderings of works of classical authors in the English language. I must also note that entire works of an author were rarely published and that published translations were most often individual poems or selections from complete works. Wherever possible, I have attempted to identify *complete* translations in order to distinguish them from selections or a single poem.

In exploring the reception of ancient literary figures, I will point out Pope's tendencies to admire or to disregard certain classical writers. In so doing, I wish to demonstrate that Pope by and large followed the trend of preferences which his eighteenth-century contemporaries, meaning his peers, poets, translators, and readers, displayed with regard to many of the Greek and Roman writers. My second purpose concerns Pope's earlier works prior to the Horatian *Imitations*. I have mentioned Pope's admiration for Virgil and epic in youth in the previous chapter, and this has already been pointed out by other scholars. Ronald Paulson has observed that, by looking at Pope's non-satiric compositions from his early career, the poet was clearly climbing the steps of "his Virgilian ascent from pastoral, georgic, and heroic epistle to epic, before settling in the 1730s in the foothills of the Horatian sermo and epistola," and Jacob Fuchs has stressed the Virgilian influence in Pope's early works:

The *Pastorals* and *Windsor Forest* had clearly announced their kinship with Vergil's *Eclogues* and *Georgics* and thus the English poet's kinship with Vergil. *The Rape of the Lock* and *The Dunciad*, of course, make the *Aeneid* part of the epic backdrop beyond the mock-epic stage.[1]

What I wish to demonstrate, then, is that, despite Pope's ambitious preconceived idea of a "Virgilian ascent" as well as early experiments with different classical authors and genres along the way,[2] Horace was already present in many of his earlier poems. In order to illustrate some of the early Horatian influences, I will also introduce examples from his *Essay on Criticism* (1711) and *Eloisa to Abelard* (1717).

I. Translations of Horace in the Eighteenth Century: A Highly Popular Poet

Horace was incontestably the most fashionable classical poet in England in Pope's time. For the first half of the eighteenth century, the timeframe in which Pope wrote and published, David Foxon counts over 100 imitations of single Horatian poems. There were 61 imitations from the *Odes*, 8 from the *Epodes*, 2 on the *Carmen Saeculare*, 20 from the *Satires*, 28 from the *Epistles*, and 10 on the *Ars Poetica*.[3] Eric Rothstein reaches a similar conclusion, listing Horace as the leading classical poet whose works were imitated, followed by those of differing periods and genres: Martial, Anacreon, Virgil, Tibullus, Claudian, Ovid, Catullus, Propertius, Juvenal, Ausonius, and Seneca.[4] More recently, concerning the period from 1660 to 1790, Stuart Gillespie comments that Horace was "numerically in a league of his own;" there were 120 translations of Horace in the period, compared to 63 of Virgil, 41 of which were partial or whole translations of the *Aeneid*, and 38 of Homer.[5]

The earliest translations of Horace in English date back to the sixteenth century. Thomas Drant translated some of Horace's *Satires* into English in his *Medicinable Morall* (1566).[6] John Ashmore was the first to produce a collection of Horace's *Odes* in 1621.[7] Ashmore translated in total 17 Horatian *Odes*, including *Carm*. 3.9 which he translated three times. These were followed by: Sir Thomas Hawkins (1627, enlarged editions in 1631, 1635, and 1638); Henry Rider (1638, second edition in 1644); John Smith (1649); Sir Richard Fanshawe (1652), who also translated Boethius and Martial; Barton Holyday's *Odes* and

[1] Paulson 1972, 59; Fuchs 1989, 54.
[2] See Hardie (2012) on the treatment of fame by Roman and English poets.
[3] Foxon 1975, 1, 356-59, 543-44, 844, 353-54, 566, and 393.
[4] Rothstein 1981, 85.
[5] Gillespie 2005, 130-1.
[6] McGann 2007, 306.
[7] Stack 1985, 291; Money 2007, 318.

Epodes (1653); and John Harington's *Odes* and *Epodes* (1684). Ben Jonson also translated *Odes* 3.9 (*Underwood* 87, 1640) and 4.1 (*Underwood* 86, 1640), as well as *Epod*. 2 (*Underwood* 85, 1640). A steady stream of translations of the Horatian *Odes* continued and in Pope's lifetime the most distinguished of them were produced by: Thomas Creech (1714); Henry Coxwell (1718); and Roscommon and other contributors (1721).

In addition to the *Odes*, single renderings and selections of poems were published regularly for Horace's *Satires* and *Epistles*. These include, though are not limited to: *An Allusion to Horace* (1675-1676) by John Wilmot, second Earl of Rochester; William Diaper's *An Imitation of the Seventeenth Epistle of the First Book of Horace* (1714); Christopher Pitt's *Poems and Translations* (1727); Charles Carthy's *A Translation of the Second Book of Horace's Epistles, Together with Some of the Most Select in the First* (1731); George Ogle's *The Epistles of Horace Imitated* (1735); William Melmoth's *Two Epistles of Horace Imitated* (1736); William Hamilton's *The Eighteenth Epistle of the Second Book of Horace Imitated* (1737); Edward Walpole's *The Sixth Satire of the First Book of Horace Imitated* (1738); and Richard West's *An Epistle to a Friend, in Imitation of the Second Epistle of the First Book of Horace* (1739). Horace's *Satires* and *Epistles*, while loosely identified as being written respectively to condemn vice and to promote virtue, were in practice, among translators, not distinguished clearly. That is, English renderings of the *Satires* and *Epistles* often displayed similar style, tone, and manner, and translators tended to group them together in their collections and publications.[8]

Horace's *Ars Poetica*, having enjoyed both attention and appraisal since the early Renaissance, retained its popularity and acclaim in Augustan England. Yet it is also true that Boileau's highly influential translation (1684) as well as Pope's *Essay on Criticism* (1711), which includes a significant discussion contrasting the approaches of Horace and Longinus, further enhanced the reputation of the poem in the eighteenth century. Some of the major translations from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were produced by: Ben Jonson, who wrote two different renderings of the same poem (1640); Wentworth Dillon, fourth Earl of Roscommon (1680, with eleven editions to 1780); John Oldham (1681); Thomas Creech (1684, dedicated to Dryden); Henry Ames's in heroic couplets (1727); Philip Francis (1746); and William Popple's in heroic couplets and accompanied by the Latin original (1753).[9] Some versions of the *Ars Poetica* were included in collections of Horatian translations, while others

[8] See Weinbrot (1969).
[9] In 1700 Pope bought Oldham's works, among which were his imitations of Horace's *Ars Poetica* and *Sat*. 1.9. See Selden 1984, 115.

were published separately, as in James Miller's *Harlequin-Horace* (1731). The Earl of Roscommon's rendering was arguably the most renowned translation. Its exceptional quality, chiefly its accuracy, was commended by prominent literary figures such as Waller, Dryden, Pope, and Johnson.[10]

Collaborative efforts were a fairly common mode of production for classical translations, and for Horace these include: *The Poems of Horace, by Several Persons* (1666; revised 1671, 1680), edited by Alexander Brome; *The Odes and Satyrs of Horace that have been Done into English by the Most Eminent Hands* (1715), edited by Jacob Tonson; and *The Works of Horace in English, By Several Hands* (1757-59) in two volumes, edited by William Duncombe. Contrarily, Christopher Pitt's *Poems and Translations* (1727) and John Hanway's *Translations of Several Odes, Satyrs and Epistles of Horace* (1730) are examples of a collection of Horatian *Odes*, *Satires*, and *Epistles* undertaken by a single translator. Christopher Smart deserves recognition in that, after publishing a prose rendering of Horace for pedagogical use in 1756, he subsequently published in 1767 a four-volume complete translation of Horace's works, this time in octosyllabic couplets. His new verse translation was accompanied by the Latin text, and at the bottom of each page he provided a prose translation different from the school-text version which he had produced a decade earlier. Nevertheless, the two most notable translators of Horace in the first and second halves of the eighteenth century were Thomas Creech and Philip Francis, respectively. Their translations, *The Odes, Satyrs and Epistles of Horace* (1688) by Creech and *The Works of Horace* (1746-1747) by Francis came to be regarded as a standard and were the most widely cited. While Francis' works appeared after Pope's death, he consulted Creech's translation in composing the Horatian *Imitations*. Overall, Stuart Gillespie and David Hopkins agree that the quality of Horatian translations in the eighteenth century was astoundingly high.[11] This comes to us as no surprise when we consider that, from the early seventeenth century on, there was a regular output of new renderings so as to provide ample material from predecessors to refer to and use as a base, making corrections as one saw the need. Reworking previous versions in such a way, the translations became refined and the general quality was improved. We shall see in a moment those which Pope relied on for his *Imitations*. The number of English translations of Latin in eighteenth-century England records its highest in the 1730s, and translations from

[10] Winnifrith 2005, 262. Benham (1955) provides a bibliographical list of the major English translations of *Ars Poetica* starting from Thomas Drant in 1567 to W.J. Bate in 1952.
[11] Gillespie 2005, 131 and Hopkins 2005, 226.

Horace, though mostly of single poems or groups of several poems, account for a considerable fraction of the total figure.[12]

We should recall that Pope's first *Imitation* of Horace was also composed as a single text. That is, Pope published his first Horatian *Imitation*, like many others, as a single poem. As I have explained in the previous chapter, he did not initially intend it to become a series. Considering the popularity of Horatian translations in the eighteenth century and specifically in the 1730s, it is not surprising that Pope decided to compose a poem based on Horace's work. In that sense, Pope was only one of many English writers who were merely following the fashion. This prolific translating activity in England was facilitated by the vast classical scholarship across Europe that had provided many studies on Horace in the century prior to Pope's. The works of the Dutch scholar Daniel Heinsius[13] and the French scholars Joseph Scaliger and Isaac Casaubon were of high repute in England. The French André Dacier's *Remarques Critiques sur les Oeuvres d'Horace, avec une nouvelle traduction* (1683-1697), though criticized in France by contemporaries such as Nicholas Boileau for its literalism in translation, became an important reference for scholars and writers in England. Pope thought highly of Dacier's commentary on Horace, as he remarked that the scholar exhibited good "Sense," "Penetration," and "Taste."[14]

Just as he kept at his side various Horatian translations including Creech's when composing his own imitations in English,[15] Pope's parallel text in Latin draws on several sources. Scholars generally agree that Pope primarily used Heinsius' 1629 edition and that he used more recent editions by his contemporaries in making emendations where he thought them necessary. Lillian Bloom has suggested that Pope must have referred to the editions by Richard Bentley (1711) and Alexander Cunningham (1721), and Robert Rodgers has added that of William Baxter (1701).[16] Frank Stack agrees that Pope drew mainly from Heinsius' edition, correcting and revising as he saw fit while comparing it with more modern editions.[17] An exception to this standard adopted by Pope is his *Imitation* of Horace's *Sat*. 1.2, in which he uses Bentley's edition instead of his usual Heinsius'. The title for this poem is: *Sober Advice from Horace, to the Young Gentlemen about Town. As deliver'd in his Second Sermon. Imitated in the Manner of Mr. Pope. Together with the Original Text, as restored by the Revd.*

[12] Gillespie 2005, 133-34.
[13] See Sellin (1968) for a discussion on the influence and significance of Heinsius in Stuart England.
[14] *Corr*., 1:492.
[15] For possible hints and borrowings from Creech's translation, see *TE*, 4:xliiin, 60n., 181n., and 236n.
[16] Bloom 1948, 150-55; Rodgers 1949, 397-98.
[17] Stack 1985, 287-88.

R. Bentley, Doctor of Divinity. And some Remarks on the Version.[18] Although Pope seems to have preferred Heinsius' edition, Allen Benham has suggested that many translators of Horace after 1711 usually referred to Bentley's.[19]

II. *Essay on Criticism*: Enter Horace

Pope's debut in print in 1709 was arranged by Jacob Tonson and he would continue to contribute to miscellanies and magazines such as Addison's *The Spectator*, but his *Essay on Criticism* (15 May 1711) was the first work to appear independently. He had begun to pen his opinions on literary criticism around 1707, and for this he turned to the classical literary theories presented in Longinus' *Peri Hypsous*,[20] Horace's *Ars Poetica*, and the supposedly fragmentary *Poetics* (*c.* 335 B.C.E.) by Aristotle (384 – 322 B.C.E.). Of the three ancient writers, Aristotle was the least translated in Pope's time. Different works of his were rendered into English, including a collaborative version of the *Rhetoric* (1686) and, after Pope's death, book 1 of *Nichomachean Ethics* by Edmund Pargiter (1745) and one book of *Politics* by William Ellis (1776). Robin Sowerby has recently stated: "His *Poetics*, which was indeed the foundation of European criticism, was rediscovered in the Renaissance but did not make a real impact until the edition of Robortello in 1548."[21] Aristotle's arguments were diffused fairly widely throughout Europe beginning in the sixteenth century. In the seventeenth century, Réne Rapin's treatise *Réflexions sur la Poétique d'Aristote* (1674) was speedily translated into English by Thomas Rymer. However, not many were attracted by the idea of translating his works from the Greek. In the eighteenth century, only four translations of his *Poetics* appeared in English. Tom Winnifrith offers an explanation: "This seems an inadequate response to one of the greatest of philosophers, although Aristotle's dry style and complexity of thought is not easily amenable to translation."[22]

The first English translation of the treatise attributed to Longinus appeared in 1652 by John Hall. Thereafter, according to Tom Winnifrith, in the period from 1660 to 1790 English

[18] *TE*, 4:71. Spence 1966, 1:143 also recorded that for *Sober Advice* Pope used a Cambridge edition, which would be Bentley's of 1711, though McLaverty 2001, 157 has expressed doubt.
[19] Benham 1955, 3.
[20] Longinus has also been referred to as Pseudo-Longinus, because the real author is unknown. Looking at the names and literary works mentioned, the work may have been written no later than in the first century C.E. Thus, possible authorship has been attributed to first century writers including Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Hermagoras, Aelius Theon, and Pompeius Geminus. But see also Heath (1999) who argues for the third-century critic, rhetorician and philosopher Cassius Longinus.
[21] Sowerby 2006, 22.
[22] Winnifrith 2005, 254.

translations of Longinus included those by John Pulteney (1680), Leonard Welsted (1712), Zachary Pearce (1724), William Smith (1739), and Charles Carthy (1762). Nevertheless, the popularity of Longinus originally reached England in large part by way of French influence. Boileau's French renderings of *Peri Hypsous* and *Ars Poetica* both appeared in 1684, and the grand authority of Boileau's *Peri Hypsous* had much to do with the surge in interest in England of the ancient critic. Longinus' commendations of grandeur and simplicity, as well as his approval of imitation, remained widely influential into the eighteenth century. A secondary translation into English from Boileau's French version was undertaken by John Pulteney and John Ozell (1711).[23] Pope's high esteem for the Greek critic is expressed in the following lines:

Thee, bold *Longinus*! all the Nine inspire,
And bless *their Critick* with a *Poet's Fire*.
An ardent Judge, who Zealous in his Trust,
With *Warmth* gives Sentence, yet is always *Just*;
Whose *own Example* strengthens all his Laws,
And *Is himself* that great *Sublime* he draws. (*Essay on Criticism*, 675-80)

Assuredly for Pope at this point in his career Longinus was a venerable ancient writer. Perhaps more significantly, the status of Longinus in the eighteenth century also served to establish a renewed appreciation for Homer, and Pope was certainly no exception in this.[24]

The rise of "neo-classical" theory[25] in England has its roots in seventeenth-century French influences.[26] There appeared a number of works such as Le père Dominique Bonhours's *Les Entretiens D'Ariste et D'Eugène* (1671) and *Manière de bien penser* (1687), Réne Le Bossu's *Traité du Poëme épique* (1675), and Dacier's translation of Aristotle's *Poetics* (1692). These works revolved around the discussion of Nature, the Rules, the Sublime, and the *je ne sais quoi*, as well as Taste, and at its center lay the question of whether a poet should write in strict accordance with the preordained Rules or whether he should be allowed to exercise some imaginative freedom. In France Pierre Corneille, for example, adhered to the sharply defined prescription of the three unities of time, place, and action for the stage, and in England Thomas Rymer was often scoffed at as a stereotypical neoclassical critic. He published *A Short View of Tragedy* (1692) in which he fiercely criticized Shakespeare for

[23] Ibid., 261.
[24] Gillespie and Sowerby 2005, 31. See Shankman (2007) for a brief yet concise discussion on the influence of Longinus' *On the Sublime* with regards to Pope and his Homer translations.
[25] See also *TE*, 1:15-20, for the two opposing theories, Rapin's "neo-classic" and Fontenelle's "rationalistic," concerning pastoral poetry.
[26] *Ibid*., 209-12.

neglecting the Rules in his drama.[27] Against this extreme were those who claimed that there are at times beauty and grace which cannot be expressed if one is to remain confined to the sharply defined Rules. Such views were expressed early on by Francis Bacon, who argued that beauty is attained by a "kind of felicity… not by rule."[28] Pope in many ways followed Dryden's stance in acknowledging the complexity of the issue. Pope, along with Dryden, was of the opinion that the Rules must be respected, but that they did not apply to all situations.[29] Dryden, for example, questioned the value of submission to the Three Unities in drama:

> How many beautiful accidents might naturally happen in two or three days, which cannot arrive with any probability in the compass of twenty-four hours? …by tying themselves strictly to the Unity of Place and unbroken scenes, they are forced many times to omit some beauties which cannot be shown where the act began.[30]

Thus the "neo-classical" theory which pervaded the literary scene in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England was eclectically interpreted and, though a topic of great interest to writers of the period, it was never uniformly agreed on or consistently formulated.

Part of the cause of such heated debate over "neo-classical" theory stemmed from the widely accepted view that the Rules were a valid system that reflected the workings of Nature. The Rules were important to follow because imitation of Nature was essentially the fundamental purpose of poetry in Augustan thought. In the Christian world of Pope's time Nature was also perceived to be the creation and work of God. The Rules reflected the order and harmony found in Nature. To let Nature be the first and foremost principle to follow as a guide is an idea that is also presented by Longinus.[31] Pope's principal instruction to his readers is as follows:

> First follow NATURE, and your Judgment frame
> By her just Standard, which is still the same:
> *Unerring Nature*, still divinely bright, (70)
> One *clear, unchang'd*, and *Universal* Light,
> Life, Force, and Beauty, must to all impart,
> At once the *Source*, and *End*, and *Test* of *Art*. (*Essay on Criticism*, 68-73)

Pope agrees with Longinus, and other contemporaries including Dryden, that Nature is the all-encompassing "*Universal* Light" that embraces "Life, Force, and Beauty." What the dramatists of the seventeenth century endeavored to do was to present various human actions and emotions on stage. The task of the poet, then, was to depict in words aspects of human

[27] Fuchs comments that although Pope did not belong to the era of tragedy, "the rules surely had a greater influence after 1660 than before" (1989, 116).
[28] Bacon's "Of Beauty," *Essay* XLIII, cited by Warton (*TE*, 1:255n.).
[29] See *ibid*., 222-23 for Pope's indebtedness to Dryden on *The Essay on Criticism*.
[30] Dryden 1900, 1:76.
[31] See *TE*, 1:247 which also contains parts of Boileau's translation in French.

life, will and actions, and meaning and purpose. To imitate Nature meant to recreate, or reflect as truly as possible, real life.

The *Essay on Criticism* was published in 1711 when Pope was twenty-two years old. Though he was already translating portions of Homer, he would not sign the contract with Lintot until 1714. This was still the period in which he largely believed that "The best of the modern Poets in all Languages, are those that have the nearest copied the Ancients."[32] In the poem he deplores the fallen state of the poets and critics of his time:

Such shameless *Bards* we have; and yet 'tis true,
There are as mad, abandon'd *Criticks* too. (*Essay on Criticism*, 610-11)

And he contrasts this to those of the Greeks and Romans:

Unbiass'd, or by *Favour* or by *Spite*;
Not *dully prepossest*, nor *blindly right*;
Tho' Learn'd, well-bred; and tho' well-bred, sincere; (635)
Modestly bold, and Humanly severe?
Who to a *Friend* his Faults can freely show,
And gladly praise the Merit of a *Foe*?
Blest with a *Taste* exact, yet unconfin'd;
A *Knowledge* both of *Books* and *Humankind*; (640)
Gen'rous Converse; a *Soul* exempt from *Pride*;
And *Love to Praise*, with *Reason* on his Side?
Such once were *Criticks*, such the Happy *Few*,
Athens and *Rome* in better Ages knew. (*Essay on Criticism*, 633-44)

Our poet's youthful tendency to glorify the Ancients is apparent, and he calls upon them to reform his own times:

Oh may some Spark of *your* Coelestial Fire
The last, the meanest of your Sons inspire,
(That on weak Wings, from far, pursues your Flights;
Glows while he *reads*, but *trembles* as he *writes*)
To teach vain Wits a Science *little known*,
T'*admire* Superior Sense, and *doubt* their own! (*Essay on Criticism*, 195-200)

Pope was convinced that the Ancients possessed "Superior Sense," and he believed that their works would serve as good models for they in large part accurately reflected Nature:

Learn hence for Ancient *Rules* a just Esteem;
To copy *Nature* is to copy *Them*. (*Essay on Criticism*, 139-40)

As thus, his advice to his readers is:

Be *Homer*'s Works your *Study*, and *Delight*,
Read them by Day, and meditate by Night. (*Essay on Criticism*, 124-25)

Pope avidly gives this counsel to absorb the techniques and style of Homer, for he believes that Homer followed Nature most closely. These lines are modeled on Horace's *Ars Poetica*:

[32] *Corr*., 1:20.

… vos exemplaria Graeca
nocturna versate manu, versate diurna. (*AP*, 268-69)

Keep turning the pages of those Greek manuscripts at night,
Keep turning them by day.

Although Homer is not explicitly named, Horace instructs that the exemplary works are to be found in those by the Greeks and that the best method is to study them as much as one can in detail and with care.

Pope explains that such venerated poets as Virgil began in youth by defiantly deviating from Nature yet later returned to it and thus succeeded in composing one of the greatest classical epics:

When first young *Maro* in his boundless Mind
A Work t'outlast Immortal *Rome* design'd,
Perhaps he seem'd *above* the Critick's Law,
And but from *Nature's Fountains* scorn'd to draw:
But when t'examine ev'ry Part he came,
Nature and *Homer* were, he found, the *same*: (135)
Convinc'd, amaz'd, he checks the bold Design,
And Rules as strict his labour'd Work confine,
As if the *Stagyrite* o'erlook'd each Line. (*Essay on Criticism*, 130-38)

In his audacious youth Virgil "scorned to draw" "from Nature's fountains," and yet, finding that "Nature and Homer were… the same," he set himself to follow the Aristotelian rules.

What is remarkable about the *Essay* in relation to Horace is not so much the fact that it simply draws from, and uses as a model, the *Ars Poetica* in structure, but the various arguments of Horace's to which Pope expresses his assent. Horace advocated Greek (*AP*, 268-69) and approved of following the Rules, but Pope did not detect a mere reworking of predecessors or rigid application of the Rules:

He, who Supream in Judgment, as in Wit,
Might boldly censure, as he boldly writ,
Yet judg'd with *Coolness*, tho' he sung with *Fire*;
His *Precept*s teach but what his *Works* inspire. (*Essay on Criticism*, 657-60)

Horace's manner of composing verse was such that he "boldly writ" and "sung with fire," and Pope lauds him as one who was "supreme… in wit." "Wit" here signifies imagination,[33] the human quality which seventeenth-century philosophers including Francis Bacon (*The Advancement of Learning*, 1605), Thomas Hobbes (*Leviathan*, 1651), and John Locke (*Thoughts Concerning Education*, 1695) shunned as unnecessary when weighed against the importance of judgment. Pope acknowledged the significance of possessing, if not juggling or

[33] See Gordon 1976, 95-98 for his four meanings of the term "wit" in Augustan England. See also *TE*, 1:212-19 for a discussion of the relationship between Wit and Judgment.

finding a balance between, the two aspects of a human mind,[34] and he praises Horace as having both. In fact Horace, in addition to recognizing space for imagination, believed in allowing some freedom in experimenting with new words:

... si forte necesse est
indiciis monstrare recentibus abdita rerum,
fingere cinctutis non exaudita Cethegis (50)
continget dabiturque licentia sumpta pudenter;
et nova fictaque nuper habebunt verba fidem si
Graeco fonte cadent, parce detorta. (*AP*, 48-53)

If by chance it is necessary
to describe obscure ideas with modern affirmation,
to apply words never heard of in the days of belt-wearing Cethegus's generation,
they will occur, and license will be granted, though adopted bashfully;
likewise, words, though new and recently contrived, will gain credibility
if terms derived from a Greek source occur sparingly.

Pope agrees with the ancient poet:

But tho' the *Ancients* thus their *Rules* invade,
(As *Kings* dispense with *Laws* Themselves have made)
Moderns, beware! Or if you must offend
Against the *Precept*, ne'er transgress its *End*,
Let it be *seldom*, and *compell'd by Need*, (165)
And have, at least, *Their Precedent* to plead. (*Essay on Criticism*, 161-66)[35]

Pope believed in allowing leniency in the rules in order to convey ideas in a manner which the writer found suitable, yet, like Horace, he warns poets to use sparingly and with caution unfamiliar words, whether old or new. Paul Baines explains that "[Pope's] sympathy as a writer is (cautiously) with rule-breakers, and he advises writers as if he were their advocate."[36]

Moreover, as Horace was ever conscious of critics, so too was Pope as the subsequent lines signal:

The Critick else proceeds without Remorse,
Seizes your Fame, and puts his Laws in force. (*Essay on Criticism*, 167-68)

This may be a general statement or it may be a hit at John Dennis (1657-1734), dramatist and critic, who vehemently insisted on abiding by Aristotle's rules at all times. An explicit attack is made later in the poem:

[34] As did Quintilian and La Rochefoucauld. See *ibid*., 98.
[35] See also a later passage in which Pope preaches a similar idea:

In *Words*, as *Fashions*, the same Rule will hold;
Alike Fantastick, if *too New*, or *Old*;
Be not the *first* by whom the *New* are try'd,
Nor yet the *last* to lay the *Old* aside. (*Essay on Criticism*, 333-36)
[36] Baines 2007, 151.

Once on a time, *La Mancha*'s Knight, they say,
A certain *Bard* encountring on the Way,
Discours'd in Terms as just, with Looks as Sage,
As e'er cou'd *Dennis,* of the *Grecian* Stage;
Concluding all were desp'rate Sots and Fools,
Who durst depart from *Aristotle*'s Rules. (*Essay on Criticism*, 267-72)

Pope and Dennis expressed fierce enmity for each other throughout their careers, and *An Essay on Criticism* (1711) marks the beginning of Pope's criticizing and naming his enemies.[37] Parodying an episode from *Don Quixote*, which had been made available in English in 1612, Pope here mocks the stubbornness of the dramatist in writing for the stage.[38]

Like Horace, Longinus certainly did not criticize solely on the basis of strict adherence to the Rules, and he in fact acknowledged eccentric genius and took into account matters of taste and beauty. Assuming that the great reverence which our young author displayed towards Longinus was sincere, it may initially seem surprising that, notwithstanding such impressive statements of approval for the third-century Greek critic, he turns *On the Sublime* as a parody in his *Peri Bathous: Or, Martinus Scriblerus, His Treatise of the Art of Sinking in Poetry* (1728). In this Greek title, Pope plays on the Greek term *bathus* which, like the Latin *altus*, can indicate both height, or elevation, and depth, and he combines the two meanings to denote a sudden shift in which serious material is turned into something trivial. First employed by Pope, the word "bathos" has since become a current term in the English language. Of this work Pat Rogers comments: "[It] seems that Pope had a much less full-hearted admiration for the sublime than did his contemporaries such as John Dennis."[39] However, we must also take into account the fact that there is a seventeen-year gap between Pope's endorsement of the ancient critic in *An Essay on Criticism* (1711) and his subsequent parody *Peri Bathous* (1728). It was not so much to turn against Longinus, but rather that by the late 1720s Pope was exasperated by the high style required by epic, as he had spent much of his early career turning the pages of Homeric epic and constantly searching for suitable expressions in poetical English for his translations, from his *Episode of Sarpedon* (1709) to the final installment of the *Odyssey* (1726). Steven Shankman explains the change in the poet's attitude in the 1730s:

What a relief, in comparison with the rigorous demands of translating Homeric epic, it must have been for Pope when he began to turn the witty, conversational style of Horace's poems into English. At the inception of his

[37] This approach by Pope may be contrasted to Horace, who, always concerned of his position and safety, only inserts names of dead or unidentifiable individuals. See Rudd (1966) and Griffin 1993, 9-11 and 13.
[38] The original *Don Quixote* was published in two parts, in 1605 and 1615. Thomas Shelton translated the work into English, and the *First Part* was published in 1612 and the *Second Part* in 1620.
[39] Rogers 2006, 631.

efforts as a Homeric translator, he viewed his climb to the top of Mount Homer as a nightmare. He appears to have enjoyed versifying Horace. It was a natural fit.[40]

After the translations of Homer, Pope felt a need to disengage himself from the Rules, as much as to be liberated from the restrictions in life that a project of so large a scale demanded. As his Homeric spirit was exhausted, the 1730s would prove to be an opportune time for Pope, by then a mature and acclaimed poet, to finally consecrate his poetic energy to Horace.

III. The Ovidian Enterprise: "The world forgetting, by the world forgot"[41]

Apart from the grand epic writers, the elegiac poet Ovid (43 B.C.E. – 17/18 C.E.) was another of Pope's preferred authors, particularly in his youth. Pope as a teenager had experimented with stories of "monstrous" or "misdirected" sexual desires, the sources of which were drawn largely from the *Metamorphoses*.[42] His *Sappho to Phaon*, from the *Epistles*, was published in 1712. Three of his translations from the *Metamorphoses* were published: from book 14, *The Fable of Vertumnus and Pomona* in 1712; from book 9, *The Fable of Dryope* in 1717; and from book 13, *Polyphemus and Acis* which was published posthumously in 1749. As was customary for him when translating classical authors, he turned to the works of his English predecessors. For the *Metamorphoses*, his English sources were the translations of Dryden and Sandys. I have mentioned in the previous chapter that Pope as a child admired Sandys's illustrated *Metamorphoses*. Pope used both of the two editions from 1626 and 1632, but he seems to have consulted more often the 1626 version. John Butt has observed that, of the two sources, Pope inclines toward Dryden's manner of a free rather than a literal translation.[43]

Ovid was sure to have been included in the formal education of Elizabethan schools,[44] and some of the earliest English versions of Ovid can be traced back to the sixteenth century. George Turbervile published his *Epistles* in 1567, and Arthur Golding's translation appeared in the same year. Christopher Marlowe had translated the *Amores*, as well as Lucan's *Pharsalia* (*c.*1582). John Harington's translation of Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* (1591), which contained many references to *Ars Amatoria* and *Amores*, served to diffuse Ovid's name and works to the English public. In the seventeenth century, there were very roughly two vogues

[40] Shankman 2007, 67.
[41] *Eloisa to Abelard*, 208.
[42] Baines 2000, 9.
[43] See *TE*, 1:332-39.
[44] Armstrong 1977, 431 cites Donne as an example.

of Ovid translations in English. The first took place in the 1630s and 1640s.[45] Some of the translations from this period include renderings of the *Heroides* by Wye Saltonstall (1636) and John Sherburne (1639). There was a temporary decline in popularity of the poet in the later half of the seventeenth century, but another surge occurred in the 1680s. Rebecca Ferguson mentions that the temporary dip in Ovidian renderings may have been due to the rise of Puritan taste and rationalistic theories in the later half of the seventeenth century.[46] According to Stuart Gillespie, there were 58 translations of Ovid between 1660 and 1790, most of which were small selections from the *Heroides* (*c*. between 25 and 16 B.C.E.) and *Amores* (15 B.C.E.),[47] and in the first half of the eighteenth century, there were 17 versions of Ovid's works.[48] Louise Vinge has stated that, in total, the number of translations of the *Metamorphoses* in the eighteenth century surpassed that of the previous century.[49]

As might be expected, there were many partial translations by individual authors. Thomas Hoy's translation of the first book of *Ars Amatoria* (1682, 1692) was one, Charles Hopkins' *Epistolary Poems: on Several Occasions* (1694) another. The somewhat lesser known, and incomplete, *Fasti* (8 C.E.) was translated in an abridged version by Thomas Creech and included in Tonson's *Miscellany Poems* (1684). Many of the Ovidian translations produced in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries were collaborative works, and the publication arrangements were quite complex. Much of this was due in effect to *Ovid's Epistles, Translated by Several Hands* (1680) which was published by Tonson whose editions continued well into Pope's time in the early eighteenth century. "Several Hands" in fact consisted of eighteen "Hands," including some notable translators and poets: Aphra Behn, Thomas Flatman, Thomas Otway, Thomas Rymer, and Nahum Tate. Dryden was of course one of the principal contributors. Because Ovid's *Heroides* is originally an anthology-like collection of letters written by heroines, with some replies from their male counterparts, the verses could easily be distributed to individual translators. Not only did this volume go through reprints over the next several decades, it also incorporated new translations by emerging writers. Pope's *Sappho to Phaon*, a translation of the fifteenth letter in *Heroides*, was included in the 1712 edition.

[45] For details and a bibliographical listing, see Gillespie and Cummings (2004).
[46] Ferguson 1986, 8.
[47] Gillespie 2005, 131.
[48] Money 2007, 321.
[49] Vinge 1967, 253.

Many translations of Ovid's other major works, *Amores* (15 B.C.E.), *Ars Amatoria* (2 C.E.), and *Metamorphoses* (8 C.E.) were included in Tonson's miscellany publications. Following the success of *Ovid's Epistles* (1680), Tonson included translations of Ovid's *Amores* in his *Miscellany Poems* (1684). By asking for various contributors, he aimed to publish a complete version by "Several Hands" and thus replicate the business model of *Ovid's Epistles* which had brought considerable profit. Dryden's translation of *Amores* 2.19 was included in the *Miscellany* of 1684, as were other poems done by Thomas Creech, Charles Sedley, George Stepney, and John Wilmot (second Earl of Rochester). However, notwithstanding the fact that the project was launched at a fairly early date, for reasons unknown, the complete volume entitled *Ovid's Amours* was not published until 1719.

Intent on printing translations of all the major works of Ovid, Tonson subsequently began to collect translations of *Ars Amatoria*, again from various "Hands." As part of an assignment from Tonson, Dryden was already working on his translation of the first book of *Ars Amatoria* in the 1690s, but his bookseller advised him to prioritize the completion of the *Aeneid* translation. Tonson was thus able to publish the complete version of the *Aeneid* in 1697, but Dryden passed away in 1700. Unwilling to leave the scattered translations as incomplete projects, Tonson decided to first print some of Dryden's partial translations in a miscellany.[50] Thus his versions of *Amores* 1.1 and 1.4 and the translation of the first book of *Ars Amatoria* were published in the *Poetical Miscellanies, the Fifth Part* (1704). For the complete *Ars Amatoria*, to which he was to give the English title *Art of Love*, he reprinted Dryden's first book. Initially left anonymous, the second book was provided by Thomas Yalden. The third book was undertaken by William Congreve. The volume also included a rendering of Ovid's fragmentary *Medicamina Faciei Femineae* by Nahum Tate which bore the English title *Remedy of Love, The Art of Beauty*, and translations from *Metamorphoses* done by Charles Hopkins with the title *The History of Love*. Tonson's *Art of Love* was published in 1709. With contributions from the leading translators of the time, the volume is commended by Garth Tissol for the accurate rendering of Ovid's voice and style and he goes so far as to say that "the Dryden-Yalden-Congreve *Art of Love* has never really been superseded as the standard English version."[51]

[50] I here follow David Foxon's conjecture: "I suspect Dryden's primary function in the first four volumes [of the Tonson *Miscellanies*] was to provide a core of his own work to which could be added verse by lesser authors. The later miscellanies are likewise built around the work of favoured authors, of whom Pope was one; it may be that the long gaps in the publication of the six Tonson miscellanies were due to the shortage of such materials" (1991, 18).
[51] Tissol 2005, 209.

In a similar manner, *Ovid's Metamorphoses, in Fifteen Books* appeared in 1717. On this project Tonson collaborated with Sir Samuel Garth, who was a physician, poet, and one of Pope's early mentors. Dryden had translated approximately a third of the *Metamorphoses*, some of which had already been printed in the *Annual* Miscellany (1694) and *Poetical Miscellanies: The Fifth Part* (1704). Using this material as a base, Garth asked some twenty translators to provide the rest. Some of the well-known contributors included Joseph Addison, William Congreve, Poet Laureate Laurence Eusden, John Gay, Pope, Poet Laureate Nicholas Rowe, and Nahum Tate. However, Pope, along with others such as John Gay, had also contributed to George Sewell's collaborative collection of the *Metamorphoses*, which was published a year earlier than Tonson's in 1716. Some of the other contributors included Lewis Theobald, John Philips, John Hughes, and Sewell himself. As Sewell understood that the publication was undertaken by Edmund Curll, the notorious bookseller who was certainly not on good terms with Tonson, and that Garth was preparing with him a similar edition of the *Metamorphoses*, he was careful to include praises of Garth, as well as Dryden and Addison in his work. Rival publications were the cause of problems for publishers and authors. In this case, Curll, upon learning of Tonson's *Metamorphoses* project, planned to block the sales of the Tonson version and decided to publish an edition before Tonson's. This was to entice customers who desired a translation of the *Metamorphoses* to buy his Sewell-Curll edition, which came out first, so that by the time the Garth-Tonson edition was published, everyone who wished to own a copy of a version of the *Metamorphoses* would already have purchased Curll's. Another example, one which involved Pope, was a case in which the publication order was reversed. Soon after Pope advertised the publication date of the first installment of his *Iliad* translation, Thomas Tickell announced that his own translation of the *Iliad* would be published soon, but at a later time than Pope's. This was to enable Tickell to make changes in layout and distribution by first observing the reception of Pope's version among readers, and also, by reading the rival version himself, to catch and correct any errors Tickell himself may have made before the final manuscript was sent to be printed. The outcome of the rival translations will be discussed in the next chapter.

Although himself a contributor, Pope did not much appreciate the collaborative efforts. He made quite an explicit attack on the collaborative effort of the *Metamorphoses* in his *Sandys's Ghost* (1727):

I hear the Beat of *Jacob*'s Drums,
Poor *Ovid* finds no Quarter! (*Sandys's Ghost*, 41-42)

And of Garth:

Then Lords and Lordings, 'Squires and Knights,
Wits, Witlings, Prigs, and Peers;
Garth at *St James*'s, and at *White*'s,
Beats up for Volunteers. (*Sandys's Ghost*, 45-48)

Although Pope never acknowledged this satirical ballad, evidence has been found to attribute it to him.[52] With Tonson and Garth drumming in the streets in their call for contributors, the passage certainly does not offer a favorable image of the process of professional publication. Nevertheless Garth Tissol, looking at the success of Sewell's and Curll's version of the *Metamorphoses*, states that "its popularity (it was reprinted in 1724, 1726, and 1733) testifies to the fact that Ovid could flourish outside the dominant tradition of Dryden and his successors, or perhaps on its margins."[53] With Ovid, as with Virgil, Dryden was incontestably the reigning translator for many classical poets and it was apparent to all that nobody could quite surpass him. His collaboration with the leading bookseller Jacob Tonson further enhanced his success in publishing his works. Similarly for Tonson, his primary motive in incorporating Dryden's translations for his Ovid publications was in all likelihood generated by the fact that Dryden was his most reputed and profitable client. We have seen time and again how Pope eliminated certain classical authors as his models due to the powerful influence of his predecessor Dryden. Although his aspiration for epic was particularly strong in youth, he avoided Virgil and settled for Homer, taking only Dryden's model of subscription publication. Similarly, as much as he had toyed with translations of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in his early years, he wisely decided against competing with Tonson's large-scale editions of Ovid, the bulk of which were based on Dryden's renderings.

For Pope, the Roman elegist was one of his favorite authors and he disclosed to Spence that he had translated in his youth "above a quarter of the *Metamorphoses*."[54] Rebecca Ferguson has noted that, "[Ovid's] influence in Pope's work as a whole is widely diffused,"[55] and in the case of *Eloisa to Abelard* specifically he modeled the poem on Ovid's *Heroides*. This poem in fact has two sources, one from Ovid and the other from the twelfth-century French account of the star-crossed lovers. The original letters of Eloisa and Abelard were published in Latin in 1616. Pope used an English version, translated from the Latin by John Hughes in 1713. Furthermore, *Eloisa* and the *Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady*

[52] See *TE*, 6:174.
[53] Tissol 2005, 214.
[54] Spence 1966, 1:14.
[55] Ferguson 1986, 8.

were published in the same year, and Mack has shown that some of the lines which were originally in the manuscript for *Eloisa* were later transferred to the *Unfortunate Lady* (1717).[56] Reuben Brower refers to 1717, when both poems were published, and the years surrounding it as Pope's "Ovidian" phase[57] in which the poet explores female emotions as they vacillate[58] between passion and despair, memory and the oppressive present, death in life (Eloisa's voluntary confinement at the Paraclete) and life in death (as in the suicide of the *Lady*).[59] Pope's indebtedness to Ovid lies chiefly in the theme of the betrayal of love, that is, tales of passionate love which end in tragic circumstances in the pitiless real world; these are women who "love too well."[60] Below are two examples, one that explicitly demonstrates Ovidian borrowing in *Eloisa to Abelard* and the other which shows Horatian influence in the same poem.

Confined to a religious life behind the walls of the Paraclete Eloisa beseeches for the strength she needs in the prayers to her loved ones:

Come thou, my father, brother, husband, friend!
Ah let thy handmaid, sister, daughter move,
And all those tender names in one, thy love! (*Eloisa to Abelard*, 152-54)

Echoes of this are to be found in at least two of Ovid's letters in the *Heroides*:

tu dominus, tu vir, tu mihi frater eras. (*Her*. 3, *Briseis Achilli*, 52)

You were my lover, husband, brother.

And:

vir, precor, uxori, frater succurre sorori! (*Her*. 8, *Hermione Orestae*, 29)[61]

Husband, I pray, come help your wife; brother, your sister!

It is characteristic of Ovid that the heroines fall from their heightened love to a state of despair in the unfortunate consequences which ensue. For Ovid's heroines as for Pope's Eloisa, love connotes not only their *amoureux* but encompasses all loyalties and ties of kinship and thus in such moments of distress they turn to their cherished family members and friends, desperately seeking whatever aid can be given to comfort them.[62]

[56] Mack 1982, 322-47.
[57] Brower 1959, 64.
[58] See Spacks 1971, 237-38 for the vacillation of emotions.
[59] See *Eloisa*, 251, 257, and 261-62 for Eloisa's statements on Abelard living a life in death.
[60] *Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady*, 6. See *TE* 2:5-14n. for the theme of "loving too well." See Fairer 1989, 70-72 for a discussion of memory and the heroic epistle as a one-way mode of letter-writing for the speaker to address a person and to recount a past. See Ferguson 1986, 15-16 on the aspects in which *Eloisa to Abelard* deviates from the heroic epistle model of Ovid.
[61] Ovid 1855, 1:76 and 1:98.
[62] See Hughes's and others' renderings in *TE*, 2:332.

The second example that I wish to mention is a line which Pope takes from Horace's *Epistles*. In her confession of envy for the "blameless Vestal's lot" (207), or one who has never loved, Eloisa imagines such a life:

The world forgetting, by the world forgot.
Eternal sun-shine of the spotless mind!
Each pray'r accepted, and each wish resign'd;
Labour and rest, that equal periods keep. (*Eloisa to Abelard*, 208-11)

When we take into account Eloisa's firm conviction that "'twas no sin to love" (68), it is not difficult to detect that this statement of envy is somewhat tongue-in-cheek, yet what I wish to draw attention to is the line: "The world forgetting, by the world forgot," which is taken directly from Horace:[63]

oblitusque meorum obliviscendus et illis. (*Ep*. 1.11.9)

forgetting my loved ones, and to be forgotten by them.

What Pope's Eloisa dreams of is a life in harmony with nature, a world apart from the merciless, unsparing circumstances which have been so inimical to her. To illuminate this desire of hers, Pope draws on the retirement theme found in Horace. For, in *Ep*. 1.11 addressed to a friend Bullatius who has been journeying in the Province of Asia, he poses the question of whether he would like to live in a town as desolate as Lebedus (*Ep*. 1.11.6-8). For Horace the answer is yes (8). It is even an enticing prospect for him to forget his loved ones and be forgotten by them and to observe the world from afar (10). This is relevant to our poet's own decision to live apart from London on his leased estate at Twickenham.

Furthermore, Horace's conclusion is:

ut, quocumque loco fueris, vixisse libenter
te dicas. (*Ep.* 1.11.24-25)

In whatever place you may be
may you be able to say that you have lived happily.

One might recall that Pope's Catholicism caused him to suffer from hostile laws which forced his family to move from one residence to another. Yet thanks to the fortune he accrued from the Homer translations, though the law forbade him to purchase property, he was able to secure a leased estate and to live a settled life there surrounded by family and friends. Here is one of the parallels which Pope found delight in discovering between Horace's ideas and his own, and, as we shall see in the chapters to come they are reflected in the Horatian *Imitations* as well. These passages from *Eloisa to Abelard* which draw from Ovid and Horace are

[63] See also Pope's "Couplet from Horace" (*ibid*., 6:391 and 394n.).

examples of Pope's borrowings from ancient authors which he incorporated in his own poetry, not as translations but as original works. For Pope's developing relationship with Horace, it is especially significant to realize that in *Eloisa to Abelard*, just as in the *Essay on Criticism*, Pope was already drawing on lines and themes from Horace long before he decided to work solely on Horace in the *Imitation* series.

Pope's "Ovidian phase" with its treatment of the themes of love is no coincidence in that it was the period in which the poet was becoming acquainted with the Blount sisters, Martha and Teresa, as well as deepening his fascination for Lady Mary Montagu, who was then accompanying her husband on an extended journey to Constantinople. Rebecca Ferguson correctly captures the essence of Pope's rendering of the French tale in stating that there is "no clear resolution to Eloisa's struggles,"[64] and David Fairer identifies parallels which can be drawn between Eloisa's situation and Pope's.[65] In drawing from Ovid's *Heroides* and the twelfth-century French tale of Eloisa and Abelard, Pope was in fact exploring his own moral complexities and the inconclusiveness of his state of mind with regards to his love interests. He would eventually fall out with Lady Mary Wortley Montagu,[66] but his tender feelings for Martha Blount would only continue to grow, oscillating between passion and irresolution, for the remainder of his life. It is no wonder, then, that he takes a sympathetic view[67] of the decisions of his female protagonists, of Eloisa in her confidence in her affair despite the tragic outcome and of the *Lady* in her suicide. Ferguson states that the two Ovidian poems are unique in that Pope handles deep and honest emotions without any touch of irony.[68] While this is true, the two poems are nonetheless no different from his other works in that they are a means of self-expression in which Pope conveys his inner thoughts, whether it be opinions on politics such as we see in *Windsor-Forest* and the Horatian *Imitations*, or the interior psychological drama of amorous troubles as revealed in *Eloisa to Abelard* and *Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady*.

Regarding other major Roman elegists, Pope did not translate Tibullus or Propertius. This may have been due to a simple lack of personal interest in these ancient poets, but it may

[64] Ferguson 1986, 2.
[65] Fairer explains: "*Eloisa to Abelard*, which he sent her in 1717, seems to catch the feverishness of his feelings for this remote impossible love, especially when Eloisa imagines a future poet 'In sad similitude of griefs to mine,/Condemn'd whole years in absence to deplore,/And image charms he must behold no more' (360-62). But Pope's feelings, like Eloisa's, led nowhere" (1989, 12).
[66] Aubrey Williams (1973) has corrected the Twickenham Edition (4:xix and 371) which attributes the compliment paid to "*Montague*" (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 1.2.166; *TE*, 4:89) as Lady Mary; Williams suggests Lady Mary Churchill, Duchess of Montagu, whom Pope did hold in high esteem.
[67] See Pope's comments on *Eloisa to Abelard* in a letter to Martha Blount (*Corr*., 1:338).
[68] Ferguson 1986, 1.

also have had to do with the difficulties which lie in applying the meter of classical elegiac verse in English. To begin with, the sonnet had occupied the dominant place in poetry in the Elizabethan era, and elegy was not the most popular genre for any aspiring poet. The English sonnet was written in the iambic pentameter, but the classical elegiac couplet consisted of a hexameter followed by a pentameter. English poets sought to keep the rhyme scheme, but it was quantitatively hard to follow in the English language.[69] They instead came to define elegy by subject rather than by its meter.

Here again we are exposed to Horace's powerful influence in England, as the prevailing definition of elegy, in terms of theme, was derived from his *Ars Poetica*:

versibus impariter[70] iunctis querimonia primum,
post etiam inclusa est voti sententia compos. (*AP*, 75-76).

At first verses unequally yoked expressed lament,
later their purpose was also extended to prayer.

It was *querimonia*, the lament, which English poets attached to the genre of elegy. Partly owing to French poets and scholars in the 1570s and 1580s who categorized the elegy as poems of lament,[71] there followed at the end of the sixteenth century a sudden surge of "elegies" in England which mixed *querimonia*, complaint, and Petrarchan lament.[72] However, Alan Armstrong dryly remarks that "many elegies of that decade are merely third-rate Petrarchan poems dressed in the thinnest of classical disguises."[73] John Donne, whose translations of Horace Pope was to imitate in the 1730s, composed his *Elegies* between 1593 and 1596. These poems reveal indebtedness to both Ovid[74] and Propertius, and Ben Jonson, in "A Celebration of Charis" (included in his *Underwood* of 1640) was one of the first poets in England to give recognition to Propertius.[75] It was perhaps owing to the decline of the sonnet, with its themes and meter, that the elegies of Propertius and Tibullus received little attention among English poets in the eighteenth century.

[69] Sir Philip Sidney experimented with the classical meter in nos. 13 and 14 of *Certain Sonnets* (1598) and nos. 11 and 74 of *Arcadia* (1590). In formal education, Ovid's *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* were used as materials in practicing the elegiac meter.
[70] The elegiac couplet was "impariter" because it consisted of a hexameter followed by a pentameter.
[71] Cf. Thomas Sébillet; Barthélemy Aneau; Joachim Du Bellay; Jacques Peletier.
[72] Thomas Nashe's "Choise" (1592-93?); John Donne's *Elegies* (1593-96); Thomas Lodge's *Phillis: Honoured with Pastorall Sonnets, Elegies, and amorous delights* (1593); Barnabe Barne's *Parthenophil and Parthenophe: Sonnettes, Madrigals, Elegies, and Odes* (1593); Francis Davison's *A Poetical Rapsody Containing Diverse Sonnets, Odes, Elegies, and other Poesies* (1602); Alexander Craig's *Amorose Songs, Sonets, and Elegies* (1606).
[73] Armstrong 1977, 420.
[74] For Donne's indebtedness to Ovid, see Leishman (1951).
[75] Armstrong 1977, 425-26.

IV. Classical Philosophers, Rhetoricians, and Orators: "Still fit for use"[76]

In addition to Aristotle, English translations of other philosophers appeared, as well as rhetoricians and orators, and some for the first time in the eighteenth century. Pope seems to have been familiar with the historical treatise on rhetoric and education by Quintilian, as he states:

> In grave Quintilian's copious work, we find
> The justest rules, and clearest method joined:
> …
> Still fit for use, and ready at command. (*Essay on Criticism*, 669-70, 674)

Although Pope never ventured to translate Quintilian, it is clear that he approved of the ancient rhetorician. Parts of the *Institutio Oratoria* were translated by John Warr as early as 1686. In the eighteenth century, both William Guthrie (1742) and J. Patsall (1774) published what they claimed to be complete translations, but in fact they eliminated certain sections and the quality of their renderings was poor. As mentioned earlier, prose translations of classical works, especially those dealing with abstract ideas, were often more difficult to comprehend in terms of content and were time-consuming to render into English with accuracy and clarity.

In the eighteenth century, Lucretius and his didactic writing gained a reputation he had not enjoyed hitherto.[77] The first complete English translation of *De Rerum Natura* was done by Thomas Creech in 1682, and, going through eight editions to 1793, it remained the standard translation well into the nineteenth century. In a letter to Swift, Pope once compared his *Essay on Man*, which was published anonymously and received high praise, to Lucretius's philosophical poem: "Whether I can proceed in the same grave march like Lucretius, or must descend to the gayeties of Horace, I know not."[78] Pope also used the adjective "grave" to describe Quintilian (above, *Essay on Criticism*, 669). He refers to the prescriptive styles of Quintilian and Lucretius which had a certain appeal to him. His *Essay on Man* does share many themes – the universe and creation, the human condition and behavior - with the *De Rerum Natura*. However, as his Horatian *Imitations* show, Pope was also attracted to Horace's "gayeties" in which the author indulges in personal anecdotes and accounts from daily life.

[76] *Essay on Criticism*, 674.
[77] Cf. Gillespie's comment: "The controversial, supposedly atheistical Lucretius [was] shunned by translators until the seventeenth century" (2005, 132).
[78] *Corr*., 3:433.

As a poet who was keen on the business side of poetry and publication, Pope must have been aware of the growing interest in the ancient philosopher among the English public and the potential for a new and lucrative translation. In an imaginary comic dialogue Lintot, a rising bookseller in rivalry with Tonson in the trade, discloses his plan: "'I'll tell you what happen'd to me last month: I bargain'd with S- for a new version of *Lucretius* to publish against *Tonson's*.'"[79] Pope is referring to George Sewell with "S-," and one cannot help but be reminded of his rival publication of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. While it is doubtful whether Pope ever felt a sufficient interest in Lucretius to produce a complete translation, it must have crossed his mind at one point or another that Dryden had already translated parts of *De Rerum Natura* and that the prospects of exceeding the reputation of Creech's version were quite slight. As a Christian, Pope may also have been sensitive to Lucretius' anti-religious arguments presented in the work.[80]

Seneca (*c.* 4 B.C.E. – 65 C.E.), a philosopher and prolific writer of epistles, dialogues, and essays on various themes and subjects, was known for his tragedies in eighteenth-century England.[81] The dramatist John Crowne staged *Thyestes, A Tragedy* (1681), and translations of his tragedies were undertaken by poets such as Samuel Pordage and Sir Edward Sherburne. Regarding his epistles and dialogues, Robert L'Estrange's collection, *Seneca's Morals by Way of Abstract* (1678), proved to be extremely successful. Selections of individual letters and dialogues were translated by an anonymous writer in 1739-1740 and by George Bennet in his *Morals* (1745), and a complete translation, *Epistles*, was produced by Thomas Morell in 1786. His relatively low repute may be explained by his discursive style of writing, and his abstract ideas may not have been the easiest to comprehend. Notwithstanding the fact that Seneca left many moral essays, Pope showed no particular zeal for this ancient writer:

> It seems to me that his [Voltaire's] Judgment of Mankind, and his Observation of human Actions in a lofty and Philosophical view, is one of the principal Characteristicks of the Writer; who however is not less a Poet for being a Man of Sense, (as Seneca and his Nephew[82] were.)[83]

Pope acknowledges the philosophical treatises of Seneca as ideas expressed by a "Man of Sense" and equally praises his literary works as a good model for poetry. While it seems that from this comment, as well as the fact that he was a learned man, Pope had read Seneca's

[79] *Ibid*., 1:374.
[80] See, for example, Melchior de Polignac's posthumous *Anti-Lucretius* (1745), composed in Latin verse.
[81] See Kewes 2005, 241-52.
[82] Lucan.
[83] *Corr*., 2:229.

works, his relatively dismissive attitude towards Seneca as a poet may merely have been a reflection of the lack of appreciation for this ancient author in the eighteenth century.

Plato's Greek made his works less accessible, but translations of high caliber were produced by Floyer Sydenham, Henry Spens, and Thomas Taylor. Gillespie counts 13 translations of Plato into English in the period from 1660 to 1790.[84] The Greek works of Marcus Aurelius (Roman Emperor, 161 – 180 C.E.) and Cebes of Thebes (fifth to fourth century B.C.E.) enjoyed some popularity, mostly due to their colorful content rather than their style or language. Notable renderings of Marcus Aurelius were done by Jeremy Collier (1701) and James Thomson (1747). Eight versions of Cebes appeared between 1699 and 1774,[85] of which some were secondary translations from the Latin.

It is a bit surprising that the Stoic philosopher Epictetus (55 – 135 C.E.) was much more appreciated in the eighteenth century. A considerable translation, *All the Works*, by Elizabeth Carter appeared in 1758. Of more significance to Pope is that, though still a rather obscure philosopher, Epictetus is mentioned as many times as Tacitus in Joseph Addison and Richard Steele's *The Spectator*, to which Pope was a regular contributor. Its index indicates that Epictetus was mentioned six times, half the occurrences of Juvenal and quite a feat considering that Latin authors were much more known and cited. Very probably Pope himself must have read or at least have been aware of this Stoic teacher.

Rhetoric and oratory occupied a place in eighteenth-century literary culture, though more often as models of argumentation than poetics.[86] Aeschines (389 – 314 B.C.E.), one of the ten Attic orators, was translated into and printed in English for the first time in the eighteenth century. Considered a rather minor orator, he was often included in the editions of translations of Demosthenes (383 – 322 B.C.E.). There were relatively few translations of Demosthenes, but the occasions for the publication of his translations demonstrate an interesting coincidence with England's political relations with France. A collaborative version, headed by Lord Somers and with contributions from some of Pope's friends such as Samuel Garth, the Earl of Peterborough, and George Granville, appeared in 1702 and 1744. England had entered into war with France at the beginning of the century, and Demosthenes' works

[84] Gillespie 2005, 131.
[85] Winnifrith 2005, 255.
[86] Geoffrey Tillotson explains: "Poetry in the eighteenth century was commonly thought of as a mode of rhetoric, defined as the art of persuasion by means of the selection and arrangement of a multitude of traditional techniques of argument. …The eighteenth-century poet… conceives of his job as akin to that of the attorney at law who has a jury to convince and whose success depends on his subtle manipulation of a body of inherited arguments, 'turns,' illustrations, allusions, figures, and received phrases" (1969, 10).

proved to be a convenient vehicle to express, in a roundabout way, England's united hostility against the French. The Treaty of Utrecht in 1713 concluded the strife,[87] but war broke out again in 1744. This was the year in which a second edition of Somers' translation was published. Furthermore, when tensions heightened again in 1756 between the two nations, versions of Demosthenes, this time by Philip Francis (1757-1758) and Thomas Leland (1754-1770, 3 vols.), regained popularity. However, as can be attested in the scarcity of allusions in his works and correspondence, Pope did not show a keen interest in classical rhetoricians and orators, and much less in those who wrote in Greek.

The great exception was Cicero. Pope was particularly enthralled by this orator and political thinker. Cicero was affectionately referred to as "Tully" by many British writers "as if he were some familiar friend,"[88] and Pope often called him this in his poetry as well as in his correspondence. The Roman orator was considered to be a brave public figure in an age of tumult and betrayal, and his fate was much swayed by violent tides of unstable and divided political factions. A fierce supporter of the Republican cause, he was later to make amends to Caesar, only to turn against him once more in siding with his assassins. Then, driven into exile, he returned a year later upon the earnest callings of the Roman people. These turbulent experiences, not to mention his tragic end, invited sympathy among the English people,[89] as they saw that the political situation then was comparable to the current state of affairs in Britain. Although his works had already enjoyed considerable prestige prior to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, 53 translations of Cicero were published between 1660 and 1790.[90] Sir Roger L'Estrange was one translator who felt deeply for Cicero and his life in such unsettling times, and he rendered some five volumes of Cicero's works, published between 1680 and 1699. Conyers Middleton's *Life of Cicero* (1741), which contained partial translations of speeches, letters, and other writings, was published by subscription, and Pope, along with Samuel Johnson, was one of the subscribers to this edition. This went through several editions, and the work was eventually translated into French and Spanish as well. However, his subsequent *Cicero's Epistles to M. Brutus* (1743) came under attack for including material that was not attributable to Cicero. William Guthrie's edition of the *Epistles to Atticus* appeared in 1752. Though his correspondence was the most popular

[87] In *Windsor-Forest*, Pope drops hints of his foresight of the end of the Marlborough wars. *Windsor-Forest* was published on 7 March 1713; the Tory-supported Treaty of Utrecht was signed a month later on 11 April.
[88] Winnifrith 2005, 264.
[89] Cf. *Corr*., 2:167.
[90] Gillespie 2005, 131.

material for translation, there appeared a handful of translations of his speeches. Thomas Gordon, who also translated Tacitus and Sallust, Duncan, who translated Caesar, John Rutherford, and Sir Charles Sedley all produced English renderings of individual speeches, often those dealing with conspiracies and the one against Catiline being the most popular. For Pope, it seems that it was Cicero's status as an outsider, as he was not Roman born and was later an exile, which attracted him to this noble speaker and he inserts short quotations of his words of wisdom in his correspondence as well as on the title page of many of his own works.[91] Like many British authors of his time, he thought fondly of Cicero and indeed referred to him "as if he were some familiar friend."

For the most part, Pope exhibited relatively little interest in Roman and Greek history and their translations, although passages in his correspondence indicate that he had read many of the major prose works of history written in Latin and Greek. This may perhaps be due to his deep ambitions to be a poet and not a translator or a university scholar of history. I give a cursory summary of the characteristics and trends among English translators with regards to historical works from Antiquity. Julius Caesar was one of the first Latin writers to be translated into English. In the eighteenth century, Martin Bladen (1705) and William Duncan (1751) published the complete works of Caesar. Other attempts included versions of the *Gallic War* by John Mair (1753) and Johnson Towers (1755). One may find it surprising that the great recorders of history, Livy and Tacitus in Latin and Herodotus and Thucydides in Greek, received little attention in the eighteenth century. A major reason for this, again, is that English translators tended to shy away from the long, winding prose of some of their works. Historical writing also required on the part of the translator background knowledge of the wars and political events which were described. In contrast to this, the works of Sallust and Suetonius were divided into short sections and the racy content may have been more amusing. Another factor was that eighteenth-century translators took more interest in histories which mirrored the current political situation in England and events to which they could relate.[92] In

[91] E.g. *De Re Publica*, 6, cap. 23, on the title page of *Epistle to Arbuthnot* (*TE*, 4:91).
[92] Tom Winnifrith describes this inclination: "Though fifth-century Athens, the main subject of Herodotus' and Thucydides' histories, represents for modern scholars the most interesting phase of Greek literature, art, and political development, it was of comparatively little interest to eighteenth-century writers. And the first century BCE, for them the most exciting period of Roman history, is not treated by Tacitus, or in the surviving Books of Livy. But the Roman historians write about figures of obvious relevance to eighteenth-century debates about the claims of monarchy, republicanism, and constitutional government: statesmen like Cicero, and leaders of unsuccessful revolts such as Catiline. The eighteenth century had no difficulty in identifying exemplars both positive and negative among these figures, and found the extension of the Roman Empire a congenial topic… Such characters have obvious counterparts in the British history of the period; it is common to find translators, of

addition, many English translations of Greek and Roman historians tended to be literal and allowed little room for creativity. As a genre one could assume that history was not as appealing to Pope who, though possessing strong political opinions, still required space for imagination in his poetry.

Another reason was the relative popularity of verse over prose in eighteenth-century England. The novel and journalism print were still in their developing stages. Apart from religious texts, works in prose had yet to be in wide circulation. It was only in the latter half of the eighteenth century that long prose works began to be appreciated, and critical prose such as history, rather than fiction, gained attention. Some of the period's monumental masterpieces include David Hume's *History of England* (1754-1762), William Robertson's *History of Scotland* (1759) and *History of America* (1777), Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* (1776), and Edward Gibbon's *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1776-1788).[93] I have already mentioned that translators were averse to complex Latin and Greek prose, and it is not surprising, for example, that very few embarked on renderings of ancient historians such as Tacitus, "Rome's greatest and most difficult historian," according to Tom Winnifrith.[94] One of the major classical prose writers who did enjoy popularity was Pliny the Younger. Pliny's letters are relatively short, and an educated English reader would even have read him in the original Latin. Three complete translations appeared in the period from 1660 to 1790,[95] and his letters were popular material for translation. Thus Pope's indifference towards prose may be attributed to his mindset as a writer of an era in which prose generally appealed neither to the writer or the public. Finally, while acknowledging that Spenser, Donne, and Milton did publish a few letters, Howard Erskine-Hill states that Pope was "the first English poet to publish his own correspondence in his lifetime to a substantial degree" and that his intention to publish his own letters derived from the examples of Cicero and Pliny the Younger. He also explains: "[Pope] wanted to vindicate himself and to display the best face of himself to the world…. He wished to put the record straight, as he saw it, and his letters seemed the ideal form in which to do so."[96] Although the publication of his letters became a complicated matter and developed into a scandal with Edmund Curll, the revisions

Sallust and Suetonius in particular, using their prefaces, and even the translations themselves, to make contemporary political points." (2005, 282).
[93] See Tillotson et al. 1969, 17-18.
[94] Winnifrith 2005, 284.
[95] Ibid., 284.
[96] Erskine-Hill 2000, xix. While Pliny's plan to publish his letters is made quite clear in his works (1.1), classical scholars usually agree that Cicero had no intention to publish his.

he made to his letters, both those which he received and those which he collected from his addressees, are indeed indications of his wish to "put the record straight" as well as to "display the best face of himself to the world."

V. Roman Satirists and Martial's Epigrams: Popularity of Juvenal and Persius

Horace was of course not the only Roman satirist who received considerable attention in the eighteenth century. In the period from 1660 to 1790 there were over 80 volumes of translations published which were devoted exclusively to the satires of Horace, Juvenal, and Persius and the epigrams of Martial. Pope did not attempt full-scale translations or imitations of these classical writers except for Horace. Nonetheless, I find it worthwhile to mention the translations which appeared, as Pope had read these authors and must have been acquainted with at least some of the versions rendered by contemporaries. In the case of Juvenal especially, scholars have pointed out the "Juvenalian" aspects of Pope's Horatian *Imitations*, and Howard Weinbrot has recently stated that "Pope reluctantly moved to the Juvenalian outrage appropriate for the satirist he had become, the poet now at odds with his declining culture, about which he can only protest rather than cure."[97] The change in Pope's attitude is manifest in particular towards the end of his Horatian *Imitations*, and the bitter resignation which Pope then feels for Horace becomes a central theme in exploring the relationship between the two poets.

Like Horace, Juvenal was an influential Roman satirist in eighteenth-century literary culture. Juvenal's open denunciations on many a topic, including marriage and women in the sixth satire, struck a chord in several eighteenth-century poets including Samuel Cobb, William Whitehead, and Charles Churchill, and he was also hailed as an advocate of liberty and an opponent of tyranny.[98] Twenty-five translations of Juvenal appeared between 1660 and 1790.[99] Barten Holyday rendered a complete translation of Juvenal's works in 1673. His translation is literal and follows the original very closely. This is attributable to the fact that, as his work was probably completed by the mid-1640s, it belongs to an era before free translation became the dominant style for English translators. The next notable complete version was produced by John Dryden in 1693 with William Bowles, William Congreve, Thomas Creech, Richard Duke, Stephen Harvey, George Stepney, Nahum Tate, and Dryden's

[97] Weinbrot 2007, 86.
[98] See Weinbrot 1978, 150-81 on the opposition to tyranny.
[99] Gillespie 2005, 131.

sons, among others, as contributors. This became another outstanding achievement of Dryden's that was difficult to compete against, and the edition saw no rival until the late eighteenth century when Edward Burnaby Greene (1763) and Edward Owen (1785) attempted to supersede it by rendering new complete translations.

As with Horace, versions of individual poems of Juvenal were popular among English translators. Examples include: *The Wish, Being the Tenth Satyr of Juvenal Periphrastically Rendered in Pindarick Verse* (1675), a rendering of the tenth satire attributed to the Irish cleric and scholar Edward Wetenhall; John Oldham's *A Satyr, in Imitation of the Third of Juvenal* in his *Poems, and Translations* (1683); *Juvenalis Redivivus: Or, The First Satyr of Juvenal Taught to Speak Plain English* (1683) attributed to Thomas Wood; John Higden's *A Modern Essay on the Thirteenth Satyr of Juvenal* (1686) and *A Modern Essay on the Tenth Satyr of Juvenal* (1687); Thomas Shadwell's *The Tenth Satyr of Juvenal, English and Latin* (1687); J[ohn] H[arvey]'s *The Tenth Satyr of Juvenal done into English Verse* (1693); the anonymous *The Merchants Advocate, A Poem, In Imitation of the Third Satire of Juvenal* (1738); and Thomas Gilbert's *The First Satire of Juvenal Imitated* (1740).

Pope was one of the first to recognize Samuel Johnson when he noticed the poem *London: A Poem in Imitation of the Third Satire of Juvenal* (1738), which was to be followed a decade later by *The Vanity of Human Wishes: The Tenth Satire of Juvenal Imitated* (1749). Johnson's *London* was published, anonymously, on the same day as Pope's *One Thousand Seven Hundred and Thirty Eight: A Dialogue Something Like Horace* on 16 May 1738. Learning of the author who was then unknown and impoverished, in a letter to Jonathan Richardson in which he enclosed a copy of *London*, Pope discloses his desire to assist Johnson in obtaining a position as schoolmaster.[100] As with Christopher Smart, in later life Pope was keen to discover new talent and to express appreciation of their works to emerging young writers.

Although each satire was relatively short and the whole of his work was less voluminous compared to the other Roman satirists, Persius enjoyed less repute and attention in Pope's time. Unlike Juvenal, renderings of individual satires by him were scarce. Barton Holyday was the first to publish an English rendering of Persius in 1616. Of the three complete translations of Persius between 1660 and 1790, Dryden's collaborative edition of 1693 was an instant success and was appreciated as having captured the essence of Persius' difficult writing in a clear and enlightening manner. Other translations include: John

[100] *Corr*., 4:194.

Senhouse's *The Satires of Persius Translated into English Prose* (1730); Thomas Brewster's *The Satires of Persius* (1741-2) with later additions by Edward Owen (1786); and Edmund Burton's *The Satyrs of Persius* (1752). Quite a few imitations of his satires came out in the 1730s, when Pope was working on his Horatian *Imitations*, such as Lord Hervey's *A Satyr in the Manner of Persius* (1730), the anonymous *Advice to an Aspiring Young Gentleman of Fortune. In Imitation of the Fourth Satire of Persius* (1733) and *Persius Scaramouch* (1734), and Benjamin Loveling's *The First Satire of Persius Imitated* (1740).[101] The works listed above all carry political overtones, either for or against the Walpole regime, embedded in their renderings.[102]

Some translators of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries produced renderings of both authors. Dryden's *The Satires of Decimus Junius Juvenalis… Together with the Satires of Aulus Persius Flaccus* (1693) are an example, as are Thomas Sheridan's *The Satyrs of Persius* (1728) followed a decade later by *The Satyrs of Juvenal* (1739), Barten Holyday's *Decimus Junius Juvenalis, and Aulus Persius Flaccus Translated and Illustrated, as well with Sculpture as Notes* (1763), Edward Burnaby Greene's *The Satires of Juvenal, Paraphrastically Imitated, and Adapted to the Times* (1763) and *The Satires of Persius, Paraphrastically Imitated, and Adapted to the Times* (1779), Edward Owen's *The Satires of Juvenal* (1785) followed by *A Translation of Juvenal and Persius into English Verse… With a New Translation of Persius instead of Brewsters's* (1786), and Martin Madan's *A New Translation of Juvenal and Persius* (1789). Others retained a prolonged interest in and worked on all three major Roman satirists. These include John Stirling's *The Satires of A. Persius Flaccus, for the Use of Schools* (1736), *The Works of Horace* (1751-53) in two volumes, and *The Satires of Juvenal* (1760) and Thomas Nevile's *Imitations of Horace* (1758) and *Imitations of Juvenal and Persius* (1769).

Imitations of Martial had been popular since the seventeenth century, but epigram as a genre was not highly regarded.[103] This may be linked to the fact that the English sonnet, once

[101] See Aden 1969, 6 for his view that Pope's Horatian *Imitations* resemble Persius' satires in their incorporation of an unchangeable and corrupt dialogue partner.
[102] See Weinbrot 1988, 144-63. Weinbrot 1982, 60-61 provides a fuller list of translations of Persius and, contrary to the general modern perception of Persius' obscurity, claims that the "unchallenged view" during the Restoration and eighteenth century was that Persius "attacked moral, political, and literary vice, especially as exemplified by the tasteless, wicked, bribing Nero and his court. Since open attack would have meant death, he resorted to masks, irony, a self-refuting, self-condemning, and uneducable adversaries… he even refused to have his satires published until after his death, thus assuring that he could be prudently satirical during his lifetime" (ibid., 75).
[103] See Hopkins 2005, 223. See also Moul 2010, 1 and 54-88 for the popularity of Martial and the epigram, especially with regards to Jonson.

prized by Shakespeare, Donne, and Milton, went out of style after the Restoration and did not regain popularity until the time of Wordsworth, Shelley, and Keats. Although prominent writers such as Sir John Denham, Sir Charles Sedley, Joseph Addison, Sir Richard Steele, and Samuel Johnson all rendered English versions, Martial and the epigram as a whole were not of primary interest to eighteenth-century authors and translators. Thus, in the period between 1660 and 1790 there were six volumes which contained Martial's poems exclusively, but they were not undertaken by Dryden or the era's leading translators: James Wright's *Sales Epigrammaton* (1663); the anonymous *M. Val. Martialis Spectaculorum Liber Paraphras'd* (1674); Henry Killigrew's *Select Epigrams of Martial Englished* (1689); William Hay's *Select Epigrams of Martial* (1755); William Scott's *Epigrams of Martial* (1773); and James Elphinston's *Epigrams of M. Val. Martial, in Twelve Books* (1782).[104] It seems that Pope was familiar with the Roman epigrammatic poet as he occasionally cites and alludes to his works in his correspondence,[105] but there remain no traces of any attempt at a major translation or imitation based on Martial. Although the popularity of Juvenal persisted well into the second half of the eighteenth century, that of Martial waned still further.

VI. Pedagogical Texts: Literal and Faithful Translations

Finally, it is worth noting that if there were more verse translations of classical works in the eighteenth century, prose translations were often produced with a pedagogical purpose in mind. The most popular in this category were Cicero and especially Aesop.[106] 22 translations of Aesop appeared between 1660 and 1790.[107] In the field of verse, Virgil was regarded as indispensable material in learning Latin poetry.[108] Ovid was another poet whose works became classic material for education, and Colin Burrow explains that the *Tristia* were often taught in schools in seventeenth-century England.[109] Cornelius Nepos was also popular for textbooks, as his Latin phrases were short and were deemed suitable material to translate for

[104] Hopkins 2005, 221-23.
[105] See for example *Corr*., 2:227.
[106] Aesop was recorded as a Greek slave in the sixth century B.C.E. The fables attributed to him were in all likelihood never composed by him. It was Phaedrus who produced a Latin verse collection of Aesop's fables in the first century C.E. and included in it fables of his own. Paul Davis explains his popularity: "To call a volume of poems *Fables* without meaning to refer in some measure to Aesop would have been unthinkable at any point between the Interregnum and the middle of the eighteenth century" (2008, 214). See also Patterson (1991) and Lewis (1996) on the influence of Aesop in English literary culture.
[107] Gillespie 2005, 131.
[108] See Friis-Jensen 2007, 293, for Virgil's popularity as educational material in the Middle Ages and Sowerby 2006, 9-10, during the Renaissance.
[109] Burrow 2002, 308-9. See also Davis 2008, 58.

beginners. Among the Roman satirists, prose versions of Horace were undertaken by Samuel Dunster (*The Satires and Epistles of Horace*, 1709), Samuel Patrick (*The Satires, Epistles, and Art of Poetry*, 1743), and Christopher Smart (*The Works of Horace, Translated Literally into English Prose*, 1756), all with notes and the original Latin texts printed *en face* and aimed at educational use. Allen Benham claims of Smart's text: "It can safely be called the most used translation of Horace's *Art of Poetry*."[110] Likewise for Persius, prose versions were done by Henry Eelbeck (*A Prosaic Translation of Aulus Persius Flaccus's Six Satyrs*, 1719), John Senhouse (*The Satires of Persius Translated into English Prose*, 1730), and Edmund Burton (*The Satyrs of Persius*, 1752), all intended for students of Latin. Thomas Sheridan, with *The Satyrs of Persius* (1728) and *The Satyrs of Juvenal* (1739), and Martin Madan in *A New Translation of Juvenal and Persius* (1789) covered two Roman satirists, and John Stirling produced separate school texts of all three authors: *The Satires of A. Persius Flaccus, for the Use of Schools* (1736); *The Works of Horace* in two volumes (1751-53); and *The Satires of Juvenal* (1760).

What is important to remark is that, as opposed to free translations and imitations, including Pope's, in which poets competed for creativity and inserted covert political messages, the translations which were intended as textbooks were usually more literal and thus more faithful. The Roman comic dramatist Terence is an example. Because it was widely believed that classical drama needed to be rewritten and adapted for the English stage, faithful translations of Terence were produced only as school texts. Similarly, although Aesop's fables proved to be a convenient medium to convey political and social comments, literal translations of Aesop and Phaedrus were made for use in schools. The first complete verse translation of Phaedrus, not intended for schools, was done by Thomas Dyche in 1712. Christopher Smart (1765) also published a complete translation of Phaedrus in verse, but, omitting certain sections which may be deemed indecent, he aimed to produce an edition that was marketable both in education and for the general readership.

As much as certain classical authors and works were preferred in schools, usually for their smooth and uncomplicated language, some were deemed inappropriate for pedagogical use due to their racy content. One whose works were not translated into prose was Martial. David Hopkins assumes that this was "probably chiefly attributable to Martial's pervasive obscenity," [111] and, though not composed for educational purposes, prominent writers

[110] Benham 1955, 3.
[111] Hopkins 2005, 223.

including Matthew Prior, Joseph Addison, and William Hay all avoided licentious passages when translating Martial. Similar discretion was shown by those who translated Horace. Scholars were perplexed by the open statements on adultery in *Sat*. 1.2, and the entire poem was often dropped by translators as indecent material for young students as well as for general publication, especially when taking into account the female readership. Christopher Smart in his translation of Horace silently discarded *Carm*. 4.10, "as if it had never existed,"[112] and he even went to the trouble of renumbering the later odes. In like manner, he eliminated the ending of Horace's *Carm*. 4.1, apparently in order to omit passages on the pretty boy Ligurinus (*Carm*. 4.1.33; 10.5). It was poverty that compelled Smart to produce a textbook version of Horace, but, despite his hopes of gaining profit from the publication, his plan did not succeed. Nevertheless, that Smart exhibited exceptional skills as a Latin translator did not go unnoticed by our poet. Pope acknowledged his abilities and corresponded with him towards the end of his life. Smart proposed to translate the *Essay on Man* into Latin and also sent a Latin translation of Pope's St Cecilia Ode, on which Pope commented in reply that, "I could see little or Nothing to alter, it is so exact."[113]

VII. Pope's Process of Elimination: Dryden and Epic

The last category of classical authors to be discussed here is devoted to epic writers. In 1743, a year before his death, Pope looks back on his career and states to Spence:

> If I had not undertaken that work [the translations of Homer] I should certainly have writ an epic, and I should have sat down to it with this advantage – that I had been nursed up in Homer and Virgil.[114]

Pope held a lifelong admiration for epic, Virgil, and Homer. It hardly surprises us today that the high standing of Virgil and Homer remained constant and that poets such as Horace and Ovid attracted many English translators. However, Tom Winnifrith reminds us that there are differences between modern perceptions and those of Pope's time. He explains that philosophers such as Seneca and, especially, Cicero were highly respected, as their works served as exemplars of rhetoric for politicians and orators like William Pitt.[115] This helps to explain the particular attachment which Pope felt to Cicero, among others. His fascination for such authors as Horace, Virgil, Homer, Longinus, and Ovid is largely in line with

[112] Money 2007, 319. This was typical of translators of this era; see Røstvig 1954, 443n.
[113] *Corr*., 4:484.
[114] Spence 1966, 1:83.
[115] Winnifrith 2005, 253.

contemporary trends so that it would hardly be an overstatement to say that his taste merely reflects that of the eighteenth century literary world. In like manner, his relative indifference towards certain authors including Plato, Cebes, Aeschines, Demosthenes, Marcus Aurelius, historians Herodotus, Thucydides, Julius Caesar, Livy, and Tacitus, and epigramists such as Martial also reflects eighteenth-century views towards these classical writers and their works. Some of the more obvious reasons for this are that, owing to the Renaissance which emphasized Latin culture more than Greek, the Latin language was more accessible and Greek was not as widespread.[116]

Pope lived at a moment in English literary history when there was a profusion of classical translations which appeared for the first time. The translation of Petronius was printed for the first time in 1659, of Catullus just prior to 1660, Silius Italicus in 1661, Manilius in 1675, Bion slightly before 1681, and Diogenes Laertius in 1683. Thomas Creech's translation of Lucretius, the first complete translation of the ancient author, was printed in 1682. This proved to be a particularly successful work and went through nine editions to 1793. Nevertheless, these were only those English translations which made it to print, and surviving works reveal that the number of manuscript translations into English exceeded those which were printed for the public.[117] Gillespie explains: "The sudden increase in new translations in the 1680s in part reflects the impact of Dryden, Tonson [the adept bookseller], and their contemporaries, both directly, and indirectly in inducing translations by others."[118] This was certainly true, although Dryden's version of Virgil would remain unchallenged as the most successful publication of a translation of a Latin poet into the eighteenth century, and several decades later Pope was to follow in his footsteps with his version of Homer. Dryden's prestige had a strong presence in English literary society even after his death in 1700, and Pope certainly took his predecessor into account when considering his mode of publication, that is, by subscription, and was conscious of his influence when choosing classical authors for his own translations.

Epic was the most highly respected genre in Dryden's era, and this remained the dominant perception in Pope's time as well. Sowerby explains that this was largely due to the invincible popularity of Virgil through the centuries in both culture and education. He also

[116] Robin Sowerby calls this "the Latin bias in the Renaissance" and explains: "In the Renaissance, long after the split between Latin west and Greek east after which knowledge of the Greek died out in the west, those who saw themselves as the natural heirs of the Romans in Italy had little Greek and little real desire to attain it" (2006, 15).
[117] Gillespie 2005, 132.
[118] Ibid., 133.

points out that epic, both Roman and Greek, could serve as a symbol of national identity. [119] The restoration of the monarchy in 1660 may be an example, when the occasion was celebrated by such poets as John Ogilby, who for the official pageantry presented poetry with a strong inclination to classical epic. However, political stability was not as easily reestablished as anticipated or hoped for. Dryden himself fell out of political favor, and for the remainder of his life was wary of writing anything with a political strain. Although he remained imbued with admiration for Virgil which was typical of his era, he decided to take the safe path by composing a translation, not a national epic commending Britain or a political commentary criticizing the current state of affairs.

Pope was able to embark on the translations of Homer while still a young man in his twenties. He had the advantage of hindsight, that is, in looking at the path his predecessor Dryden took in his career: first in public office, then in the theatre, and then a Poet Laureate who was stripped of the title due to his untimely conversion to Catholicism. Dryden turned to translation in the last twenty years of his life to earn his much-needed income, and the majority of his translations had classical sources. He had set a precedent in that a classical translation could be a safe option to avoid overt political statements. In addition to the complete version of Virgil, Dryden translated two books of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, along with portions from six other books, the first book of *The Art of Love*, three *Epistles*, and three books of the *Amores*. He also translated a considerable amount of Lucretius, and he rendered a complete version of Persius, five of Juvenal's *Satires*, and four of Horace's *Odes*. In the field of pastoral, he worked on four of the poems of Theocritus. He also tried his hand at the major Greek epic poet and completed the first book of the *Iliad*.

Dryden's *Works of Virgil* was first published in 1697 and saw ten editions by 1790. He had previously contributed a preface-poem for the *Poems* (1660) by Sir Robert Howard (1626-98), who was to become his brother-in-law in 1663, in which was included a translation of the fourth book of Virgil's *Aeneid*. Yet prior to Dryden's, Sir John Denham's *Passion of Dido* (1668) was a version of Virgil that met with success. As the title suggests, it was a partial translation of Virgil's epic, and the beginning of composition dates back to the 1630s. There was also *Virgil* (1654) by John Ogilby, whose translations of Homer had greatly inspired Pope as a child. Ogilby's *Virgil* was published by subscription, still a rare publication venture in the seventeenth century, and it saw little success. It was Dryden's *Works of Virgil*

[119] Sowerby 2005, 149-50.

which became the first major classical translation in English to generate substantial profit by subscription publication.

Pope, in July 1714, made public the terms of his *Iliad* subscription in an advertisement he inserted in the third edition of the *Rape of the Lock*:

> It is proposed at the rate of one Guinea for each Volume: The first Volume to be deliver'd in Quires within a space of a Year from the Date of this Proposal, and the rest in like manner annually: Only the Subscribers are to pay two Guineas in hand, advancing one in regard of the Expence the Undertaker must be at in collecting the several Editions, Criticks and Commentators, which are very numerous upon this Author.
>
> A third Guinea to be given upon delivery of the second Volume; and so on to the sixth, for which nothing will be required, on consideration of the Guinea advanced at first. Subscriptions are taken in by *Bernard Lintott*.[120]

This is certainly comparable to Dryden's own subscription proposal decades earlier. In a letter to William Walsh, whom he lauded as the best critic and whom Pope would later befriend, Dryden disclosed his plan:

> I propose to do it by subscription, having a hundred and two brass cuts, with the coats of arms of the subscriber to each cut; and every subscriber to pay five guineas: half in hand; besides another inferior subscription of two guineas for the rest whose names are only written in a catalogue printed with the book.[121]

There is little doubt that the success of Dryden's Virgil translation by subscription furnished hints for Pope for his own publication. For Dryden his complete translation of the *Aeneid*, along with the unprecedented success which ensued, perhaps became the compensation for his aspirations to compose an epic of his own which was never realized in his lifetime. Some half a century later Pope would come to be labeled as a political poet, but his main concern in the 1710s was how to advance his reputation and establish himself as a poet of the highest standing. He was well aware of the incontestable authority of his predecessor, as he states in the Preface to his *Iliad*:

> It is a great Loss to the Poetical World that Mr. *Dryden* did not live to translate the *Iliad*. He has left us only the first Book and a small Part of the sixth… However had he translated the whole Work, I would no more have attempted *Homer* after him than *Virgil*, his Version of whom (not withstanding some human Errors) is the most noble and spirited Translation I know in any Language.[122]

As Pope knew all along how difficult an undertaking it would be to attempt to surpass Dryden's achievement with the translations of Virgil, he wisely turned to the other great epic poet for whom no comparable translation had yet been produced: Homer.

Acquainted with the ancient poet since his youth, he had already published the *Episode of Sarpedon* (1709) from the *Iliad* and the *Arrival of Ulysses in Ithaca* (1713) from

[120] *TE*, 7:xxxvi n. Pope's formal proposal was not published until October 1714.
[121] Dryden 1942, 64.
[122] *TE*, 7:22.

the *Odyssey*, which were to serve as precursors of his complete Homeric translation.[123] As with Horace, Pope was able to find previous translations and studies by scholars on Homer. The first complete English translation of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* was done by George Chapman. Publication of his *Whole Works of Homer* began in 1598 and continued until his completion of the translation in 1616. Other complete translations of Homer were undertaken by John Ogilby (1660, 1665) and Thomas Hobbes (1675). There were secondary translations based on André Dacier's French version (*Iliad*, 1699; *Odyssey*, 1708), which were undertaken collaboratively by John Ozell, William Broome, and William Oldisworth (1712). In embarking on his monumental work, Pope relied regularly on the translations by Chapman and Hobbes.[124] In his passage on Sarpedon, he inserted a note of acknowledgement to Sir John Denham: "I ought not to neglect putting the reader in mind that this speech of *Sarpedon* is excellently translated by Sir *John Denham*, and if I have done it with any spirit, it is partly owing to him."[125] He had paid a similar homage in the headnote to his *Episode of Sarpedon*:

He [Sarpedon] *incites* Glaucus *to second him in this Action by an admirable Speech, which has been render'd in English by Sir* John Denham *after whom the Translator had not the Vanity to attempt it for any other reason, than that the Episode must have been very imperfect without so Noble a part of it*.[126]

This open statement of indebtedness in particular may have stemmed from true feelings of gratitude, as the *Episode of Sarpedon*, years earlier in 1709, was Pope's first translation of a classical work to be published.[127] In addition to previous English translations, he also had access to contemporary criticism provided by Anne Dacier, and, as he was to do in preparing his edition of Shakespeare in 1725, he hired some scholars, Fenton and Broome, to translate and further provide him with research on the Greek poet.

Pope was no doubt proud of his own translation. Though acknowledging his indebtedness to the predecessors Chapman, Hobbes, and Ogilby, he states:

I attempt him [Homer] in no other Hope but that which one may entertain without much Vanity, of giving a more tolerable Copy of him than any entire Translation in Verse has yet done.[128]

Thus he wrote in the Preface to the first volume of his *Iliad* in 1715, and not only did he make a record-breaking achievement with the fortune he accrued from the Homer translation, he

[123] For *The Gardens of Alcinous*, a fragmentary translation, see *TE*, 6:103-104.
[124] *Corr*., 1:43-44; apparently Pope sometimes relied on the translations so much that he deviated from the Greek original without knowing he had done so.
[125] *TE*, 8:96.
[126] *Ibid*., 1:449.
[127] See Sherburn 1934, facing p. 85 for a reproduction of the receipt for this work.
[128] *Prose Works*, 1:250.

also contributed to a change of trend in English literary history by making Homer a popular and accessible ancient epic poet.

Part of the difficulty in approaching his works, in comparison to Virgil's, for example, lay in the language barrier. Sowerby explains:

> In the eighteenth century itself, in which readers of the original Greek were far less numerous than those who knew Latin, it was effectively Pope's translations that turned Homer into a classic for the English reader.[129]

Stuart Gillespie agrees that it was in effect Pope, by way of his English translations, who turned Homer into a more readily accessible classical poet for the English reading public:

> Pope's *Iliad* goes through 27 editions and his *Odyssey* 33 by 1790, together making up nearly half the number of all printed book-length English-language editions of Homer in our period. Plainly, none of his competitors and successors had more than a fraction of his impact, and Pope can fairly be said to *make* Homer a classic for the Enlightenment English reader, not simply to confirm a standing conferred by tradition, scholarship, and other translating activity.[130]

As the two scholars point out (note that both use the same phrase), it was Pope's translations which made Homer "a classic for the English reader." I have already stated above that, even in Dryden's time, Virgil's formula for an epic commemorating one's own nation began to be less viable in the decades following the Restoration. Virgil's epic model was beginning to lose its appeal and applicability. Although Pope's translations of Homer were published in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, it is hardly an understatement to say that Pope's English rendering of Homer, in breaking the language barrier and providing significant historical and poetic insight in his notes, was a contributing factor in opening the doors for a new appreciation of the Greek epic poet in England.

Despite the fact that no other English translation of Homer was to equal Pope's success, it is important to recognize that such an achievement did not necessarily deter other poets from translating the Greek poet. As the popularity of imitations began to decline in the second half of the eighteenth century, so did the standard form, the heroic couplet. Stylistically the subsequent translations tended to experiment with form. James Macpherson published a version of the *Iliad* in prose (1773), but, had it not been for time constraints, his true ambition seems to have been to produce a Homer translation in blank verse. It was William Cowper who in 1791 published a translation of Homer in blank verse. He chose not to be confined to a specific rhyme pattern, as his aim was to render a faithful translation. While at the opening of the eighteenth century, thanks largely to Dryden, the dominant style

[129] Sowerby 2005, 164. To illustrate the lasting influence of Pope's achievement, he adds: "When Homer is cited, for example, in the generous selection illustrating epic in John Newbery's *The Art of Poetry on New Plan* (1762), the quotations are from Pope's translation" (ibid.).
[130] Gillespie 2005, 131. Young 2003, 412 counts 44 editions of Pope's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* before 1800.

of translation was translation with latitude, and included paraphrases and imitations, by the end of the century the notion had changed to favor those which were literal and more faithful to the original text.

It is worth mentioning, in this discussion of epic translations, that Virgil and Homer were certainly not the only classical epic poets who enjoyed attention from Pope and other eighteenth-century writers. Apart from the most dominant and celebrated authors of epic, the Silver Age Latin poets gained considerable repute in the early eighteenth century. Statius (Publius Papinius Statius, *c*. 45-96 C.E.) was one such epic poet from the so-called Silver Age to whom Pope took a liking in his youth. He told Spence that he in fact liked Statius better than "all the Latin poets" and that he had been exposed as a child to a rendering of Statius "by some very bad hand."[131] Calling him "the best Versifyer Next Virgil,"[132] he translated the first book of the *Thebaid*, based on the brothers Polynices and Eteocles who contend with each other for the throne of Thebes. As was the habit for Pope upon producing any translation of his own, he consulted an earlier work, *Traité du poème épique* (1675), by Le Bossu.[133] He had begun work on his *First Book of Statius His Thebais* as early as 1703, although it was published in a miscellany only in 1712. Sowerby suspects that even as a teenager in 1703, Pope was well aware that he could not match the success of Dryden's Virgil (1697) and thus settled on a more minor epic poet.[134] This may well have been true, as Pope had set his heart on producing a grand epic since an early age. Another, though relatively minor, factor to consider is that Statius was for a long time believed to be a Christian. Howard Erskine-Hill points out: "Like Seneca the Younger Statius was considered to have been a Christian in the Middle Ages. So he is presented in Canto XXI of Dante's *Purgatorio*, where Statius pays homage to his master, Virgil,"[135] and it may well have been that our poet developed a sense of affinity for the "Christian" aspect of the ancient poet. However, of far more importance is the increased interest in the epics of Silver Age poets which unhesitatingly depict gruesome battlefields with heaps of bloodsoaked soldiers, merciless betrayals, and deep rancor.

The taut tension and grim tone of Silver Age epic poems are generally in stark contrast to the optimistic tone of the commendatory epic of Virgil and more generally of Augustan

[131] Spence 1966, 1:279 and 276. This was Thomas Stephens's *An Essay upon Statius: or, The Five First Books of Publ. Papinius Statius his Thebais, Done into English Verse* (1648). Despite his remark, Pope did consult this work, though infrequently (*TE*, 1:349-50).
[132] *Corr*., 1:37.
[133] *Ibid*., 63.
[134] Sowerby 2005, 157.
[135] Erskine-Hill 2000, 394. Statius himself modestly states in the closing lines of his *Thebaid* (12:815-16) that his epic will never be an equal to Virgil's *Aeneid*.

poetry which often exhibit a sense of hope and renewal. Neither Lucan nor his *Pharsalia* share many similarities with Virgil and his *Aeneid*. Marcus Annaeus Lucanus (39-65 C.E.) was ordered to die by suicide after Emperor Nero discovered his involvement in a conspiracy against him. Lucan's short life and premature death, as well as his epic which depicts a nation not unified in peace but divided in war, seem to be far from the ideal image of Virgil who enjoyed the favors of Maecenas and Augustus and of his epic extolling the courageous journey which led to the foundation of a grand empire. Translations of Lucan had already appeared in England before the Restoration. For instance, Ben Jonson expressed commendation of Thomas May's 1627 version of Lucan.[136] Part of the reason why Lucan appealed to the eighteenth-century English public was because England lived under looming uncertainty and tensions stemming from a possible imminent war. Nicholas Rowe (1674-1718) published partial translations of the *Pharsalia* which appeared in Tonson's *Poetical Miscellanies: The Fifth Part* (1704) and *Poetical Miscellanies: The Sixth Part* (1709), and he published a complete translation of the epic in 1718. Rowe, a very successful tragic dramatist best known for his play *The Fair Penitent* (1703), was appointed Poet Laureate in 1715, a position he kept for the remaining few years of life. He became the first editor of Shakespeare's plays, an edition which was published in 1709. Pope and Rowe, though not the closest of friends, remained on good terms. Pope agreed to write the epilogue to Rowe's *Jane Shore*, and he wrote an epitaph for Rowe following his death.[137] Having contributed several works in *The Sixth Part* (1709) in which Rowe's version of book 11 of the *Pharsalia* appeared, he was certainly aware of Rowe's intentions to produce a complete translation of Lucan's epic. Nevertheless, although Pope had indeed tried to avoid Virgil due to Dryden's translation, it would seem a far-fetched conjecture to presume that Pope chose to work on Statius in order to avoid an overlap with Rowe's project. Although Pope himself had found Lucan's characters and sentences to be "too profess'd or formal and particularized,"[138] in terms of language and form, Statius' verses were deemed to be of higher caliber than Lucan's, and Pope in all likelihood translated parts of Statius in his early career in order to further sharpen his skills in the Latin language.

Finally, Silius Italicus (25/26-101 C.E.) is a lesser known Silver Age epic poet, and his reputation remained in the shadows of Statius and Lucan. It is worthwhile to mention, though, that this writer of an epic on the Second Punic War unhesitatingly displayed his admiration

[136] Johnson 1947, 395.
[137] *Corr*., 2:25.
[138] *Ibid*., 229.

for Virgil's *Aeneid* and that Pope, familiar with Silius' work, derived his inspiration of the metaphor of his ascent as a poet from Silius' description of Hannibal's crossing the Alps: "Hills peep o'er Hills, and Alps on Alps arise!"[139] Though instances of inspiration such as this serve as an indication of Pope's familiarity with the Latin epic poets, even a relatively minor one as Silius, he had a grander scheme which evidently required a far more celebrated and authoritative classical author in order to attract subscribers as well as the general reading public.

Pope shrewdly took into account the translations which were published among his contemporaries and predecessors. He admired epic most, but a complete translation of Virgil's *Aeneid* had been undertaken by Dryden. He therefore chose to translate Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, as if to blaze a trail in unchartered territory in order to achieve the fame he so yearned for. The next chapter will be devoted to the eighteenth-century book trade and will examine the commercial side of Pope's rise to success.

[139] *An Essay on Criticism*, 232. See Silius Italicus' *Punica*, 3, with *TE*, 1:232n. and 265-66. In addition to Pope, English writers such as Milton, Dryden, and Addison admired the works of Silius; see Bassett (1953).

Chapter 4

The Translator and the Book Trade: "I am now like a wretched man of business"[1]

In the previous chapter I began my discussion of Pope's process of elimination in his aspiration to achieve fame in the literary society of eighteenth-century England. This chapter will continue in the discussion of his ambition for success, but my focus will be, not on the choice of material but, on the financial aspects of realizing this aspiration. For, to become a celebrated writer means not only to produce poetry of quality. It also means dealing with the literary market, something that was still a novelty in Pope's time. Pope's boastful remarks on his financial success and the independence thereby gained are found in the Horatian *Imitations*:

But (thanks to *Homer*) since I live and thrive,
Indebted to no Prince or Peer alive. (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.2.68-69)

I can find no equivalent to this passage in Horace; I shall return to this shortly. This is one of the famous passages in which Pope overtly states his refusal to subject himself to a patron or a king and his spirit of independence in having paved his own way. However, his success, not only in writing poetry but also in selling his works, did not come without effort. While it is true that Pope could proudly claim to be "indebted to no Prince or Peer" after the translations of Homer, in order to keep selling his works he had to deal with agents in the book trade. Without the protection of an influential patron, he had to fend for himself against criticism, competitors, and piracies. Similarly, without financial support from a patron, he had to sell his own works. He conducted business transactions on his own and carried out price negotiations with different agents in the book trade. While Pope had connections with the most highly reputed printers and booksellers in London, many of whom worked with him on multiple projects, at times an agreement could not be reached and he fell out with some, such as Motte and Gilliver, and even resorted to litigation, as in the case of Lintot. The very fact that the passage above does not have an equivalent in the Latin original is a significant indication that Pope and Horace had different ways of supporting themselves as poets.

Pope's skills as a businessman in the book trade need to be understood in the context of the cultural status of the translator, as well as the commercial value of translations. In many ways this chapter will be a survey of the growing and increasingly thriving book trade of

[1] *Corr*., 1:297.

Pope's time, but in the course of the discussion, I wish to make two points. First, I wish to discuss the ways in which our poet was a very "calculating" writer in matters of publication, and I will focus on the effects of such astute handling of his works. Following this, I shall then argue that it was partially owing, perhaps ironically, to our poet's intelligence and unprecedented efforts to possess control of his own publications, and thus the profits and independence gained, that he ends up, in addition to his outsider status due to his religion and deformity, more than ever alone, a nagging thought which he laments in the Horatian *Imitations* and which contributes to his having an increasingly difficult time finding parallels in Horace.

In the first section, I will engage in a brief discussion of the cultural status of the translator within eighteenth-century literary society. Many writers, both those struggling to make a breakthrough and those already established in their fame, took on translation in addition to publishing original material. I shall discuss how Pope viewed and distinguished between poets, translators, and editors. Although on occasion he turned to translation and editing, he valued poetry as an outlet for his imagination and originality. After many youthful experiments and the complete translation of Homer, he came to understand first-hand that translation did not leave enough room for creativity, and I have shown that this accounts for one of the reasons why he turned to imitation. I shall explain how translation served as a preliminary step in paving his way to imitation and in particular the Horatian *Imitations*.

Following this, I wish to present the history and growth of the book trade in the eighteenth century, and I wish to devote some attention to the Copyright Act of 1710, as, for the first time in history, it acknowledged the author as the inventor of his work and thus enabled him to dispose of his creations for his own profit. Pope preferred freedom for imagination in his works, and in becoming his own publisher he was able to gain freedom in the publication and marketing of his works as well. In engaging in such a discussion, I wish to point out that, not only did Pope have no patron to rely on, but he often struggled in his dealings and negotiations with booksellers. Although he was astute in choosing the most highly skilled printers, he often worried that his requests or instructions for corrections would be neglected. As a poet who met with success already in 1714 with *The Rape of the Lock* and who was able to maintain his status as a renowned literary figure for the rest of his life, he knew the most reputable booksellers and printers of his time. One might recall that his debut in publication was prompted by an offer from Jacob Tonson, one of the most notable booksellers in England. He was thus, from the very beginning of his career, endowed with the

most enviable connections in the literary market. Nevertheless, as with any business dealings, he needed to bargain hard, became tangled in conflicts, and quarreled over the distribution of profits, and through the course of such struggles, he understandably developed a mistrust of agents. Although Horace had his own precautions to take in the face of powerful patrons, the issues which Pope struggled with were different from those of the ancient poet.

After presenting the general proceedings of the book trade and the publication process, I wish to focus on the popularity of translations in the literary market. In addition to translations from classical material, the English public exhibited a hunger for contemporary European works. French influence was particularly strong in English culture. Not only were works written in French translated into English and valued by English literary society, the French language itself often played an indispensable role in translation, mainly in its function as an intermediary language in secondary translations. I will explore Pope's thoughts regarding this phenomenon, as he compares the dominance of Greek in Horace's time to the domination of French in his era in England.

Combining the aspects of the status of the translator, how the book trade functioned, and how translations fared in the literary market, the next discussion will be on the purchasing capacities of the readers and writers' incomes. As I stressed previously, Pope was a very "calculating" writer when it came to his works and publications.[2] In Chapter 3, I tackled the question of the ways in which he *calculated* his rise to fame, the chief example being, once again, his manner, in the choice of genre and avoidance of Virgil, of skirting around Dryden's grand authority so as to build one of his own. He thus chose his material well. In this chapter I wish to show that he also chose his audience well. That is, the eighteenth century witnessed a continual expansion of readership to different classes. Literacy and the purchase of books were no longer confined to the well-to-do. Pope often produced luxurious editions in folio, the target of which were members of the elite class, and he would also order a different edition in smaller folio, which was a less costly edition of the same work geared toward middle-class customers. Pope was not only a gifted writer; he was also a skilled businessman who constantly sought to maximize his profits in accordance with the different purchasing capacities of his readers.

[2] See Griffin 1978, 73 and 169. Foxon 1991, 12 has observed that "even in the very earliest years his dealings with the trade show him taking an active and innovatory role," and Rose 1992, 202 has claimed that "more than any other writer of his day he behaved like a literary entrepreneur."

I. Status of the Translator: "They'll swear they understand all the languages in the universe"[3]

While a translator such as Thomas Creech, who left a number of long-standing renderings of ancient authors including Manilius, Lucretius, and Horace, could be cited as proof that a writer of no reputable original work may still be immensely respected and successful, such cases were rather exceptional. For the most part, translators of the eighteenth century were not attributed prestigious status, neither in literary society nor in the book trade. While there were exceptions such as Jacques Amyot (1513-1593) who is most known for his translations of Plutarch's works into French, professional and academic translators who devoted their careers more or less solely to the production, study, and research of the art of translation began to appear only in the nineteenth century.[4] In Pope's time, many translators were themselves novelists, poets, and playwrights. Nicholas Rowe, Aphra Behn, Coleman the Elder, Thomas Cooke, and John Hoole were primarily dramatists. Some were even physicians or held positions in the clergy. Samuel Garth, James Grainger, John Nott, and Henry William Tytler belong to the former category and Thomas Parnell, Francis Fawkes, Philip Francis, and Christopher Pitt to the latter. The Scottish writer Tobias Smollett (1721-1771) balanced the two occupations of physician and writer until he renounced medicine in the mid-1750s. The situation in reality was such that many translators endeavored to support themselves financially from their writings, and translation was one source of income which they turned to. In seeking fame and fortune, writers took on multiple projects, both original texts and translations. In many cases, translation may have been more of a secondary profession, yet on the other hand it should not be assumed that it was used as a last resort by writers who struggled to make a breakthrough with original material. Nor should it be assumed that translation was not a lucrative activity. Although one could argue that Dryden's name and authority were firmly established by then, we must not forget that translation was his principal means of income during the last two decades of his life.

Furthermore, I have already mentioned that part of Dryden's motives in becoming a translator in later life, in addition to the need for income, lay in his conscious avoidance of writing anything which could be deemed politically unacceptable by the government. Referring to this, Matthew Prior in *A Satyr on the modern Translators* (1685) accused Dryden

[3] *Corr*., 1:373.
[4] Gillespie and Sowerby 2005, 21.

of cleverly turning to the "safe innocence of a *dull Translator*" (line 52).[5] What this shows is that translation as a literary activity imposed restraints on the author. In Dryden's case this suited him well, as the restraint on his own ideas enabled him to keep himself in "safe innocence." This passage from Prior is quoted in one of Pope's letters to Caryll of September 1714, shortly after he signed the contract for his translation of the *Iliad*. Pope in the letter concedes: "I walk about here as innocently [as Dryden]."[6] Firstly, this is another indication of our poet's following in the footsteps of his great literary predecessor. He is comparing his embarkation on a complete translation of Homer to that of Dryden's Virgil. He also knew that, like Dryden, he was positioning himself "innocently," that is, in the safety of translation as opposed to an original and opinionated work which could draw unwanted attention from government authorities or be subject to censorship. Yet more importantly, there is a sense of resignation in Pope, that he is prudently settling for something out of caution.[7] Translation may have been safe and, potentially, lucrative, but for Pope it was an impediment to experimenting with and displaying one's creativity as a writer.

Earlier in 1716, Pope had composed a letter to the Earl of Burlington in which he inserts a comic travelogue. It is an imaginary journey to Oxford with Bernard Lintot, the publisher of his Homer translations, and it is a reflection of Pope's views on the translator's job. I already quoted a short excerpt earlier, but this witty piece deserves a longer citation:

> Pray Mr. *Lintott* (said I) now you talk of Translators, what is your method of managing them? "Sir (reply'd he) those are the saddest pack of rogues in the world: In a hungry fit, they'll swear they understand all the languages in the universe: I have known one of them take down a *Greek* book upon my counter and cry, Ay, this is *Hebrew*, I must read it from the latter end. By G-d I can never be sure in these fellows, for I neither understand *Greek*, *Latin*, *French*, nor *Italian* my self. But this is my way: I agree with them for ten shillings *per* sheet, with a proviso, that I will have their doings corrected by whom I please; so by one or other they are led at last to the true sense of an author; my judgment giving the negative to all my Translators." But how are you secure that those correctors may not impose upon you? "Why I get any civil gentleman, (especially any *Scotchman*) that comes into my shop, to read the original to me in *English*; by this I know whether my first Translator be deficient, and whether my Corrector merits his money or no?
>
> "I'll tell you what happen'd to me last month: I bargain'd with *S-* for a new version of *Lucretius* to publish against *Tonson*'s; agreeing to pay the author so many shillings at his producing so many lines. He made a great progress in a very short time, and I gave it to the corrector to compare with the *Latin*; but he went directly to *Creech*'s translation,[8] and found it the same word for word, all but the first page. Now, what d'ye think I did? I arrested the *Translator* for a cheat; nay, and I stopt the *Corrector's pay* too, upon this proof that he had made use of *Creech* instead of the original."[9]

[5] Prior 1959, 1:20.
[6] *Corr*., 1:256.
[7] Davis 2008, 6 goes so far as to speculate that Pope must have conceived of his task of translating Homer as "unrewarding drudgery."
[8] Recall to mind that Creech's translation of Lucretius in 1682 was the first complete translation to appear in English.
[9] *Corr*., 1:373-74.

In Pope's dialogue, Lintot labels translators as "the saddest pack of rogues in the world" and his "judgment giv[es] the negative to all my Translators." This is of course an imaginary conversation which reveals Pope's view of how he thinks Lintot regards translators, and as such we should not jump to the conclusion that in reality Lintot or, in a collective sense, all publishers held the same opinion of translators. However, though a subjective view, the observation given by Pope, as one who was actively involved in the book trade, does give us an indication of how matters stood between translators and publishers. Lintot gives his reasons for his mistrust of translators, that "they'll swear they understand all the languages in the universe," when in fact they cannot even tell Greek from Hebrew. He explains the solution which he has come up with, that "I will have their doings corrected by whom I please." The publisher has tired of the false claims by translators of their language abilities so that he feels the need for correctors. Yet Pope shrewdly asks of the reliability of the correctors themselves: "how are you secure that those correctors may not impose upon you?". Surely enough, this system does not cure the problem, as Lintot then tells of his contract with George Sewell to translate Lucretius in which he found that not only had the translator copied Creech's translation word for word but that the corrector, instead of relying on his own knowledge of Lucretius and the Latin language, had also turned to Creech's edition. I take this account not as an isolated incident which Pope inflates in a comic manner but as Pope's observations of the general quality of translators and the problems of publishers in having to deal with their ignorance and unreliability. If dishonesty was a part of the standard practice of translators at large, and by consequence their unpopularity among publishers, Pope must surely not have been overly proud of his status as a translator.

Some years later, in the midst of editing Shakespeare's works, he wrote to Caryll:

> I must again sincerely protest to you, that I have wholly given over scribbling, at least any thing of my own, but am become, by due gradation of dulness, from a poet a translator, and from a translator, a mere editor.[10]

Pope clearly articulates the structure of hierarchy which he has constructed in his mind. If Pope did not hold the occupation as a translator in high esteem, he thought that being an editor was even less rewarding. However, the hierarchy that he presents here, I believe, is more an indication of Pope's dream, that above all he wanted to be and remain a poet, to create something "of [his] own." Further clues to his true ambitions are to be found in *The Preface of the Editor to the Works of Shakespear*. In it, he explicitly states that he has taken

[10] *Ibid*., 2:140.

on "the dull duty of an Editor," but he claims that he performed this duty faithfully and in the following manner:

> …to my best judgment, with more labour than I expect thanks, with a religious abhorrence of all Innovation, and without any indulgence to my private sense or conjecture.[11]

Pope may have found the "duty of an Editor" to be "dull." He believed that an editor must refrain from "all Innovation" and "indulgence to [one's] private sense or conjecture." His strict principles on what an editor should and should not do may have contributed to his disliking the task of editing. By the time he had taken on the job of editing Shakespeare, he was seeing the fortune he was amassing from the great success of the translation of the *Iliad*. Pope well knew, especially in his adamant refusal of patronage or writing propaganda for the current political power, that it was not always easy to make a living solely by "scribbling… any thing of my [his] own." He at times needed to take on other projects, including translating and editing, not only for remuneration but also to promote his name and reputation in the literary circles and market. Nevertheless, what Pope wished to do was precisely to devote his time to "Innovation" and to reveal his "private sense" and opinions. His desire to write and publish something "of [his] own" conveys his wish for originality in his writings. Pope knew that when a translator or editor, he was in principle not allowed originality.[12] It is this motive to create his own literature, coupled with the connections he wished to highlight between himself and Horace, that I argue accounts for his settling on imitations.

II. The Book Trade: Publishers, Booksellers, and Printers

Before broadening our scope from the tasks and status of a translator to how their translations fared in the literary market, I shall first explore the publication process as a whole and the methods and agents involved in the publication of any literary work. The book trade was by no means stagnant in the eighteenth century.[13] There was a strong drive on the part of the booksellers towards publication of any work deemed profitable, as we shall see with Tonson and Lintot in their relationship with Pope. In addition, owing to various factors including new copyright laws and the decline of patronage, the literary market thrived yet at the same time

[11] *Prose Works*, 2:24-25.
[12] Cf. Davis 2008, 6 who expresses his view that "much of what made translation feel 'distinctive' for Augustan poets was negative," and he cites one of the reasons to be "the imposition of severe constraints on their imaginative freedom."
[13] Cf. Rose's comment that as a society "in the course of the seventeenth century England had become essentially a market-place society and the values of possessive individualism had been defined and promulgated" (1992, 201).

became increasingly complicated as authors and publishers alike strove to claim their share of reputation, rights, and profit.

Scholars have noted time and again that Pope became in many ways his own publisher.[14] Yet his attitude towards being a publisher was not favorable:

I have sunk to the humble thing I now am: First from a pretending Poet to a Critick, then to a low Translator, lastly to a meer Publisher.[15]

We should not, however, dismiss his views towards a publisher as seeing him as a mere sales and marketing person as opposed to the poet who actually worked on his craft of poetry. Pope held an ambivalent attitude towards being a publisher and especially his own publisher.[16] So what were Pope's relations with publishers and the book trade? What drove him eventually to become "his own publisher" and what were the advantages and complications which resulted from it? How are his feelings and experiences in the book trade reflected in the Horatian *Imitations*?

Traditionally three agents – printer, bookseller, and publisher - worked collaboratively, each taking distinct roles in the publication process. Before we enter into a detailed discussion, perhaps it is necessary first to define and differentiate between a printer, a bookseller, and a publisher. The printer was in charge of the typography, layout of illustrations and emblems, and the numbers of letters to be fitted on each sheet as well as the size and type of paper to be used. Books were still an expensive commodity, as was paper, and a printer's skill in the presentation of the book, including font and engravings, was of cardinal importance in fixing the price and meeting clients' expectations. The first English printer was William Caxton, who published the first two folio editions of Chaucer's *The Canterbury Tales* in 1478 and 1483. John Watts, a partner with Tonson and whom Foxon appraised as "perhaps the most elegant printer of the period,"[17] was Pope's first printer, and over the course of his career his works were printed by William Bowyer, John Wright, and Henry Woodfall, among others. A bookseller was the retailer, one who kept a bookshop. Jacob Tonson senior (1656-1736) began his career as a bookseller in Chancery Lane, and Barnaby Bernard Lintot (1675-1736) too was originally a bookseller. Pope later assisted Robert Dodsley (1703-1764) in starting his own shop,[18] and with his brother James as his partner, he eventually became the publisher for

[14] Foxon 1991, xv; McLaverty 2001, 1.
[15] *Corr*., 2:142.
[16] In matters of presentation and layout, McLaverty comments: "Pope's love of print was never pure, uncontaminated by self-consciousness and suspicion" (2001, 2).
[17] Foxon 1991, xv.
[18] Pope opened a shop for him in Pall Mall for £100. See *Corr*., 3:454.

Pope, Edward Young, Samuel Johnson, Laurence Sterne, William Shenstone, Mark Akenside, Christopher Anstey, Bishop Thomas Percy, Oliver Goldsmith, and Charles Churchill; it was Dodsley who approached Johnson with the idea of an English dictionary. Rose has pointed out that "Pope's prominence [from his Homer fortune] gave him enormous bargaining power, which he used to secure unusually favorable terms from his booksellers,"[19] but his influence extended beyond his own publications. One can say that it was partially owing to Pope's status in the trade that Dodsley was able to secure a steady flow of high profile clients.

The main role of the publisher was to prepare and distribute books, pamphlets, and other publications to be sold by booksellers. Booksellers needed agents who could supply them with books to fill their bookshops. Although the specific duties varied from one publisher to another, they collected subscriptions, searched venues for advertisement, picked up printed material from printers, stitched and bound books, delivered books to booksellers, and did book-keeping of sales on behalf of booksellers. Publishers were very few in number in the early eighteenth century. Foxon notes that there were only five between 1714 and 1717, all of which are listed in the imprint of Pope's *A full and true account of a horrid and barbarous revenge by poison, on the body of Mr. Edmund Curll, bookseller* (1716): J. Roberts, J. Morphew, R. Burleigh, J. Baker, and S. Popping.[20] In the late 1720s, when there was a shortage of publishers, "mercuries" partially assumed some of the tasks of publishers. Pope's first *Imitation*, *The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace*, bore the names of mercuries Mrs Dodd and Mrs Nutt in the imprint. I do not wish to enter into a detailed explanation of mercuries as they are not the focus of my discussion, but to provide a simple definition, mercuries were distributors of newspapers in the first stages of the newspaper trade.[21] Some owned pamphlet shops or expanded into large businesses, and most were women, often spouses or daughters of printers. I mention mercuries here because the important distinction to be made between a publisher and a mercury was that a mercury, by custom rather than prohibition by law, did not hold copyrights, and this is one demonstration that publishers, as owners of copyrights, acquired an increasingly powerful position in the literary trade. I shall return shortly to the issue of copyright and the laws pertaining to publication.

Publishers held a number of other functions in the book trade. They prepared books meant for private circulation and which were not destined to be sold at bookshops. They also provided supplies to the provinces as well as to distribute printed material from the provinces

[19] Rose 1992, 202.
[20] See figure 7 in Foxon 1991, 3.
[21] See Steinberg 1996, 113-14 for the role of mercuries in the newspaper business.

in the London market. Provincial booksellers relied on publishers based in London to procure books from the city to be sold in the country, and printers and booksellers in the country also depended on a London publisher to stock and sell their books in the city.[22]

Pope published some of his works anonymously, as did other authors, and publishers also stood as convenient agents in concealing the identity of an author.[23] If a bookseller carried at his bookshop an anonymous, and sometimes controversial work, a customer could approach him at his shop to inquire of the author. To refuse to disclose the name of an author in such a situation could mean that the customer would not purchase the work, which would be a loss for the bookseller. A publisher, on the other hand, instead of arranging for the imprint to read that it was *sold* by a particular publisher, as was the common practice in the eighteenth century, could choose to put on the imprint that it was *printed* for the publisher. That a book was printed for a publisher did not always mean that it was sold by him. As such, the work could be carried and purchased at a bookseller's shop but the bookseller did not know or have to reveal the name of the author, since any inquiries had to be directed at the publisher. Pope used this tactic with his *Key to the Lock* (1715), in which the imprint read "Printed for J. Roberts," when in fact a different publisher, Lintot, had paid fifteen guineas for the copyright. In making public that Roberts was the publisher who distributed the work, Lintot was able to conceal his own as well as the author's identity. While his *Essay on Man* (1733-34) was neither libellous nor seditious and thus there was no need to hide the writer's name, Pope wished this work to be published anonymously in order to make a contrast to the Horatian *Imitations*, for which he expected criticism and attack. For this the imprint carried the name John Wilford instead of Gilliver, and the first three parts were printed by John Huggonson, Edward Say, and Samuel Aris, instead of Wright.[24]

The discussion of imprints leads us to the shifting trends of the roles of the agents in the book trade. S.H. Steinberg has shown that in the seventeenth century it was still fairly common to find the printer, bookseller (or the location of his bookshop), and publisher on an imprint: "Printed by Tho. Cotes, for Andrew Crook, and are to be sold at the black Bare in

[22] Foxon 1991, 3-4.
[23] Swift as a political activist is another author who published his works anonymously, including his *Gulliver's Travels*. He also used various pseudonyms such as Lemuel Gulliver, Isaac Bickerstaff, and M.B. Drapier. Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* is another example of a novel which was published anonymously. Pat Rogers 2002, 234 explains that in many cases the public could easily identify the authors but authors chose anonymity to avoid censorship and prosecutions.
[24] To discard the name of Gilliver – Pope's usual printer – could be construed as a clear attempt to conceal the author's identity, but Foxon 1991, 122 has suggested that his choice of hiring printers other than Wright may have been due to his concern that Wright may not have been able to keep his mouth shut about the scheme.

Pauls Church-yard" (*Briefe of the Art of Rhetorique* by Thomas Hobbes, 1637). Some quarter of a century later, the format of the imprint for another book by Hobbes has changed: "Printed for Andrew Crooke, and are to be sold at his shop, at the Sign of the Green-Dragon in St Paul's Church-yard, 1662." Here, the printer's name has disappeared, and Andrew Crook, the publisher, apparently controls the bookshop as well. Steinberg has pointed out that these two examples are indications of the growing power of the publisher over the other two publication collaborators, one of the evidences being that it became an increasingly common practice to leave out the printer's name.[25] In fact, the rare occasions on which the printer is noted were often due to deliberate emphasis of prestige, such as "De l'Imprimerie royale," or of an affiliation to a university, as in "Printed by Tho: and John Buck, printers to the University of Cambridge."[26]

In a similar manner, booksellers gradually gave way to publishers. Improvements in the organization of the book trade led to greater efficiency, until the necessity of a publisher to entrust the retail of books to a reputed bookseller was eliminated. As early as 1717, a publisher in Leipzig advertised that his publications could be found in every bookshop.[27] For a publisher to ensure that a stock is available in every bookstore is a mode of distribution that has become a norm in the present day. Yet the eighteenth century was still in a transitional stage. Traditionally a publisher turned to a particular bookseller for his publications to be sold in that one bookseller's shop. A customer who desired a particular book could look at the imprint of a copy and be directed to a bookseller or his shop to purchase a copy for himself. Gradually the publisher gained property rights and permission to fix prices for his publications to be sold at every bookshop, thus discarding the need for a trustworthy bookseller.

This has much to do with a series of laws which were passed during this era, the most notable being the Copyright Act of 1709.[28] However, it may be useful to begin a little further back in history, for it must not be misunderstood as if, prior to the establishment of copyright laws in the late seventeenth to eighteenth centuries, there was no sense of moral or ethical practice involving publication and authorship. It is true that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, once an author sold his work to a bookseller or a theatrical organization, he could no longer claim any property rights to his manuscript. However, in the early modern and

[25] Steinberg 1996, 106-7; imprints from 106.
[26] Ibid., 107.
[27] Ibid.
[28] This act is dated as 1709 or 1710. The Act was passed in 1709 but it was not put into effect until 1 April 1710.

Renaissance periods, there had developed a tacit rule that no work should be published without the consent of the author.[29] Lyman R. Patterson has also shown that sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English booksellers, without legal obligation, deemed it necessary to pay authors for any copies sold.[30] The Licensing Act of 1662 required that three free copies of a publication be presented to the Stationers' Company. This was increased to eleven but eventually settled at six: British Library, National Libraries of Scotland and Wales, the Bodleian, Cambridge University Library, and Trinity College in Dublin.[31] This system of registration at copyright libraries helped to ensure protection of publications from piracy[32] and other misuse. The ordinance of the Stationers' Company of 1681, which required every publication to bear the name of the printer or bookseller, as well as the Stamp Act of 1712, followed to ensure a similar type of protection.[33]

The Copyright Act of 1709, which became law as the Statute of Anne in 1710 (8 Ann. c. 19), was instigated by a petition from publishers. It was the world's first copyright statute and one of the first instances of recognition of intellectual property.[34] Foxon has provided a concise summary of the most significant points of the legislation, which I cite here:

> 1. Authors or proprietors of books already printed were to retain the exclusive right of printing for 21 years from the date of the Act; and for new books there was to be a term of fourteen years. There were penalties for those offending against these rights: the books were forfeit to the proprietor to be damasked, and a penny was to be paid for each sheet (half to the treasury; half to be sued for).
> 2. No one could be subject to the penalties unless the book had been entered in the Register of the Stationers' Company 'in such manner as hath been usual'.
> 3. If book prices became unreasonable, appeal could be made to named authorities.
> 4. Nine copies 'upon the best Paper' had to be deposited at Stationers' Hall for the use of named libraries.
> 5. All lawsuits had to begin within three months of the offence.
> 6. At the end of the term of fourteen years the rights would return to the author for fourteen more. (This was a House of Lords amendment.)[35]

[29] See Rose 1992, 200 for examples of lawsuits and decrees in Italy, France, and England in which it was asserted that no work should be published without permission from the author.
[30] Patterson 1968, 64-77.
[31] Steinberg 1996, 127.
[32] Misspelt names of printers were a mark of piracy. The pirated version of Pope's *Dunciad* bore the imprint of "A. Dob" instead of the correct "A. Dod," and James Watson's piracy of Pope's *Letters* of 1737 was carried out under the name of Thomas Johnson of The Hague (Foxon 1991, 123 and 135). For the latter, Pope was advised by Murray and the matter was settled outside of court with John Knapton as the arbitrator; Watson was subject to heavy penalties in addition to compensation (ibid., 245-47). Pope also filed lawsuits against Jacob Ilive for the piracy of *Dunciad* IV in 1743, and he also brought a case to the Chancery over the piracy by Bickham, an engraver, of his *Essay on Man* in 1744. Pope was successful in suppressing the piracy for both cases (ibid., 250).
[33] The Stamp Act of 1712 concerned mainly pamphlets. It imposed a duty of 2*s*. for every sheet of a pamphlet which was less than 20 sheets total in folio, 12 if it was in quarto, and 6 in octavo. The duties were to be paid at the Stamp Office within a week of publication, and a penalty of £20 was incurred for every pamphlet that failed to meet the requirements of imprint and payment (ibid., 1).
[34] Intellectual property, of course, traditionally concerned scientific inventions, and the first major debates over this property right arose in England in the 1660s. It was in February 1668 that Henry Oldenburg, the Secretary of the Royal Society, established the "Depository of Inventions" in which he kept a record of the dates and times when he received news of inventions so as to prevent or resolve disputes of plagiarism. See Iliffe (1992).
[35] Foxon 1991, 238.

Patterson has insisted that the Queen Anne Act was a law for the booksellers, who hoped to guard the traditional regulation practices of the guild of printers and booksellers in London.[36] This guild has its origins in the charter granted to the Company of Stationers by Queen Mary in 1557 which, though under royal surveillance, allowed booksellers and printers exclusive control over publishing in England. It had become custom, in fact, since the 1520s for printers to secure privileges, or the royal prerogative, to avoid competition and piracy.[37] One disappointment of the Statute of Anne of 1709/1710, then, was that copyright was not granted for eternity, as had been the practice prior to the Act.[38] In addition, in what Rose marks as "a second departure from traditional guild practices," the Statute of Anne accorded all rights to the authors as inventors of their works.[39]

Pope, as usual, was extremely interested in this matter. The letter from Gay to Swift on 28 August 1732, in which Gay quotes a letter from Pope may contain the first recorded use of the term "Copyright."[40] Traditionally, sixteenth- and seventeenth-century booksellers in England, upon entering titles in the Stationers' Register, referred to publications as "copies" or simply "books." A "copy" only suggested the manuscript from which copies could be made. However, it was certainly not without reason that Pope as an author took great interest in what rights he could claim as the creator, or inventor, of a "copy."

The Statute of Anne was "An Act for the encouragement of learning by vesting of the copies of printed books in the authors or purchasers of such copies during the times therein mentioned,"[41] and it established as its primary purpose protection for authors by according them rights to their works as property for which they could sell or control for their benefit and profit. However, this is not to say that, despite the disappointments concerning privileges and perpetual copyright, there were no advantages for the publishers. As Steinberg explains, the Act was a positive breakthrough for both publisher and author:

> The publisher who, through shrewdness or good luck, correctly gauged what the public wanted, or succeeded in making the public want what he had to offer, could now order his printer to strike off copies by thousands instead of hundreds. The author who wrote the right kind of book for the right kind of publisher and got himself established with the public was now able to live on his royalties. No longer had he to pursue his literary work in

[36] Patterson 1968, 143-50.
[37] See Parmelee 1994, 854 for the series of laws passed in sixteenth-century England and the government's attempt to prevent sedition.
[38] Efforts at perpetual copyright continued until 1774, when it was rejected definitively by the House of Lords; see Rose 1992, 214 and Steinberg 1996, 112-13. Foxon has noted, however, that the clause was not always strictly enforced within the book trade and that "in practice the booksellers operated a system of perpetual copyright, independent of the statutory provision" (1991, 241).
[39] Rose 1992, 199.
[40] *Corr*., 3:309.
[41] Cited from Steinberg 1996, 107.

the time he could spare from his duties as an official, a teacher, a clergyman; nor had he to abase himself before king, prelate, nobleman or city father.[42]

Publishers, as buyers of authors' works, were able to fix prices accordingly with the current market and to secure profit for themselves, and with the public as the client instead of a patron, there arose the necessity for publicity. In addition to predicting sales and keeping stock, publishers put out advertisements and reviews in newspapers and periodicals. The Act also had far-reaching consequences in society. Patronage, the centuries-old system on which authors had relied for their living, was gradually replaced by the growing literary marketplace. That is, instead of writing to please an individual patron, an author was now required to satisfy the ever-changing taste of the reading public at large. With patronage on the decline, Steinberg's observation that an author needed no longer to "abase himself before king, prelate, nobleman or city father" corresponds with Pope's description of himself, introduced at the beginning of this chapter, that he lived "[i]ndebted to no Prince or Peer alive" (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.2.69).

However, Pope yearned for more than simply freedom from patronage. He strove for independence in the literary trade as well. In order to better understand Pope's path towards becoming his own publisher, I shall now discuss our poet's attitude towards professionals in the book trade. Despite being a poet who cherished independence and control of his works, Pope inevitably had to rely on professionals in the literary trade in order to print, distribute, and sell his works. His early works up until the *Dunciad* of 1728 were, with a few exceptions, published by Tonson or Lintot. Although Pope increasingly attempted to own the copyrights to his works, and from the 1730s until his death, he chose and worked with a variety of publishers and printers.[43] However, for the first five years of his career, at least, the need for income obligated Pope to sell his copyrights. The copyrights for the contributions which Pope made to Tonson's sixth volume of the *Miscellanies* (1709), *Ovid's Epistles* (1712), and Steele's *Poetical Miscellanies* (1714) were held by Tonson. The copyright to *An Essay on Criticism* (1711), his second major poem after the debut with the *Pastorals* and his first separate publication, was first owned by William Lewis before it was bought out by Lintot for in 1716; Lewis was Pope's classmate from his days in Catholic school who had become a bookseller in Russell Street, Covent Garden. Tonson had paid Pope well for the material he contributed to the collections, 13 guineas for the sixth part of the *Miscellanies* and 15 guineas

[42] Ibid., 108.
[43] See table 4, 12, and 15 in Foxon 1991, 40-41, 121, and 139, respectively, for the names of printers, owners of the copyright, and imprints for the Horatian *Imitations*.

for Steele's *Miscellanies* but James McLaverty has suggested that Tonson may have refrained from making an offer for *An Essay on Criticism* and instead proposed to Pope to publish at his own expense, since the profits from a single poem were much less predictable than those from a miscellany collection.[44]

In 1712 alone Lintot paid for the copyrights to the translation of Statius, the translation of Ovid bearing the title *The Fable of Vertumnus and Pomona, To A Young Lady with the Works of Voiture, On Silence, To The Author of a Poem, Intitled Successio*, and *The Rape of the Lock*. He also acquired the copyrights to *Windsor-Forest* (1713), *Ode for Musick* (1713), the *Temple of Fame* (1715), and the *Key to the Lock* (1715). An indenture dated 28 December 1717, indicates that the copyright to Pope's *Works* of 1717, published seven months earlier and which included new works such as *Eloisa to Abelard*, was owned by Lintot. Pope also granted the right of printing, except for material which he had contributed to the miscellanies of Tonson senior and his son, to Lintot.[45] Pope's frequent dealings with Lintot are an indication of the publisher's endeavors to outdo his rival by securing more clients. Jacob Tonson's reputation was already well established, as he was the publisher for prominent contemporary writers including Dryden, Otway, Addison, Steele, and Rowe. In hopes of advancing his status, Lintot was more willing to offer higher prices to an author in order to acquire the copyright.

Pope signed the contract for the translation of the *Iliad* with Lintot in the summer of 1714, with the agreement that the first installment would be distributed a year later in 1715. As we shall see in Section IV on readership and writers' incomes, one of the strategies which they decided on was to use large paper format as well as large type in order to inflate the total number of pages and thus the price they could charge for each volume. Foxon explains that, compared with Madame Dacier produced in three volumes on duodecimo paper, Pope's version of the *Iliad* was published in six volumes in quarto or folio.[46] It also made sense in terms of production cost to publish annual volumes over the course of six years, since the publisher would only have to supply capital for the first volume and thereafter he could apply the profit gained from the sales of the first volume to prepare the second, and so on.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, Pope's idea of a subscription venture was partly inspired by his predecessor Dryden. However, sales by subscription had already begun in the seventeenth century, and it was in Pope's century that the system was most frequently applied.

[44] McLaverty 2007, 187.
[45] For more details on this agreement, see Foxon 1991, 47-48.
[46] Ibid., 51.

Subscription had its own aspects, and contrary to what one might believe on hearing that Pope acquired his wealth by his subscription publication, it was in fact a method most often reserved for expensive editions and especially for material for which the profits were difficult to predict. Securing a list of customers ahead of time helped lessen the risk of publishing at a loss. Pope's *Iliad* was certainly not the only elegant edition of a classical translation which was sold by subscription. Across the Channel in mainland Europe, Johann Heinrich Voss gathered 1,240 subscribers for the first edition of his translation of the *Odyssey* into German in 1781. Both Pope's *Iliad* in English and Voss' *Odyssey* in German met with great success. Pope's subscribers were asked to pay 2 guineas in advance, although the total charge was 6. The subscribers' copies were to contain their names in initials engraved on copper at the beginning of the volume.[47]

Pope ordered 750 copies to be printed for his subscribers, and Lintot was allowed to print a trade edition to be sold to non-subscribers. Perhaps Lintot had overestimated Pope's success with *The Rape of the Lock* when preparing 1,750 small folio copies for the first volume of the *Iliad*, and it must have been due to poor sales that he reduced the number to 1,000 for the second to sixth volumes. Although Pope was able to reap an immense fortune from his translations of Homer, the work did not fare too well in the market.[48] In fact, as late as May 1739, Thomas Osborne of Gray's Inn advertised in the *Daily Gazetteer* that both Pope's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in folio and in small paper were available. That the publications did not sell well in the market may have had more dire consequences for Lintot, the publisher, than it did for Pope, who secured his own subscribers and retained the profits from the subscriptions. According to Foxon's calculations, Lintot's profit from the six volumes of the *Iliad* would have been about £666, or £111 per volume, in contrast to about £361 per volume, had his trade editions successfully sold.[49]

Lintot was understandably frustrated, and small frictions ensued between the publisher and author. In the contract the parties had agreed that Lintot was not entitled to sell any of his trade editions in folio until one month after the subscription copies had been delivered or an advertisement notifying that delivery was ready appeared in the newspaper. Delivery of the first volume in quarto began on Monday, 6 June, yet on the same day Lintot put out the

[47] In Dryden's subscription for the *Aeneid*, the first subscribers were charged 3 guineas in advance, out of the total payment of 5, and were entitled to having their names printed on their volume (ibid., 52).
[48] Piracy may also have played a role.
[49] See ibid., 54-57.

announcement in *The St. James's Post* and *The Daily Courant* that his trade edition in fine folio would be available the following week. He wrote to Pope on 10 June 1715:

> Pray detain me not from publishing my Own Book [Lintot's trade edition] having deliverd the greatest part of the Subscribers allready, upwards of four hundred.
> I designd to publish Monday sevennight [June 6, 1715] pray interrupt me not by an Errata.
> I doubt not the Sales of Homer if you do not dissapoint me by delaying the Publication.[50]

Lintot was undoubtedly anxious to begin the sale of his own editions so as to secure profit for himself from this venture. However, contrary to the announcement on 6 June, the trade edition did not appear for another few weeks. Sherburn has pointed out that the earliest advertisement is found in *The London Gazette* of 2 July 1715, but Mack and Foxon maintain that the announcement was made in the *Post Man* of 28-30 June.[51] We do not have any evidence as to how Pope reacted to Lintot's attempt to breach the contract. The exact circumstances of the aftermath of this affair remain unknown, but seeing that despite the advertisement he put out and his letter to the author, the publication of Lintot's edition was indeed delayed by approximately a month, at least until the end of June, it seems that Pope must have confronted Lintot in order to deter the trade publication in accordance with the original contract.

If Lintot's profit from the *Iliad* was approximately £666, how did it compare with Pope's? Pope was never able to achieve his target of acquiring 750 subscribers.[52] The real figure is closer to 654 copies for 575 subscribers.[53] Some subscribers ordered more than one copy, with the intention of giving the extra copies to friends. Such was most likely the case with the Earl of Carnarvon, who was the largest subscriber ordering twelve sets. It is also very likely that Pope himself may have given out a volume or two, or a set or two, to friends without charging them. In addition, there were subscribers for the first volume who discontinued for subsequent volumes, those whom Pope called "deserters."[54] Thus it makes it almost impossible to determine an exact figure of how many sets, and still further, how many volumes, were sold by subscription. Nevertheless, Foxon has calculated that the maximum profit would have been £5,435, if 650 subscriptions were paid and that full payment was made

[50] *Corr*., 1:295.
[51] See *ibid*., 295n. for Sherburn; *TE*, 7:xxxvii n. for Mack; Foxon 1991, 59.
[52] In discussing Pope's edition of Shakespeare which also called for subscribers, Pat Rogers has commented on the system of subscription: "[an] easy 'commission is a myth: there was only the struggle to find, and to keep, an audience interested enough to subscribe" (1978, 35).
[53] Griffith 1922-27, 1:41.
[54] *Corr*., 1:464.

by Lintot to Pope, and a minimum of £4,372. He thus takes a middle figure and concludes that an approximate profit of £5,000 was made by Pope personally.[55]

The last installment of the *Iliad* collection was published in the spring of 1720, and by the summer of 1723 Pope had hired Broome and Fenton, whom he had already been working with in preparing his Shakespeare edition, for the translation of the *Odyssey*. This time it was settled that, of the twenty-four books in the *Odyssey*, Pope would translate twelve, Broome, eight as well as the commentary, and Fenton, four. As the *Odyssey* was shorter in length than the *Iliad*, a complete set was to consist of five volumes. The first three volumes were delivered to the subscribers in April 1725 and the last two in June 1726.

Pope once again turned to Lintot to publish his volumes of the *Odyssey*, although, due to the bitterness which resulted from the *Iliad*, he may have approached Tonson first yet was turned down. Fenton wrote to Broome on 9 January 1724, about Pope's search for a publisher:

> Tonson does not care to contract for the copy, and application has been made to Lintot, upon which he exerts the true spirit of a scoundrel, believing that he has Pope entirely at his mercy.[56]

It seems that Tonson was not interested, and the contract for the translation of the *Odyssey* was signed by Pope and Lintot on February 18, 1724. There were a few differences from the contract for the *Iliad*. This time Pope decided to gather subscribers and arrange for delivery on his own so that he would not have to pay Lintot for those expenses. It was agreed that for ten years, the publisher would not order to print any of the volumes of the *Odyssey* in the same format, in quarto, on the same type of paper, or with the same illustrations and engravings as the subscribers' edition. Lintot, for his part, must have resisted the clause of the month's delay between the subscriber's edition and his own and for the *Odyssey* the trade editions were allowed to be on sale a week after the publication of the subscription edition.

Although the contract was not signed with Tonson, Lintot was infuriated once again when he found out that Pope had asked Tonson to help him collect subscribers.[57] His subsequent course of action was to advertise for subscriptions to his trade edition, which cost less than Pope's subscribers' edition. Although his edition would not have the engravings which Pope's subscribers would have, it would still cost a guinea less for the customer to buy his edition in large folio than the subscription copy by Pope. Pope gave the request to Samuel Buckley to begin printing advertisements in January 1725, and they appeared both in the

[55] Foxon 1991, 61-63. For comparison, it may be noted that Pope once estimated Dryden's profits from his translation of Virgil to have been about £1,200 (Spence 1966, 1:27).
[56] *Corr*., 2:182.
[57] *Ibid*., 286.

London gazette and in the *Daily courant* a few days later. Lintot's advertisement appeared in the *St James's evening post* of 23-26 January. Somewhat ironically, in the *Post boy* of the same date his advertisement and Pope's were printed on the same page.[58]

Despite Lintot's continued discontent with this project with Pope, Foxon has calculated his profit from Pope's *Odyssey* to be slightly higher than that from the *Iliad*, at approximately £794.[59] How did Pope fare in this venture? To begin with, he had more subscribers than for the *Iliad*; for the *Odyssey* there were 610 subscribers for 1,057 copies. In what Foxon explicitly terms "patronage,"[60] he had many aristocratic friends, more than for the *Iliad*, who willingly supported his subscription. Many subscribed for multiple sets. The Duke of Argyll, Earl Arran, Peter Bathurst, Duke and Duchess of Buckingham, Earl of Burlington, Lord Viscount Cobham, Duke of Dorset, Lord Gower, Duke of Grafton, Earl of Kinnoul, Duchess of Marlborough (Henrietta), Countess of Oxford, Earl of Peterborough, Earl of Pontefract, Duke of Queensborough and Dover, Earl of Scarborough, Lady Viscountess Scudamore, Earl of Sussex, and Hon. Edward Wortley Montague each subscribed for 5 copies. Lord Bathurst, Lord Bingley, Hon. Martin Bladen, Lord Carleton, Lord Carteret, Duke of Chandos, Rt. Hon. Spencer Compton, Lord Foley, Lord Viscount Harcourt, Duke of Newcastle, Mrs. Newsham, Earl of Oxford (Edward), and William Pulteney subscribed for 10 each. Robert Walpole and Lord Viscount Townshend also asked for 10 copies each, but this may be in connection to the royal grant of £200 which they accorded to Pope on this venture.[61] The fact that all the volumes of the *Odyssey* were delivered in 1725 and 1726, in contrast to the six annual installments of the *Iliad*, would have meant that there were less "deserters" who lost interest and dropped their subscriptions over time. Foxon has again calculated that the 1,057 copies from the 610 subscribers would have amounted to £5,549. 5*s*. Lintot also paid 350 guineas to Pope for copy-money. The total would then have been £5,916. 15*s*. Even after deducting the payments to Fenton and Broome, £200 and £400 respectively,

[58] Foxon 1991, 94-96 doubts that Lintot's actions were taken solely to hinder Pope's subscription and explains that Lintot may have been more concerned about his own profits; advertising and selling his edition himself instead of through the trade may have cut costs, and he may have also feared that wholesalers would not be interested in buying such large numbers of the translation, in which case Lintot would have to price down further in order to avoid being stuck with the stock.
[59] Ibid., 95-98.
[60] Ibid., 99 and 100; he also refers to the subscription of the *Iliad* as "collective patronage" (ibid., 39). See also Chapter 5.
[61] Ibid., 99-100. See also Hodgart (1978).

and other miscellaneous expenses, Pope still made a profit of approximately £5,000 from the translation of the *Odyssey*.[62]

Although Pope would file a lawsuit against Lintot for a different conflict later in his career, he was not completely without scruples towards his publisher. There remains no record of payment to Pope for editing the *Poems on Several Occasions*, a miscellany which was published by Lintot on 13 July 1717, six weeks after his *Works* of 1717. Pope may have agreed to the task of editing without payment, in order to compensate Lintot for the *Iliad* several years earlier, which brought in less profit for the publisher than expected. Regarding the project for the translations of Homer, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu once wrote of Pope that he "outwitted Lintot in his very trade."[63] The poet must have learned from this subscription venture that he should minimize his dealings with agents in the book trade, turning to them only for necessities such as printing, in order to retain the maximum profit for himself. He was steadily building his business acumen, but it would still be some years after the Homer project that he would be able to act more independently and buy the copyrights in order to further ensure that profit went directly into his pocket.

Contentions, minor or grave, may arise between an author and a publisher for any publication. In his early career, Pope had to rely on the offers of publishers in order to have his works published. This was typical of a new young writer. However, the *Dunciad* of 1728 marks a new beginning in that he began to appoint and pay his own printer for his works and to sell the volumes himself to booksellers. By this time, having secured both fame and wealth, he was far from any concern of relying on a patron or having to sell copyrights for income. Pope increasingly attempted to ensure that he was the holder of the copyright of his own works. He also owned the copyright for works after the Horatian *Imitations*, such as the *Works in Prose II* (1741) and the *New Dunciad* (1742).[64]

Pope also timed his publications well. He knew that the new year was considered the best time for sales in the book market. He wrote to Allen about the publication of his *Letters* of 1737 which he prepared at around the same time as the *Imitations* that, in addition to the factor of "the slowness of the subscribers," he thought it best to publish an advertisement "in January, when the Town fills."[65] Pope had in fact employed the same tactic as early as his *Odyssey*, the proposals for which were advertised at the beginning of the year on 10 January

[62] Sherburn 1934, 259 and Foxon 1991, 101.
[63] Line 55 in "Pope to Bolingbroke" (Wortley Montagu 1977, 282).
[64] Foxon 1991, 139.
[65] *Corr*., 4:41.

1725. Similarly, *The Sixth Epistle of the First Book of Horace Imitated* bears the year 1737 on the title page but the publication date is 24 January 1738; *The First Epistle of The First Book of Horace Imitated*, the year 1737 but the publication date 7 March 1738; and the *Poems and Imitations of Horace*, 1738 but the publication date 11 January 1739.

It is now time to turn to how Pope viewed publishers, booksellers, and printers – vital agents to him in his road to independence. Though himself indebted to the most successful publisher of the period, Pope makes a sour comment about Jacob Tonson in a letter addressed to the Reverend Ralph Bridges, a nephew of Sir William Trumbull and a friend who would later assist Pope in his Homer translations:

> I shall continue to be [your Friend] even after my being erected into an Author and created an Eminent Hand by Jacob, who makes Poets as Kings sometimes make Knights, for Money, and not for their Honour: for as one may, if the King pleases, be a Knight and yet no gentleman, so if Jacob pleases, one may be a Poet and yet no Wit.[66]

Pope has successfully launched his literary career at an early age. However, he is aware that he owes this to Jacob Tonson, as he explicitly admits that he has been "erected into an Author" by Jacob and his joining the ranks of an "Eminent Hand" has been done by the same publisher. The beginnings of his dream have materialized in large part because his piece had caught the attention of Tonson. However, it is significant that as early as 1709, when this letter was written, Pope was already critical of the well-reputed publisher who establishes careers for poets "for Money." Perhaps it was a youthful misunderstanding on Pope's part that, as I shall mention again in the next section on translations in the literary market, he did not recognize sufficiently that books were commodities to be sold and that the driving force for any publication was, primarily and realistically, monetary profit. However, I do believe that what he is trying to convey in this statement is his regret towards publishers' apparent lack of appreciation of the commodity as nevertheless a work of art. Pope himself, when he became his own publisher later in his career, was to drive hard bargains with various agents in the trade. However, in contrast to a publisher whose concern revolved solely around profit, Pope with the dual role of publisher and author could not help but be aware of both the business aspects and the literary quality of any work he produced.

This reinforces what I discussed earlier about the hierarchy which he presents from a "Poet to a Critick, then to a low Translator, lastly to a meer Publisher."[67] Pope does not hold in high regard his stepping into the shoes of a publisher. It is rather a role which he plays out of necessity in order to be able to oversee the publishing of his own works. A publisher's

[66] Erskine-Hill 2000, 23.
[67] *Corr*., 2:142.

ignorance of the quality of the works he undertakes to publish is also apparent in Pope's comic fictional dialogue with Lintot which I have mentioned. In Pope's account, Lintot is troubled by the dishonesty of translators, but he admits: "By G-d I can never be sure in these fellows [translators], for I neither understand *Greek*, *Latin*, *French*, nor *Italian* my self."[68] Unlike Lintot, these were all languages which Pope knew. This is not to say that he is comparing his own learning to Lintot's, but I think that there is a hint of his awareness that publishers cannot even understand the content of the books which they push so hard to recommend and sell to the public.

Pope was equally skeptical of printers. He was extremely sensitive when it came to the printing process. What is observable in Pope's sensitivity is that it seems to arise largely from mistrust, from the fear that his printers and booksellers will not follow through with his instructions. In a letter tentatively dated to 1717, Pope, in preparing his *Works* of 1717, gives instructions to William Broome, the addressee, and printer William Bowyer:

> I desire, for fear of mistakes, that you will cause the space for the initial letter to the Dedication to the Rape of the Lock to be made of the size of those in Trapp's Praelectiones. Only a small ornament at the top of that leaf, not so large as four lines breadth. The rest as I told you before.
>
> I hope they will not neglect…[69]

The detailed instructions are quite typical of Pope, and it is true that English printers of this period were notorious for their sloppy work. Citing examples of the "Judas Bible" of 1611 in which Matt. 26:36 bears the name of Judas instead of Jesus, the "Wicked Bible" of 1632 which prints "Thou shalt commit adultery," the "Printers' Bible" of 1702 of which Psalm 119:161 reads "Printers have persecuted me," and the "Vinegar Bible" of 1717 which lists the "Parable of the Vinegar" in Luke 20, Steinberg concludes that, not only in the Bible but in books on many subjects, "[t]here is hardly an edition down to the present century in which single words, groups of words, or whole lines have not been omitted through sheer carelessness."[70] However, Pope, an author who cared deeply about the presentation of his work in print, did not engage printers who neglected or forgot instructions.

John Wright was a printer with whom Pope worked frequently in the last fifteen years of his poetic career. As shown in Table 1, Wright was the printer for many of the Horatian *Imitations*. His first assignment by Pope was the *Dunciad Variorum* which was in preparation for publication in 1728. Pope's eternal foe John Dennis wrote of the partnership between Pope and Wright:

[68] *Ibid*., 1:373.
[69] *Ibid*., 394.
[70] Steinberg 1996, 98.

Does not half the Town know, that honest *J.W.* [John Wright] was the only Dunce that was persecuted and plagu'd by this Impression? that Twenty times the Rhapsodist alter'd every thing that he gave the Printer? and that Twenty times, *W.* in his Rage and in Fury, threaten'd to turn the Rhapsody back upon the Rhapsodist's Hands?[71]

Although Dennis' account is intentionally hostile so as to put his enemy in a bad light, Pope did notoriously tend to insist on changing the text after it had been submitted to the printer. On another occasion, McLaverty has pointed out that Wright made minor mistakes in the signature and left damaged types, but he correctly explains that this was largely due to Pope's orders for last minute changes. The printers Woodfall and Wright were originally instructed to prepare one extended volume of *Works II*, yet were told later by Pope that it would in fact be published in two volumes, *Works II. Part I* (1738) and *Works II. Part II* (1739). It fell on Wright, who was in charge of the *Dialogues*, to rearrange the two poems so that they would appear at the beginning of *Part II* instead of at the end of the first volume. He managed to retype the paginations yet did not catch all of the corrections to be made. However, mistakes such as these, which were due to an unexpected insistence of alterations by the author, could hardly be attributed to the fault of the printer.

Dodsley also undertook the task of adding Pope's revisions. He transcribed the *Epilogue to the Satires* and sent the fair copy to the author for approval. Joseph Warton claims:

Every line was then written twice over; a clean transcript was then delivered to Mr. Pope, and when he afterwards sent it to Mr. Dodsley to be printed, he found every line had been written twice over a second time.[72]

Wright was far from being the only printer who received additional requests for change from the author even after it was thought that the final draft had been sent in. It may not be an understatement to say that Dodsley owed his career to the author, and as such he may have been more willing to comply without complaining.[73] One thing to remark in line with this is that as Pope's reputation grew, so did his authority. He was a poet who paid immense attention to minute details and had always given specific instructions to his printers, but, if in 1717 he somewhat meekly expresses his worry that "I hope they will not neglect [my instructions],"[74] instead of correcting his tendency to send late, additional changes to the printer, it seems that he unhesitatingly continues with this habit late into his career.

Pope falls out with Wright, his long-time printer, over a piracy of one of his poems:

[71] *TE*, 5:xxvii.
[72] Warton 1822, 4:294.
[73] Cf. Foxon: "Dodsley was Pope's protégé" (1991, 64).
[74] *Corr*., 1:394.

They have pyrated my Poem – by the foolish Delays of my Printer whom I'l pay off, & imploy less for the future. It was Charity made me use him.[75]

Sherburn has dated this letter April 1742 and suggests that the poem in question would be the *New Dunciad*, which was published on 20 March 1742. It was indeed first printed by Wright and there was a piracy by J.H. Hubbard, yet Foxon has convincingly argued for an earlier date for the letter, as Bowyer, Wright's replacement, was already working with the author in the early months of 1742.[76] There thus remains some uncertainty as to which poem Pope refers to in the letter, and whether the piracy of that poem could be attributed to any mistake or carelessness of the printer. Just as he had fallen out with Gilliver in the late 1730s, Pope's collaboration with John Wright, who had printed all of the Horatian *Imitations* except two which were done by Woodfall, comes to an end.

On Pope's attitude towards printers, I do not conclude that the poet held a vehemently negative view of them. Taking into account the hierarchies he expressed in his letters, it does seem that he regarded himself, a poet, as occupying the top rung. McLaverty has commented on the poet's dealings with printers, that: "[a]ny sense that the printer is a potential collaborator with a pride in his craft is missing."[77] While it may have been true that his agents did not have the devotion which Pope felt for each of his pieces, he had a tendency to *assume* that he was alone in caring about his business, as if he was deliberately positioning himself as an outsider who did not believe in the existence of good collaboration and partnership. Seeing that Pope picked highly skilled printers in the trade, it is hard to conceive that he thought of his printers as deliberately performing sloppy work or working without pride while aware of their renown. It is also understandable that Pope, as a writer who wrote for his daily bread, like anyone in any other occupation, would exhibit caution and demand perfection, even if it meant making last-minute orders for change, as every detail or decision could potentially affect sales. What I notice in Pope, though, is that he assumed that printers and others involved in the preparation of his works did not care for the quality of the product. In that sense, McLaverty's statement is accurate in claiming that Pope thought that printers regarded their jobs as nothing more than orders to be obeyed and tasks to be completed.

Matters were also complicated when it came to copyright, a system which Pope endeavored to grasp and control throughout his career. As I have already noted, he and Lintot were involved in a long series of arguments regarding the copyright of many of the poet's

[75] *Ibid*., 4:392.
[76] For Sherburn, see *ibid*., 392n.; Foxon 1991, 146.
[77] McLaverty 2001, 6.

works. I shall expand here on some of the major disagreements, including the case over the *Dunciad* of 1728 which led them to go to Chancery in 1743. I shall begin with an earlier case. The contract drawn between Pope and Lintot for the *Works* of 1717 has been noted by Foxon as "the strangest of his [Pope's] surviving agreements."[78] In accordance with the Queen Anne Act of 1709, it was agreed that the copyright for the *Works*, which was published on 3 June 1717, would be granted to Lintot for a term of fourteen years. However, the contract also stated that after the first term expired and the copyright returned to the author, Pope would not sell his rights to anyone but Lintot and that the rights would be granted to him for another fourteen years at no cost to the publisher. When the expiration of the first term approached, Pope began to insist that he had no obligation to yield the rights to Lintot for a second term unless another agreement were drawn up suggesting the specific conditions. At the time when the original contract was drawn, the publisher may have been cautious not to incur unwanted expenses, for he had been embittered by the fact that the author had succeeded in making him pay for delivery costs of the *Iliad* subscription. Whatever the exact negotiations between the publisher and author, Pope, with Fortescue as his counsel, in fact sold the rights to the *Works* to Lintot for the second term for 5*s*.[79]

On 16 February 1743, Pope and Lintot went to Chancery to settle a dispute over the duration of Henry Lintot's rights to Pope's *Dunciad* of 1728.[80] The original rights to the *Dunciad*, for a term of fourteen years, had initially been granted to Lawton Gilliver. However, being on the verge of bankruptcy in the late 1730s, Gilliver sold a third of the rights to John Clarke, most likely a former partner. Clarke sold it to John Osborne, who then sold it to Henry Lintot, son of Bernard, on 18 January 1740. Two-thirds of the rights were sold directly to Henry Lintot on 15 December 1740. Thus the entirety of the rights to the *Dunciad* came to be owned by Henry Lintot in 1740, but as the term of fourteen years approached, there was dispute over how long he could own the rights, from the original date when the rights were sold to Gilliver or from the time Lintot purchased those rights in 1740. The matter was brought to court. Unfortunately we do not have the exact terms of settlement, only a letter from Pope to Warburton dated 21 May 1743, in which he indicates that the lawsuit is coming to a close.[81] Working from existing facts, we know that Pope published a new edition of the *Dunciad* on 29 October 1743. It seems that Pope thus waited for the expiration of the first

[78] Foxon 1991, 240.
[79] For details on this dispute as well as some earlier ones with the Tonsons and Lintot, see Foxon 1991, 239-40.
[80] See Vincent (1939).
[81] *Corr*., 4:455.

fourteen years, for those rights were not in his hands. As for Henry Lintot, considering that the Act stated that the rights revert back to the author after the first term, in all likelihood he lost the rights to the work after that term.[82] Foxon makes a dry comment about Pope with regard to the many copyright disagreements: "Pope was anxious that everyone else should stick to the rules, but that he himself should be free – a not uncommon desire."[83]

III. The Literary Market: Predictability and Profitability of Translations

I mentioned in the beginning of this chapter that the literary market as a whole flourished and expanded in Pope's time. Within this growing literary trade, the market for translated works was also thriving. For booksellers and other professionals in the trade, commercial profit was understandably the driving force for publication of translations, and in some respects it even reduced the cost for those preparing such publications.[84] As mentioned earlier, translators were not always well-known writers whose reputations were solid enough that they could approach a publisher with an original work and expect it to sell. This was a double benefit for the publisher, for they were less expensive to pay, though the sales of a translation depended more on the reputation of the original author than the translator. Thus the translation of a major work by a highly-renowned author, such as Voltaire or Virgil, could be expected to yield profit, regardless of who the translator was. In addition to being cost-effective, translations were often seen to carry less risk. Once a translation of a major work proved to be successful, it served as a sign that it would be profitable to commission a translator to produce a new edition. We know that 69 titles of Greek and Latin translations, both new and reprints, were published in the 1660s and that translations of classics reached a peak with 197 titles in the 1770s.[85] It is important to keep in mind, however, that most renderings were published in small selections and only a handful of complete translations appeared. As Gillespie and Wilson note, "[m]iscellany publication, not wholly unprecedented for English poetry or even for translation, proved an extremely convenient vehicle for occasional translation," and both

[82] Foxon 1991, 250 has suggested that there is a possibility that a compromise was reached between the two parties.
[83] Ibid., 138. See also book 2 of the *Dunciad*, which reflects Pope's observations and opinions on the book trade.
[84] See Gillespie and Wilson: "Translations had clear practical advantages for the copy-hungry book trade: first and foremost, it was usually cheaper to pay a translator than to commission a new work, especially where non-technical prose (such as fiction) was concerned" (2005, 38).
[85] Gillespie 2005, 134.

verse and prose translations appeared regularly in periodicals and magazines.[86] Taking all these factors into account, translations in the eyes of a publisher were, to put simply, predictable and profitable.

Finally, although this comes slightly after Pope's era, there was even a press which specialized in the publication of classical and philosophical works. The Foulis Press in Glasgow, then the center of printing in Scotland, was run by two brothers Robert (1707-76) and Andrew (1712-75) Foulis who assumed the roles of bookseller, printer, and publisher. The classical material was mostly Greek, and editions were printed in the original languages as well as translations. The press also employed university professors as editors for the content. The brothers were acclaimed for the quality of their publications, both for their content, as each sheet was proof-read multiple times with extreme care, and for the simplicity of the layout and pages.[87]

We must not assume, however, that translations in this era were all translations of Latin and Greek works. Translations were done of classical, modern European, and oriental works, though French dominated. French cultural authority had been established especially in the fields of literary criticism and classical tradition. As seen in the previous chapter, Corneille's strong support of the Rules on the Three Unities were influential in England, and Dacier's commentary on Homer served as indispensable material in the preparation of Pope's translations. While demand for Latin and Greek translations remained fairly constant in Pope's age, Gillespie states that, "[b]y very early in the period 1660-1790, French has displaced the classical languages as the source of most literary material. …the centrality of French is a fundamental feature of the history of literary translation over this period."[88]

The French language occupied a significant place in the field of translation. In the sixteenth-century, Europe saw an explosion of publications, which included not only books but also pamphlets. The late sixteenth century was an era in which English printing regulations were tightened as the royal government attempted to suppress sedition at the same time as promoting materials which it deemed favorable for the crown. Nevertheless, French propaganda infiltrated the minds of the English reading public by way of an extensive network of English ambassadors and diplomats, translators, printers, and spies.[89] Thus English

[86] Gillespie and Wilson 2005, 41 and 46.
[87] Steinberg 1996, 100-1.
[88] Gillespie 2005, 143; quote from 125.
[89] See Parmelee (1994) for French propaganda works in sixteenth-century England, including the career of English printer John Wolfe and the influence of French pamphlets in Christopher Marlowe's *The Massacre at Paris* (*c*. 1591), based on the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre in 1572.

translations of French writing, especially political pamphlets, had already permeated certain privileged reading classes in England, yet, in the field of literature, we can say that England saw an increase in the number of translations from French literature following the Civil War and into the eighteenth century.

In the field of literature, translations from French and other modern languages reached a larger audience than did classical translations. Voltaire's works were the most widely translated, with approximately 65 separate translations into English.[90] Gillespie offers an explanation that, first, during the two decades following the Civil War a Francophile court resided in England and that, second, especially after 1750 there was a substantial increase in the size of readership and a rising demand for fiction, which English works alone could not supply.[91] In the theatre, French influence was conspicuous more in adaptations modeled on French originals rather than in faithful renderings of the originals. French comedy proved more successful on the English stage than tragedy, and adaptations from Molière, especially from *Le Misanthrope*, were probably the most numerous. Willard Austin Kinne has estimated that a quarter of English comedies in the eighteenth century can be labeled as French adaptations, a popularity which reached a peak in the 1780s.[92] We must not forget too that, not only were notable French works translated into English, but English works were made available in French. Pope's *Essay on Criticism* and *Essay on Man*, both highly successful at home in England, were translated into French and circulated in French literary circles. The author of *Mémoires du Comte de Grammont* sent Pope a French verse translation of the *Essay on Criticism*.[93] In 1717 Jean Robethon, private secretary to King George I, produced *Essai sur la critique, imité de l'Anglois de Mr. Pope* based on Pope's work, and in 1730 Abbé du Resnel translated the piece into French.[94] With the aid of Voltaire, the latter was re-issued in 1736 with a verse translation of *Essay on Man*; together they were given the title: *Les Principes de la Moral et du Goût*.

However, French had perhaps a still more significant function as the intermediary language for translations from other languages. John Ozell, described by David Hopkins and Pat Rogers as possibly the "most prolific translator" of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, translated Boileau, Voiture, Molière, Corneille, and Perrault. He

[90] Gillespie 2005, 138, referring to the period between 1660 and 1790.
[91] Ibid., 135.
[92] Kinne 1967, 246.
[93] *Corr*., 1:192-93.
[94] Weinbrot 2005, 214.

produced the first English version of Montesquieu's *Lettres Persanes* in 1722, as well as a French-English dictionary earlier in 1717.[95] Mentioned in Chapter 3, he, along with William Broome and William Oldisworth, rendered an English translation of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* from André Dacier's French version. Gillespie states that translation accounted for a quarter to a third of all published fiction between 1700 and 1740, and, in addition to French fiction translated into English, the French language was of particular importance as a medium of secondary translation from Middle Eastern works.[96] Antoine Galland's *The Thousand and One Nights* (1704-1717), reprinted many times, is a prime example of an oriental work which, by way of translation through French, was made available in English. Rendered into French primarily from a fourteenth-century Syrian manuscript, *Les mille et une nuits* was the first European version of *The Nights*. It was in 1706 that an anonymous translation of this work appeared in English, entitled *The Arabian Nights' Entertainment* and now commonly known as the "Grub Street" version. *The Thousand and One Days: Persian Tales*, attributed to Ambrose Philips, followed in 1714. Beyond the field of literature, the Koran was first translated into French before it was rendered into English by Alexander Ross in 1649. French also served as the intermediary language in the appearance of the first German fiction in English. The *Sorrows of Werter* (1779), attributed to Daniel Malthus, was a secondary translation from a French text.[97]

How did Pope regard the French dominance of English culture in his time? As Pope had studied French along with Italian and appreciation for contemporary French writings is frequently noted in his correspondence, he showed both an interest in and admiration for French culture and its products. His awareness of the French influence, especially in literature, is made manifest in one of the *Imitations*:

We conquer'd France, but felt our captive's charms;
Her Arts victorious triumph'd o'er our Arms. (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.1.263-64)

Pope deftly creates a comparison between the surge of French cultural dominance in England and the introduction of Greek culture to Rome. Horace's original reads:

Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artis
intulit agresti Latio. (*Ep*. 2.1.156-57)

Conquered Greece captivated the uncultivated victor

[95] Hopkins and Rogers 2005, 87.
[96] Gillespie 2005, 127.
[97] Stockley 1929, 2-4, among other reasons, has cited the prevailing anti-German sentiment in England due to the Hanoverian reign of the two Georges as resulting in the relatively late appearance of German-English translations when compared to other European languages.

and introduced their arts to rustic Latium.

Britain had conquered France in the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-1714), which included Queen Anne's War (1702-1713) on the North American front, and it was concluded with the Treaty of Utrecht (1713). While there was earlier exposure to Greek culture, it was in the third and second centuries B.C.E. in the aftermaths of the conquest of the battles of Tarentum in 212 and 209 B.C.E. that Romans began to incorporate the Greek arts into their culture. However, both nations required some time to restore stability as a country before they could concentrate on developing the arts and literary culture:

Late, very late, correctness grew our care,
When the tir'd nation breath'd from civil war.
Exact Racine, and Corneille's noble fire
Show'd us that France had something to admire. (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.1.272-275)

Pope correctly captures the widespread appreciation for French drama, which Racine and Corneille represent as authorities. This is based on the passage from Horace:

serus… Graecis admovit acumina chartis
et post Punica bella quietus quaerere coepit
quid Sophocles et Thespis et Aeschylus utile ferrent. (*Ep*. 2.1.161-63)

Late, the Roman applied his intellect to Greek writings,
and, at peace after the Punic Wars, began to ask
in what way Sophocles, Thespis, and Aeschylus may be of service.

Gradual admission of and appreciation for the Greek dramatists began after the Punic Wars (264-241, 218-201, and 149-146 B.C.E.), when Rome was "quietus," at peace. A small discrepancy is to be noticed in that Pope describes that England was "tir'd" after the war. Indeed, in contrast to Rome which had fought a series of wars, albeit long, in a faraway land, the English Civil War (1642-46, 1648-49, and 1649-51) was fought at home. Though "serus," Rome was ready to work on its "acumina" and to turn to the cultivation of the nation's arts. As described by Pope, England took much longer, "late, very late," until it could even breathe ("breath'd") from the aftermaths of the war.

As mentioned earlier, French comedies were the most popular, not tragedy, and Pope captures this idea:

…the Tragic spirit was our own,
And full in Shakespear, fair in Otway shone. (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.1.276-77)

He follows Horace quite faithfully, as the corresponding Latin reads:

temptavit quoque rem, si digne vertere posset,
et placuit sibi, natura sublimis et acer;
nam spirat tragicum satis. (*Ep*. 2.1.164-66)

The Roman also attempted the same, to see if he could transform it properly,
and, of an aspiring nature and enthusiastic, he was pleased;
for he has sufficient poetic inspiration for tragedy.

Horace, while admitting that the great Greek tragedians Sophocles, Thespis, and Aeschylus brought refinement to Latin poetry (*Ep*. 2.1.163), asserts that Rome had its own gift for tragedy. Pope claims the same in asserting that English tragedy flourished in the works of native dramatists, Shakespeare and Otway, playwrights whom he admired. Thus far Pope has neatly lined himself up in parallel with Horace. He has no problems in admitting that influences from France helped develop his nation's culture, just as Rome absorbed the influences from Greece. Pope succeeds in drawing a similarity between his and Horace's time. The metaphor works. Where Pope begins to deviate from Horace in the *Epistle to Augustus* is in regard to Horace's supposed willingness to write in praise of the emperor. There we shall see Pope's deviation, one of many, from Horace. The contrasting attitudes which the two poets exhibit in their poems will be discussed in Chapter 7.

IV. Readership: Class, Purchasing Power, and Profit for Writers

What about readership in eighteenth-century England? I have briefly discussed education in the classics in Chapter 3, pointing out that, albeit obligatory, learning Latin and Greek most often entailed studying the grammar from fragmentary excerpts without being compelled to understand the particularities of an author or the content of an entire work. However, a typical gentleman's education is not the same thing as readership. Although exposure to a work or an author in one's education may play a role, in as much as familiarity may become the driving motive to acquire a book, readership has to do with literacy, gender,[98] as well as the purchasing capacities of different classes. I will first focus on the knowledge of the classical languages as it pertains to the readership of Latin and Greek translations. However, as Gillespie has correctly pointed out, "any attempt to explore the cultural significance of translation in a given period must look beyond the activity of translators to that of the book-

[98] Although female readership accounted for a new and significant portion of the literary market towards the end of the seventeenth century and into the eighteenth century, I refrain from discussing the subject as it is not central to this thesis. I realize that it is an important topic as conventional female education did not include the classics, and translations were thus important in that they gave access to ancient works which women would not have been able to read in the original language. See Fuchs 1980, 28-34 and Davis 2008, 120. Among Pope's works, *The Rape of the Lock* understandably incited few imitations or responses by women poets, but his *Eloisa to Abelard* was taken up by many contemporary women poets. See Matthews (1990) and Thomas (1994) for Pope's female audience.

buying public."[99] Thus I would also like to explore the material side of production and the ways in which Pope selected paper types and styles of print for customers which now included the rising bourgeoisie. In Section II, I discussed Pope's dealings with agents and the publication process *before* a work was published. This section deals with the outcome, or how a work was received by the public *after* publication. This will reveal another side of our poet's business skills, as, in addition to the hard negotiations he conducted with printers and booksellers, he certainly did not fail to calculate the ways in which he could maximize his profits by attracting an audience.

The advent of print certainly contributed to an increase in literacy across Europe in the sixteenth century. Nevertheless, until about the end of the seventeenth century, literacy and leisure essentially remained luxuries available only to the privileged classes. It was during the eighteenth century that the commercial middle class acquired significant purchasing power as well as an appetite for intellectual improvement. The introduction of compulsory education[100] contributed to a significant boost in literacy, but this is a factor that applies more to the period following our poet's time and we shall confine our discussion to Pope's century.

The eighteenth century marks an era in which middle class writers like Daniel Defoe and Samuel Richardson attained success. How does Pope's profit compare with the living expenses of the time as well as with other writers' incomes? The cost of living in England in the eighteenth century averaged about £30 a year.[101] We shall compare this to the incomes of some of the most renowned writers. The system of patronage diminished gradually throughout the century, as I have mentioned, and after Pope's time some writers were able to net a fairly large profit from their works. Samuel Johnson received 10 guineas for *London* (1738), the poem which Pope approved of, and 20 guineas for *The Vanity of Human Wishes* (1749). He was paid £125 for *Rasselas* (1759) and £1,575 for the *Dictionary* (1755). Contemporary with Johnson, Edward Young was paid £220 by his publisher Dodsley for *Night Thoughts* (1742), Charles Churchill received £450 for *The Duellist* (1763), and Bishop Percy, £300, for the *Reliques* (1765). Henry Fielding most likely enjoyed more success than other fiction writers, and his profits were £700 for *Tom Jones* (1749) and £1,000 for *Amelia* (1752). In the genre of histories, William Robertson earned £600 for his *History of Scotland* (1759) and £4,500 for

[99] Gillespie 2005, 132.
[100] Compulsory education was first introduced in 1619 in the dukedom of Weimar, but we do not know how efficiently or strictly the system was implemented. Prussia followed suit almost a hundred years later in 1717. It was only in 1870 when the system was introduced in England, although charity schools and academies established by Christian sects had long encouraged literacy prior to this implementation. See Steinberg 1996, 119.
[101] Ibid., 110.

his *Charles V* (1769). David Hume received £3,400 for his history of England, and Tobias Smollett £2,000 for his *Complete History of England* (1757-1765). From the six volumes of his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1776-1789), Edward Gibbon is said to have made a net profit of £9,000. Authors were not the only ones who enjoyed financial success, as Andrew Millar, publisher for Robertson, Hume, and Smollett, accrued a net profit of £6,000 from the fourteen editions of Robertson's *History of Scotland*. Notwithstanding the fact that there were authors, and publishers, who made a larger fortune than Pope, it is still a monumental achievement that as early as 1720 Pope was able to make a profit amounting to £5,000 from the translation of the *Iliad*.

Furthermore, it was also the century in which readership expanded.[102] James Lackington, a London publisher, recorded in 1791 the changes he witnessed in his industry:

> The sale of books in general has increased prodigiously within the last twenty years. The poorer sort of farmers, and even the poor country people in general who before that period spent their winter evenings in relating stories of witches, ghosts, hobgoblins etc., now shorten the winter nights by hearing their sons and daughters read tales, romances etc., and on entering their houses you may see *Tom Jones*, *Roderick Random* and other entertaining books, stuck up in their bacon-racks etc.[103]

While the novel remained the most popular book form and was read by the greatest number of the population, it was not only native tales but also translations, though not necessarily from the Latin or Greek, which attracted readers.

Nevertheless, books were costly to produce and they were luxury items to own. One other thing to keep in mind is that illustrated books were approximately twice as expensive per sheet as those which contained only text,[104] and, as Pope was primarily a writer of poetry and not of prose, it is important to mention that a book of poetry cost more. Cynthia Wall explains:

> One of the ways in which poetry is distinct from prose is the way it occupies a page. Poetry takes up a lot of room, with large empty spaces surrounding self-limited lines. It's *expensive* in terms of production. Poetry is luxurious; poetry is lofty.[105]

In addition, Pope loved to play with margins, set headpieces, tailpieces, and engravings, and his printed poems sometimes contained more notes than lines of poetry per page.[106] While Pope was notoriously parsimonious when writing his drafts of poetry, even scribbling passages on the backs of his correspondence, in selling his works he took heed to use as much space as possible in order to inflate prices and ensure maximum profit.

---

[102] Tillotson et al. 1969, 1.
[103] Cited in Steinberg 1996, 119 and 121.
[104] Ibid., 96-97.
[105] Wall 2007, 59.
[106] For Pope's predilection for notes, see ibid., 59-62 and McLaverty 2001, 209-41.

Paper size was one factor which Pope took into account in order to raise the purchase price per copy. While his fame, partly owing to his contributions in miscellanies alongside the most celebrated poets published by notable figures such as Tonson, rose steadily if not very quickly, success in terms of profit did not come as easily. It must be noted that in fact Pope in his earliest years had had difficulties selling his individual poems. Part of the reason for this is because Pope was so intent on commercial gain from the beginning that he chose large paper sizes for his publications. The result was that, while he was able to charge more per copy, the total number of copies sold was less than if he had produced cheaper copies on smaller paper. For both *Windsor-Forest* (1713) and *Ode for Musick* (1713) he decided to print in large folio format. *Windsor-Forest* did well enough for a second edition to be printed, yet this was not unusual even for poems which sold poorly. There was still enough stock left for the poem to be advertised as late as in the fifth edition of the *Rape of the Lock* in 1718.

It was in fact with the five-canto version of the *Rape of the Lock*, published on 4 March 1714, that Pope succeeded in making his first commercial hit. The author wrote to Caryll on 12 March 1714:

The Rape of the Lock… has in four days time sold to the number [of] three thousand, and is already reprinted…[107]

If our author was elated to see that the *Rape of the Lock* sold three thousand copies, his *Key to the Lock*, published a year later on 25 April 1715, saw an even greater success. Yet as we shall see, Pope soon realized that in order to make serious profit he needed to take into account not only the total number of copies sold but also the price per copy, as well as per edition.

For Pope, as for other authors and publishers, it was not enough to focus solely on the taste of the public to predict sales. It was also necessary to produce different editions depending on the different classes of readers who had varying purchasing capacities. An example of this has been given by Joseph Candido who compares the Shakespeare editions of Nicholas Rowe and Pope. Rowe's first edition in 1709 consisted of six volumes in octavo size and was priced at thirty shillings a set. His second edition of 1714 consisted in eight volumes on duodecimo paper. Clearly Rowe intended his editions to be accessible to a wide and general readership. Pope's edition of 1723-25 appeared in six volumes on large quarto

[107] *Corr*., 1:214.

paper,[108] which recalled the elegant folio format of the seventeenth century, and its introductory apparatus lists the king's name, dukes, and booksellers, as well as the names of its four hundred subscribers. Candido argues that Pope intended to make a statement of "cultural status," and his edition does indeed stand in contrast to Rowe's whose goals include the diffusion of Shakespeare's works to a public that previously could not afford to own a copy.[109] Just as he did with the subscriptions for his Homer, Pope was apparently targeting the aristocracy and wealthy classes from whom he could earn more.

Pope's tactic in later years was to print an elegant version for subscribers and as a collector's edition and a more affordable one for the wider public. This may be comparable to the appearance of a new publication today in a hardcover edition which is followed by a paperback edition. Although profit was always on Pope's mind, it must not be assumed that he was careless about the smaller and cheaper editions.[110] The *Epistle to Arbuthnot* was first published as a 24-page folio in January 1735. A different edition in octavo, though the text was identical to the first, soon followed. There was indeed a gradual shift in preference among the purchasing public for the smaller octavos over the more costly folios and quartos. Spence recorded Pope's comment: "I was first forced to print in little [i.e. octavo] by other printers' beginning to do so from my folios."[111] It was not Pope, the author, but printers and other agents in the trade who first recognized the changing trends in the customers who were increasingly of the bourgeois, merchant, and middle classes. However, he soon realized that the octavos ensured a safe way for a steady income. Octavo editions for his prose works, both in 1737 and 1741, were issued first before the folio and quarto editions. In fact, between the years 1737 and 1742 a total of thirteen octavo volumes of his prose works were published.[112]

The first Horatian *Imitation* was published on 15 February 1733 (*The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace Imitated*), and the last on 18 July 1738 (*One Thousand Seven Hundred Thirty Eight. Dialogue II*). The *Imitations* were all printed in folio, and editions in

[108] Foxon 1991, 94n. states that there were 411 subscribers for 417 copies of this subscription venture. For details on Pope's Shakespeare edition with Tonson, see ibid., 86-91, which includes a copy of the contract, and Sherburn 1934, 232-47.
[109] Candido 2000, 212-13. Cf. Foxon's comment: "[Pope's] bulky Shakespeare seems a retrograde step from Rowe's octavo, but it probably had to be bulky as a subscription edition for Tonson's benefit" (1991, 64).
[110] Cf. McLaverty: "[a]lthough there were rather grand books throughout Pope's career, often for subscribers, there were also small ones for the general public on which he seems to have lavished no less attention" (2001, 2).
[111] Spence 1966, 1:91.
[112] Foxon 1991, 138. One of the surviving copies of Pope's contract with Lintot for the *Iliad* specifies the format as octavo, although the subscribers' edition was printed on quarto. Foxon suggests the possibility of an original plan of an octavo subscription for the translation, but, with the success of the *Rape of the Lock* in quarto, Pope and Lintot may have decided to print the *Iliad* likewise in quarto, since they would be able to charge more per volume (ibid., 241).

quarto and octavo followed.[113] *The First Epistle of The First Book of Horace Imitated*, for instance, was first printed in folio, then a revised version in quarto appeared, and another revised edition in octavo. Criticism for this practice was printed in the *Daily Post* in 1742:

> [Pope resorted to] the lowest Craft of the Trade, such as different Editions in various Forms, with perpetual Additions and improvements, so as to render all but the *last* worth nothing; and by that Means, fooling many People into buying them several times over.[114]

This is a malicious attack and the statement that "all but the *last* [was] worth nothing" is exaggerated, but there is a grain of truth in that Pope endeavored to sell the maximum number of copies by varying the format and to squeeze out the highest profit from any single work.

Almost two decades later, Pope filed a lawsuit against Curll for piracy of his letters, a suit which Mark Rose claims as "one of the first cases in which a major English author went to court in his own name to defend his literary interests."[115] While Rose argues that Pope's primary goal in *Pope v. Curll* in 1741 was to preclude Curll or others from unauthorized publication of private correspondence, he raises the important point that Curll's cheap version presented a commercial threat.[116] Pope expressed his thoughts on the matter in a letter to Ralph Allen:

> That Rascal Curl has pyrated the Letters, which would have ruin'd half my Edition, but we have got an Injunction from my Lord Chancellor to prohibit his selling them for the future, tho doubtless he'l do it clandestinely. And indeed I have done with expensive Editions for ever, which are only a Complement to a few curious people at the expence of the Publisher, & to the displeasure of the Many.[117]

Curll knew Pope's inclination to publish at least one, usually the first, edition which was elaborate and expensive. Though Pope is enraged that Curll had taken advantage of this by printing cheaper copies, it is clear in the letter that he is aware of his scheme of reaping the most profit out of any publication.

Although books were altogether still an expensive commodity, elaborate collectible editions with copper plates bearing the owner's name to be shelved for display in the libraries of private mansions were going out of style. Nevertheless, while admitting that the decorative

---

[113] See Mack 1982, 106-21.
[114] Sawney and Colley's "A Poetical Dialogue," printed in the *Daily Post*, 31 August 1742 (Guerinot 1969, 305).
[115] Rose 1992, 197-98.
[116] Ibid., 204. The issue became a lawsuit because the Queen Anne Act did not explicitly define letters as literary property, and as such Rose claims that this particular case was "an important transitional moment in the concept of authorship and of authors' rights, and a transitional moment, too, in the conception of literary property" (ibid., 198). On 17 June 1741, Lord Chancellor Hardwicke ordered the injunction of Curll's publication, but only for the letters which Pope wrote and not for those which were addressed to him. It is interesting that Hardwicke recognized rights to the author only for the letters which the author himself composed but not ones which were written by others (ibid., 207-8). See also Ransom (1951).
[117] *Corr*., 4:350. At the time when this letter was sent in the summer of 1741, Pope was almost £200 in debt to his printer.

editions are unpopular and are "to the displeasure of the Many," he never quite renounced producing them. One of the reasons, which Foxon has suggested and which I take as a gesture of courtesy and respect for loyal customers despite his desire for profit, dates back to the subscription edition in quarto of the *Iliad* in 1715. He decided to continue to publish his other poems in the same quarto format so that the early subscribers who had remained loyal readers would be able to keep adding to their collection.[118]

Thus far we have seen that Pope was careful in calculating which size editions, folio, quarto, or octavo, would be most profitable in the market. It is worthwhile to note, however, that even before these editions reached the customers, he also drove hard bargains with booksellers for the price per volume, whatever the paper size or edition. Pope wanted to make sure that any volume of his works would be priced at no less than 18*s*. for the general public and a guinea for the more privileged classes. It is very probable that he had calculated that a volume of the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* cost about 3*s*. 6*d*. to print. It cost another 3*s*. 6*d*. for expenses such as advertisement and distribution. Since 3*s*. 6*d*. corresponded to a sixth of a guinea, if a volume was sold to a gentleman at a guinea, one-third would be taken away for the cost of production but two-thirds of the retail price would be kept as profit. This was probably the calculation he had in mind when he told Spence in 1739: "An author who is at all the expenses of publishing ought to clear two thirds of the whole profit into his own pocket."[119] Spence also recorded the example which Pope gave him:

> For instance, as he explained it, in a piece of one thousand copies at 3*s* each to the common buyer, the whole sale at that rate will bring in £150. The expense therefore to the author for printing, paper, publishing, selling, and advertising, should be about £50, and his clear gains should be £100.[120]

Had Pope *truly* been his own publisher, this estimate may have been made for many transactions.

In a letter to the bookseller and printer Buckley Pope writes of the *Works* of 1735:

> I hope you have by this time the present I ordered you, of All I am worth, that is, *my Workes*. It is a very poor return…indeed for many friendly offices you have always been ready to do me. It was merely an Unwillingness to give you Trouble, that hinderd my doing myself the Service of desiring your Assistance in printing this book. As it is, it has cost me dear, & may dearer, if I am to depend on my Bookseller for Re-imbursement. If it lye in your way to help me off with 150 of them, (which are not to be sold to the Trade at less than 18s or to Gentlemen than a Guinea) it would be a Service to me, a Bookseller having had the Conscience to offer me 13s a piece, & being modestly content to get 8s in the pound himself, after I have done him many services. Another, quite a Stranger, has taken 100 at 17s but I want to part with the rest.[121]

[118] Foxon 1991, 145.
[119] Spence 1966, 1:85.
[120] Ibid.
[121] *Corr*., 3:454.

What Pope failed to or did not wish to take into account was that booksellers usually charged a wholesaler's price in preparing copies for publication. In the letter he expresses his disappointment that Gilliver proposed to buy the volumes at the wholesale price of 13*s*. The discontented Pope went in search of other booksellers who would be willing to pay him 17*s*. The "Stranger" who did buy them for 17*s*. was most probably John Brindley, a bookseller of New Bond Street who had previously bought a quarter share of *Sober Advice from Horace* in 1734.[122] The solution he resorted to, in subsequent publications, was to make the volumes thinner, or to reduce the number of sheets, in order to minimize the cost of production.[123]

The development of the book trade in the eighteenth century is by itself a fascinating subject for scholarly study. There are avenues of interest which I did not explore in full detail, including the changing relationship between cost of living and book prices, as well as litigations which arose from the Copyright Act. However, the purpose of this chapter has been to show that, for Pope, attaining and maintaining financial independence involved a career-long series of toil and conflicts. I began by discussing the status of the translator, from struggling writers who took on commissions to translate at the same time as producing original material to renowned authors such as Dryden. Although first and foremost a poet, Pope also took on translations and editorial work. However, established poets such as Cowley found, as did Pope, that although translation could be lucrative, it did not allow enough freedom for imagination and originality. After his career was established, Pope sought firm control over his publications. Such endeavors led at times to difficult negotiations and he developed a mistrust and skepticism of printers, booksellers, and publishers. Even after his fame was secure, he continued to seek to maximize his profits by paying careful attention to the different classes of readership and thus the varying degrees of purchasing power which his customers had. Pope's road to independence, though ultimately successful and financially enviable, was hard won. Pope certainly had business acumen, but the seemingly endless disagreements and negotiations led him to develop a mistrust of agents in the trade as well as an inner sense that he was fighting alone, casting himself as an outsider struggling in his dealings with insiders in the trade.

All in all, the financial success and independence which Pope chose as an alternative to patronage involved its own struggles and sets of problems. What he endured is testament to

[122] Foxon 1991, 129.
[123] Ibid., 102-3; table 11 (ibid., 120) presents Gilliver's possible profits as a bookseller from the Horatian *Epistles*.

the magnitude of his vehement refusal, bordering on antagonism, of patronage. Nonetheless, as I mentioned at the opening of this chapter, Pope saw it as a rewarding status:

But (thanks to *Homer*) since I live and thrive,
Indebted to no Prince or Peer alive. (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.2.68-69).

These two lines capture the hard-won independence which took many long years to attain, and, as I have shown, the negotiations and bargains were to continue as long as he composed and published his poetry. As we know, the situation was different for Horace, whose patrons included Maecenas, introduced through Virgil and Lucius Varius Rufus, and later the emperor Augustus. The focus of this chapter has been on Pope more than on Horace. As a counterpart to this, the next chapter will be devoted to a detailed discussion of patronage and, in particular, Horace's circumstances.

Chapter 5

Patronage: "Indebted to no Prince or Peer alive"[1]

One may recall that Horace humbly confesses that satire was the only genre left for him, as Fundanius occupied the chief place in comedy, Pollio in tragedy, Varius in epic, and Virgil in pastoral (*Sat*. 1.10.40-48). He further adds that even in satire he is "minor inventore" (48), inferior to the inventor of the genre: Lucilius. Pope similarly had grand predecessors and in the previous chapters I discussed his process of elimination. Pope avoided translating certain classical authors, as he was fully aware that his chances of outshining some of his acclaimed predecessors, notably Dryden, were slim. The prime example is his settling on the project of rendering a complete translation of the Homeric epic instead of the Virgilian, even though it was Virgil's footsteps he had carefully followed in progressing from the *Bucolics*-based *Pastorals* to the *Georgics*-based *Windsor-Forest*. Dryden was also the reason why, earlier in his youth, he resorted to translating Statius and eliminated the works of Ovid, Juvenal, and Persius as material for translation and publication. In the case of Lucretius, Dryden had left partial translations, yet Pope was keenly aware that Thomas Creech's *De Rerum Natura* (1682) had already become an invincible authority and thus judged it best to turn to other classical writers. Such is, in part, the story behind Pope's success. In the last chapter I focused on Pope's ambitions and his road to financial independence. We know that Pope was a poet who refused patronage. I shall backtrack somewhat in devoting the first section of this chapter to patronage in eighteenth-century England and Pope's views on the system. Nevertheless, much of the chapter will be devoted to an examination of the choices which Horace faced in his road to success. In order to do so the question of patronage cannot be avoided, as it is a topic which is deeply intertwined with Horace's writing career. Patronage will thus be the main topic of discussion in this chapter.

In the first section, I intend to explore the circumstances and the reasons why Pope chose an independent path, and I shall also discuss his views on his predecessors and contemporaries who took the traditional route of patronage. This discussion on patronage in Pope's eighteenth-century England will serve as a preface to my discussion of the patronage as it relates to Horace and his patrons Maecenas and Augustus, which in turn will help us understand Horace's ambitions to join the elite circle. The second section will explore

[1] *Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.2.69.

Horace's process of elimination in literary genres. Like Pope, he was aware of the standing of his predecessors, but he was also more circumspect than Pope in his choices. This may be seen in his *recusatio* which refers to his avoidance of epic and politics. The third section will primarily consider the first book of *Satires*, Horace's earliest collection. The focus will be on Horace's determination to succeed in his early career. I will introduce passages in which Horace claims that he was repeatedly reminded of his inferior background as he was making his social ascent. I suspect that Horace may be exaggerating his poverty, but it struck a chord in Pope, as he too was a poet who attained unprecedented fame in the face of adverse circumstances. In both poets, there was a strong will to succeed. Finally, as a prelude to the next chapter which will deal with the balance between poetry and politics under a new ruler and patron, Augustus, I shall explain Horace's relationship with his first patron, Maecenas. Horace expressed both resistance and sincere gratitude towards him. The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate that patronage under Maecenas went beyond a patron-and-client relationship between a poet and a social superior. There was genuine affection shared in the *amicitia* between Horace and Maecenas.

I. Pope and Patronage: "Homer will at last do me justice"[2]

In Chapter 1, I discussed Pope's Catholic faith which barred him from ever hoping to be appointed a Poet Laureate. He could not hope to be endorsed by the king. Pope must have had at least a vague notion since his early days that patronage, which required wooing the court culture, would not have been a primary option for him. His family was quite wealthy, but they did not come from the ranks of the aristocracy. In Chapter 4, I traced Pope's path to independence. He personally took charge in conducting negotiations, driving hard bargains, and at times even filing lawsuits. I mentioned that he gradually developed mistrust towards agents in the book trade. He felt insecure, and there was no aristocratic patron to fall back on. His fragile health and limited stature did not always work to his advantage, although they did not ultimately impede his success.

The picture which I have presented so far is of a hard-working writer who, notwithstanding the twin toll of religious denomination and deformity, paved his way to success all alone. While this is true in many ways, the reality is that Pope's writing career falls somewhere between independence and patronage. That is, he never had official patrons who

[2] *Corr.*, 1:297.

paid for his expenses and to whom he in turn had to dedicate his works and express obligated gratitude. But he did have supporters who recognized his talent, read and recommended his manuscripts to others, and subscribed to the poet's works. It certainly helped that many were aristocratic friends. I begin this chapter with a general discussion of the system of patronage in eighteenth-century England and explore Pope's views on his predecessors and contemporaries who had patrons. Particular focus will be placed on Dryden who appears several times in the Horatian *Imitations* with respect to the restricted freedom of a writer who wrote under patronage. Lastly, I shall once again discuss Pope's career, this time from the viewpoint that he took a middle course between patronage and independence, especially as it relates to his early career. His reservations towards the court culture never dissipated, but he eventually attained a status reputable enough that even the government offered funds to support his poetry and a university offered him an honorary degree.[3]

For those writing under a patron, dedication was a way to express their gratitude and loyalty to their patrons, but at times it contained an underlying request for further favor.[4] Dryden's dedication of his *Examen Poeticum* (1693) to Lord Radcliffe begins with the words:

> THESE Miscellany Poems are by many titles yours. The first they claim, from your acceptance of my promise to present them to you, before some of them were yet in being. The rest are derived from your own merit, the exactness of your judgment in Poetry, and the candour of your nature, easy to forgive some trivial faults, when they come accompanied with countervailing beauties. But, after all, though these are your equitable claims to a dedication from other poets, yet I must acknowledge a bribe in the case, which is your particular liking of my verses.[5]

In addition to politeness, humility, and expressions of gratitude, flattery was a necessary aspect of the system. Dryden commends his patron's "merit," "exactness of… judgment in Poetry," and "candour of… nature." In the same dedication, Dryden says:

> Without flattery, my Lord, you have it in your nature to be a patron and encourager of good poets… You maintain the character of a nobleman, without that haughtiness which generally attends too many of the nobility.[6]

It is hard to consider his statements to be "without flattery," but this was the customary mode of dedication addressed to a patron.

Just as it is clear that Lord Radcliffe had more than one client, the reverse was also true, that a writer could have more than one patron. I shall cite one more example from Dryden. *A Discourse Concerning the Original and Progress of Satire* (1693) was dedicated to

[3] In the early 1740s Pope was offered an honorary degree from Oxford University, but he declined it on the grounds that his friend Warburton was denied the same honor. See *Corr*., 4:362 and 436-38.
[4] Steinberg 1996, 108.
[5] Dryden 1900, 2:1.
[6] Ibid., 8.

a different patron, the Earl of Dorset and Middlesex. Dryden devotes the first pages of his *Discourse* to describing his patron's relationship with his clients:

> Mere acquaintance you have none; you have drawn them all into a nearer line; and they who have conversed with you are for ever after inviolably yours. This is a truth so generally acknowledged, that it needs no reproof: 'tis of the nature of a first principle, which is received as soon as it is proposed; and needs not the reformation which Descartes used to his; for we doubt not, neither can we properly say, we think we admire and love you above all other men; there is a certainty in the proposition, and we know it. With the same assurance I can say, you neither have enemies, nor can scarce have any; for they who have never heard of you, can neither love or hate you; and they who have, can have no other notion of you, than that which they receive from the public, that you are the best of men.[7]

Dryden provides a list of the formidable qualities which he believes the Earl possessed, and later, he adds that the Earl is: "the restorer of poetry, the greatest genius, the truest judge, and the best patron." In addition, just as he claims to address Lord Radcliffe "without flattery," he writes to the Earl: "You who, without flattery, are the best of the present age in England."[8] Of this dedication to the Earl, Niall Rudd has commented: "I only observe that the man [Dryden] who could grovel like that before a very minor figure was in no position to sneer at Horace for being 'a court slave.'"[9] For the modern reader, the praise heaped upon praise appears to be overdone, and we may be prone to suspect insincerity in Dryden's acknowledging more than one patron in like manner. However, we must bear in mind the conventions of the era. Dryden was in all likelihood not the only poet who addressed his patrons in this manner, and we must rather acknowledge these statements as evidence that to write under a patron was no easy occupation. S.H. Steinberg states of writers in Europe: "Until the middle of the eighteenth century it was considered bad manners to write for cash remuneration instead of for reputation."[10] In the era before writers dealt with agents in the print trade in which they negotiated upfront for their own income, a respectable way for writers to earn their means was to build a reputation for themselves by writing for a noble patron.

Patrons, in supporting writers, had their own needs to meet. Dedication of a work was an honor that served to increase their status, but historically patronage was comparable to commissioned work. Citing the example of the Earl of Leicester at Queen Elizabeth's court, Steinberg explains that he had nearly a hundred books dedicated to him but that most were "practical manuals, historical dissertations, religious tracts – in short, useful books, designed to further the causes in which the patron was engaged." He concludes that patronage was "far

[7] Ibid., 16.
[8] Ibid., 17 and 39. Dryden was not the only one to offer excessive expressions of praise and gratitude. Thomas Shadwell called the Duke of Newcastle, who was also Ben Jonson's patron, "the only Maecenas of our age" and dedicated his dramatic work to him. See Hammond 1993, 143 and references.
[9] Rudd 1994, 69.
[10] Steinberg 1996, 108.

less a matter of literary connoisseurship than of political propaganda."[11] Pope, of course, did not endorse such a custom. He wrote about politics but not propaganda for the state.

Of eighteenth-century England, Steinberg explains:

> In Augustan England patronage was as much a weapon of party politics as a means of furthering literature. Authors as well as their patrons can be distinguished fairly clearly on the party lines of Whig and Tory. Lord Somers, who drafted the Declaration of Rights in 1689 and the treaty of Union with Scotland in 1707, and Charles Montagu, Earl of Halifax, who ruled Exchequer and Treasury under William III and George I, befriended Addison, Steele, Congreve, Prior, Vertue, Locke and Newton in the Whig interest. Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, and Henry Saint-John, Viscount Bolingbroke, the Tory leaders under Queen Anne, bestowed their favours on Dryden, Pope and Swift. Whereas these men at least combined their services to a political group with genuine conviction, smaller men did not scruple to sell their pens and their consciences to the highest bidder.[12]

The line was not as clearly drawn as it seems here. As we shall see later, many of the Whig names mentioned befriended Pope at one time or another and some were even subscribers to his poetry. Nevertheless, as Steinberg states, politics infiltrated literature and patronage was connected to both. The content of a literary work produced by a client-writer had to satisfy his patron, whether for the patron's personal reputation or the political causes which he supported, if not both. While an aristocratic patron could provide sufficiently for a writer, there were reasons why writers turned to praise their current king too. First of all, the king represented the winning political faction, and therefore, as long as he remained on the throne, the writer knew what type of panegyric to compose in order to secure and maintain a living. As we will see, censorship laws, their enforcement, and severe penalties were not to be taken lightly. Secondly, the king was expected to supply more substantial support than an aristocratic patron for dedications which he received and approved. Contemporary with Pope, there was Laurence Echard's *History of England* (1701) which was dedicated to George I and for which Echard received £300 from the king. Several years after Pope's death, Benjamin Hoadly received £100 from George II for the comedy, *The Suspicious Husband* (1747), which was dedicated to him.[13] As we have seen in Chapter 4, the financial aspects of being a client or dedicating a work to a king served as a strong incentive to the courting of royalty.

Many famed English poets prior to the eighteenth century wrote under the patronage of aristocrats and royals. For reasons explained above, poets traditionally vied for the king's approval in order to sustain and enhance their literary career. One of Pope's preferred poets, Edmund Spenser (*c.* 1552-1599), presented his *Faerie Queene* to Elizabeth I in hopes of securing a royal patronage. If he succeeded in obtaining a pension, the procedure proved to be

[11] Ibid., 109.
[12] Ibid.
[13] Ibid.

a hard-wrought struggle as there were tensions between him and Lord Burghley, an influential secretary of the queen. Ben Jonson (*c*. 1572-1637), whom Joanna Martindale calls "an ambitious self-made man who established himself as court poet," wrote under the patronage of aristocrats including Elizabeth Sidney, daughter of Sir Philip Sidney, and Lady Mary Wroth, and in 1616 he was granted a yearly pension of 100 marks by King James I.[14] However, Jonson could not quite win the favor of Charles I, who succeeded his father and assumed the throne in 1625. In his "Humble Petition" to Charles I, he actually solicited an increase in his pension, a request which was eventually granted.[15] Edmund Waller (1606-1687) enjoyed a steady career in politics until he was arrested for involvement in Waller's Plot, which was a conspiracy against Parliament. He was exiled to France in 1643 and returned to England in 1651 when the banishment was revoked by the House of Commons. Soon after, he wrote *A Panegyric to my Lord Protector* in 1655 to Oliver Cromwell and in 1660 *To the King, Upon His Majesty's Happy Return*, to Charles II upon the Restoration, whereby he managed to secure a position in the House of Commons and maintained a stable political and poetic career thereafter. As can be seen, historically it was usual for poets to seek royal favor in order to secure their living and status. However, to obtain as high a pension as one wanted or expected and to remain in favor through changing monarchs and circumstances were no easy feats.

Conversely, the price to be paid for falling out of favor with the king and his state was not negligible. I return to Dryden as an example. As I mentioned previously, Dryden was Poet Laureate and Historiographer Royal until James II was dethroned. In this misfortune Dryden received the help of the Earl of Dorset and Middlesex. Although Rudd refers to the Earl as a "minor figure," he was certainly not so for Dryden. In *A Discourse Concerning the Original and Progress of Satire* (1693) Dryden explains:

> But being encouraged only with fair words by King Charles II, my little salary ill paid, and no prospect of a future subsistence, I was then discouraged in the beginning of my attempt… since this revolution,[16] wherein I have patiently suffered the ruin of my small fortune, and the loss of that poor subsistence which I had from two kings,[17] whom I had served more faithfully than profitably to myself; then your Lordship was pleased, out of no other motive but your own nobleness, without any desert of mine, or the least solicitation from me, to make me a most bountiful present, which at that time, when I was most in want of it, came most seasonably and unexpectedly to my relief. That favour, my Lord, is of itself sufficient to bind any grateful man to a perpetual acknowledgement.[18]

[14] Martindale 1993, 64.
[15] Peterson 1981, 31.
[16] In 1688.
[17] Charles II and James II.
[18] Dryden 1900, 2:38-39.

Although we can detect posturing and flattery on Dryden's part, this is meant to be a poignant confession. It is to be expected that any address to a patron would exhibit a humble attitude of inferiority, so as to show one's understanding of one's own position in the hierarchical structure of the system. It is also typical to include copious expressions of gratitude that, to modern readers, may seem overdone. Pope may have been able to relate to this situation of Dryden's, when religious faith posed difficulties and interfered with many aspects of life. However, his conclusion on Dryden's fate is summarized in *Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.1.213: "Unhappy Dryden!" Dryden's self-representation is also comparable to Horace's account, to be discussed later in this chapter, of his first encounters with Maecenas and the gratitude which he expresses towards his patron (*Sat*. 1.6.46-64). Patronage could provide security, in reputation and in remuneration, but situations were always liable to change. We are apt to think that Pope chose the hard route in insisting on his financial independence. While that is true in certain respects, English writers under patronage did not always enjoy an easy life either.

We shall now take a look at Pope and his own relations with patronage. It should be noted that, although Pope's choice of independence was unique in his time, he was not the only writer who managed to live without support and protection from a patron. Across the continent, Voltaire (1694-1778) in France and Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729-1781) in Germany supported themselves through their own writing without relying on patronage. In England, Samuel Johnson followed in the steps of Pope in the latter half of the eighteenth century. As for Pope, in addition to his innate talent, he was endowed with many good connections from a very early age. As I discussed in Chapter 1, he had many older friends such as Wycherley, Caryll, Walsh, Trumbull, and Henry Cromwell who encouraged his budding poetic gift and read his early drafts. With such influential and wealthy literary acquaintances, Pope would not have had difficulties finding a patron if he had wished and he did receive offers from members of the aristocracy. In 1738, long after he had secured a fortune from his translations of Homer, he describes his early career:

But does the Court a worthy Man remove?
That instant, I declare, he has my Love:
I shun his Zenith, court his mild Decline;
Thus SOMMERS once, and HALIFAX were mine. (*Dia. 2*, 74-77)

Lord Somers (1651-1716), a successful Whig politician, and Charles Montagu, the Earl of Halifax (1661-1715), poet and politician, had both proposed to become his patrons. However,

Pope turned down these offers.[19] Yet, as we can well imagine, matters were more complex than one simple decision.

While never on the verge of bankruptcy, Pope certainly did not live in a leisurely and financially comfortable state. The double taxes which were levied on Catholics were a serious matter of concern in Pope's family, compelling them to contemplate selling their property. Pope needed to earn money. However, it is equally clear that, as he had desired freedom of imagination in his poetry,[20] he wanted freedom of speech in his writing. To be a client-poet under a patron might have assuaged his financial concerns, but it would restrict what he would be allowed to write in his works. Pope knew of Dryden's financial status, that, as mentioned earlier, it rose and fell according to changing political situations. In the Horatian *Imitations*, Pope mentions the curbed freedom his predecessor experienced in writing under an aristocratic or royal patron.[21] Patronage had its own risks.

In addition, there was also personal scorn of the mainstream in which various artists essayed to make connections with the great:

The *Robin-red-breast* till of late had rest,
And children sacred held a *Martin*'s nest,
Till *Becca-ficos* sold so dev'lish dear
To one that was, or would have been a Peer. (40)
Let me extoll a *Cat* on Oysters fed,
I'll have a Party at the *Bedford Head*,
Or ev'n to crack live *Crawfish* recommend,
I'd never doubt at Court to make a Friend. (*Hor. Imit. Sat.* 2.2.37-44)

Pope's fame and fortune were secure by the time he composed this poem and the other *Imitations* in the 1730s. He expresses his opinions in a fairly free manner, and, in an ironic tone, he scoffs at those who attempt to win court favor: "I'll have a Party at the *Bedford Head* | … I'd never doubt at Court to make a Friend." Bedford Head was a famous gathering place in Covent Garden where writers and playwrights dined and conversed. Apparently among the many artists who frequented Bedford Head were those who wished to secure connections with potential patrons in order to pursue and enhance their career.

The Latin equivalent in Horace's original has no mention of writers:

tutus erat rhombus tutoque ciconia nido,

[19] Lord Somers also offered financial assistance to Dryden in his translation of *Virgil* (*TE*, 4:384). For the Earl of Halifax, see ibid., 371. He was a subscriber to Dryden's *Virgil*. He also subscribed for ten sets of Pope's translation of the *Iliad* (Spence 1966, 1:88). For his proposal of patronage to Pope, see ibid., 87-88. For Pope's polite reply of refusal, see *Corr*., 1:237 and Sherburn 1934, 64 and 126. Another figure who offered patronage was James Craggs (1686-1721), Secretary of State. He proposed numerous times a pension of £300 a year, from money which came from secret service funds (*TE*, 4:354).
[20] See Chapter 2.
[21] See Chapter 6.

donec vos auctor docuit praetorius. ergo,
si quis nunc mergos suavis edixerit assos,
parebit pravi docilis Romana iuventus. (*Sat*. 2.2.49-52)

The turbot was safe, and the stork kept a safe nest,
so long as the authority of the praetor instructed you.
Therefore, if now somebody was to proclaim that roasted seagulls are sumptuous,
the Roman youth, easily swayed by perversities, will comply.

This is a passage in which Horace speaks on the topic of food in order to illustrate certain points. First of all, he advocates the simple life, not one blinded by luxury, including food. Based on this, he criticizes how people, particularly the young, are easily persuaded into thinking that one type of fowl is better than another, not because of its taste, but simply because an authority ("praetorius") claims it as such.[22] Instead of judging for themselves people allow themselves to blindly follow the verdict handed down by those with power in society. In addition, these trends go rapidly out of fashion according to the judgment of an authority: "Tutus erat rhombus tutoque ciconia nido, | donec vos auctor docuit praetorius." Pope faithfully takes up Horace's example of foods by mentioning fowls newly introduced for eating (e.g. "*Robin-red-breast*") as well as those that are considered delicacies (e.g. "*Becca-ficos*"). Using "till" where Horace uses "donec," he describes how the vogue shifts: "The *Robin-red-breast* till of late had rest, | … Till *Becca-ficos* sold so dev'lish dear." However, the image of writers mingling at an eatery and hoping for connections with the powerful is original to Pope. This addition inserted by Pope is an indication of his feelings towards patronage and of his scorn towards those who believe that their literary aspirations can flourish only when confined to that system.[23]

"Homer will at last do me justice," Pope claimed in a letter shortly after the first volume of his *Iliad* translation was published.[24] In addition to the fact that, as I have noted repeatedly, the independent route was no easy venture, we must also take into account his subscription publications. Although Pope's courage in aiming for independence should not be underestimated, the ingenious solution he came up with was to enlist the aid of his aristocratic connections yet at the same time to avoid the reins of patronage. In spite of the fact that "it did not succeed without a fight," no one can deny that Pope procured the support of many

[22] There is irony involved here, as this may refer to a certain Rufus who could not obtain the praetorship. His authority to persuade that eating *ciconiae* was safe and fashionable lasted only while there was still the expectation that he will become praetor. See Fairclough 2005, 140-41.
[23] See also *Dia*. 1:70 and ibid. 2:181-84.
[24] *Corr*., 1:297.

influential people.[25] He had not only aristocrats but also such renowned figures as Isaac Newton on his list of subscriptions. In the Preface to his first volume of the *Iliad* from 1715, following a list of those who encouraged and assisted him in the translation, including Addison, Bolingbroke, the Duke of Buckingham, the Earl of Carnarvon, Congreve, Garth, Halifax, Harcourt, Parnell, Rowe, Stanhope, Steele, and Swift, he states: "In short, I have found more Patrons than ever *Homer* wanted."[26] He knew that he needed support which was similar to patronage, but he managed to secure it without succumbing to the system or a pension. Furthermore, for his translation of the *Odyssey* a few years later, he won a Civil List grant of £200, which in all probability could not have happened without Walpole's consent.[27] His Homeric translations did not carry political overtones as did, say, the Horatian *Imitations*, but it is clear that he received assistance from both the Court and government. Pope took the independent path. He did not choose to excel in his poetic career with the support of a patron. While both of these statements are true, the reality was more that he took a middle course between the two.

On a final note, it may be worthwhile mentioning that Pope lauded those who endeavored to embark on their literary careers without support from the powerful, even if they found themselves required to rely on patronage at some point. His praise of Shakespeare in his Preface to his edition of 1725 includes: "[Shakespeare] writ to the *People*; and writ at first without patronage."[28] In *The Sixth Epistle of the First Book of Horace Imitated* Pope commended Viscount Cornbury, Lord Hyde, for having refused a court pension which his brother-in-law had obtained for him.[29] However, Pope also recognized that his situation and success were unique, and he did not express disapproval of his contemporaries who wrote under patrons. One of his closest friends, Swift, wrote for Sir William Temple and also had a patron, Robert Harley, the Earl of Oxford.[30] Another friend, John Gay, had as patrons William Pulteney and the Duke and Duchess of Queensbury. Pope understood that patronage was the only viable option for many in his era. He was ahead of his time, as literary patronage was gradually to expire in the eighteenth century and thereafter:

[25] Fairer 1989, 5.
[26] *Prose Works*, 1:255.
[27] Baines 2000, 25. Baines also states that "somehow he [Pope] managed to obtain the patronage of the King and the Prince and Princess of Wales for the *Odyssey*" (ibid., 190).
[28] *Prose Works*, 2:16.
[29] See *Hor. Imit. Ep*. 1.6.61. See also *TE*, 4:240-41n.
[30] See Elias (1982) for Swift's relationship with Temple. See Sherburn 1934, 73 for Swift's patronage under Harley.

One of the reasons for the disappearance of individual patronage was its inherent tendency towards confusing literary merit and political expediency. Even the eponymous patron of all patrons, Maecenas, gently made his Virgil, Horace, Propertius support and glorify the political programme of the Emperor Augustus.[31]

Steinberg claims that Maecenas steered the poets whom he took under his wings to celebrate the ultimate political ruler of their time, Augustus. Maecenas was for a long time a close associate of Augustus, and the new emperor was to take on the role as patron of his poets. However, Maecenas chose to remain a knight and did not actively immerse himself in Augustus' new realm.[32] Neither were all of his poets quite so eager to write panegyrics for their emperor.[33] It is time now to turn to Horace and his relations with patronage.

II. Horace's Ambitions and Process of Elimination: "periculosae plenum opus aleae"[34]

Horace had ambitions for success. He confesses in these famous lines that it was poverty that compelled him to turn to poetry: "paupertas impulit audax | ut versus facerem" ("Reckless poverty impelled me to write verses") (*Ep.* 2.2.51-52).[35] Having fought on the wrong side at the Battle of Philippi, he claims that he returned to Rome only to find his paternal home and land confiscated (*Ep.* 2.2.49-51). Though feeling destitute with "wings clipped" ("decisis pennis") (*Ep.* 2.2.50), Horace was still able to procure the position of *scriba quaestorius*.[36] The Battle of Philippi took place in 42 B.C.E., and Horace, through his friends Virgil and Varius (*Sat.* 1.6.55), met Maecenas around 38 B.C.E.[37] It could well be that he was looking for something more prestigious than a career as a *scriba quaestorius*.[38] However, as seen in the first chapter, Horace's insistence on poverty is an image which he wishes to present in his

[31] Steinberg 1996, 109.
[32] Seager 1993, 30.
[33] Cf. Horsfall: "Very few panegyrics and contemporary historical epics were in fact composed" (1981, 10-11).
[34] *Carm*. 2.1.6.
[35] Rudd 1993, 88 claims that this statement was made "half-jokingly." Although one must always treat with circumspection the accuracy of Horace's biographical statements in all of his works, unless otherwise indicated with evidence, I conduct my discussion in this chapter in acceptance of the validity of the information which Horace presents in his poetry, including his relationship with Maecenas.
[36] According to Suetonius' *Vita Horati*. Gordon Williams 1994, 401 suggests that the families of Horace, Gaius Asinius Pollio, and Gaius Trebatius Testa were involved in the Social War in 91-88 B.C.E. and that it may have been Pollio, through these family associations, who helped obtain the post of *scriba quaestorius* for Horace.
[37] Mention of the two paired together is also found at *Ep*. 2.1.247 and *AP* 53-55. On the delayed response by Maecenas ("revocas nono post mense," *Sat*. 1.6.61) and his possible absence from Italy to meet Octavian and Antony, see Du Quesnay 1984, 21 and Griffin 1993, 16.
[38] Cf. Anderson 1982, 58: "Horace had failed to make a successful political start because he chose the losing side at the battle of Philippi, and about the same time his father lost his money and died. Without money and political support, Horace had no chance of success in ordinary ambitions." He also states that around the time Horace made his publication debut with his first book of *Satires* he was "an ambitious young poet eager for patronage" (ibid., 56).

poetry. Even after the confiscation of his property, he was certainly not impoverished nor without an income. Rather, his decision to take up poetry reflects his ambitions to be a part of the Roman elite. In this section I discuss Horace's choice of language, genre, and personal associations, as well as his manner of *recusatio*, and I demonstrate that, like Pope, Horace was calculating in his social ascent.

First we take a look at Horace's choice of language:

atque ego cum Graecos facerem, natus mare citra,
versiculos, vetuit me tali voce Quirinus,
post mediam noctem visus, cum somnia vera:
'in silvam non ligna feras insanius ac si
magnas Graecorum malis implere catervas.' (*Sat*. 1.10.31-35)

And when I myself, born on this side of the sea, was writing little verses in Greek,
Quirinus, appearing after midnight, when visions are real,
forbade me in such words:
"You would not be more foolish to carry logs into the woods,
than if you wish to enlarge the great throng of Greeks."

Although born in Italy ("natus mare citra"), there was a time when he tried his hand at Greek verses ("Graecos facerem… versiculos"). Perhaps Horace did so in his days of study in Rome and Athens. He recounts that one night Quirinus appeared in a dream and warned him that there were already enough Greek or Greek-writing poets ("magnas Graecorum… catervas"). In the words of Quirinus, one could not be more foolish, or madder ("insanius"), to attempt more in Greek. Though put in the words of the deity Quirinus, this is a clear manifestation of Horace's aspirations in which he saw that if he wished to make a name as a poet, he could not do so in Greek and should write in Latin instead.

Horace claims that it was Quirinus who forbade him. "Vetuit" signifies an order. Here it is in the negative, a prohibition; "vetuit" imposes a restriction and gives instruction of what not to do. The deity does not tell him what he should do, but it is a divine calling, and a Roman one at that, that acts as guidance for Horace.[39] It seems that by mentioning the dream Horace, in an oblique manner, masks his real ambitions. In addition, Quirinus was originally a Sabine god of war but associated with Romulus in Horace's time. All in all, it seems relevant that it was an Italian deity who forbade the Italian-born Horace to write in Greek, thus ushering him towards a career in writing poetry in Latin and about Rome.[40]

The dream is also an echo of Callimachus' encounter with Apollo. It is an irony that the passage bears Greek influence, but the significance lies in that Callimachus advocated

[39] Cf. Virgil's version of a calling from the Muse in *Ecl*. 6.3-5.
[40] Cf. Gowers: "Greek literature is full: all that remains is satire" (2012, 323).

short and sophisticated poetry. This serves to emphasize Horace's statement earlier in that poem: "est brevitate opus" ("[Poetry] needs brevity") (*Sat*. 1.10.9), and it also strengthens his criticism of Lucilius later on the need for clarity and concision (*Sat*. 1.10.50-51).[41]

Horace has disclosed that it was an Italian god who guided him in his choice of language. He goes on to explain his choice of genre:

arguta meretrice potes Davoque Chremeta
eludente senem comis garrire libellos
unus vivorum, Fundani; Pollio regum
facta canit pede ter percusso; forte epos acer
ut nemo Varius ducit; molle atque facetum
Vergilio annuerunt gaudentes rure Camenae:[42] (45)
hoc erat experto frustra Varrone Atacino
atque quibusdam aliis melius quod scribere possem,
inventore minor; neque ego illi detrahere ausim
haerentem capiti cum multa laude coronam. (*Sat*. 1.10.40-49)

Fundanius, you alone of those living are able to chatter politely in scripts
about the sly prostitute and Davus eluding the old Chremes;
Pollio sings of the deeds of kings in triple-beat rhyme;
intense Varius takes the lead in brave epic, as nobody has;
the Muses rejoicing in the country have granted to Vergil tenderness and elegance.
This, which was attempted in vain by Varro of the Atax and certain others,
was what I could write better, though inferior to the inventor;
nor would I dare to remove the crown fixed to his front with much acclaim.

Fundanius, under the influence of Terence, was a writer of New Comedy. The dialogue with Horace in *Sat*. 2.8 attests to their friendship as well as the fact that both were included in the aristocratic circle of Maecenas. Gaius Asinius Pollio (76 B.C.E. – 4 C.E.), although initially active in politics and military campaigns, refused to take sides before the Battle of Actium in 31 B.C.E.[43] An orator and historian as well, he is lauded here for his works as a tragic playwright. Lucius Varius Rufus composed tragedy and epic, one of which was *De Morte*.[44] Through the mouth of Lycidas, Virgil had humbly confessed in his *Eclogues* (9.35-36) in 38 B.C.E. that he saw himself as no match for Varius in epic. Virgil had begun his career with the publication of the *Eclogues*. His celebration of the "rus" (45) caught the attention of Maecenas, for it was while Virgil was composing the pastoral dialogues that Maecenas became his patron and encouraged him to write the *Georgics* and later, with Augustus, the *Aeneid*. Publius Terentius Varro Atacinus, who wrote *Bellum Sequanicum* about Julius Caesar's campaigns against Ariovistus and also translated Apollonius Rhodius' Greek

[41] See Zetzel 2002, 38-40. See also Kahane (1994) and Harder (2012) on Callimachus.
[42] *Camena* was an ancient Italian divinity associated with a spring near the Porta Capena in Rome. See Hinds 1998, 52-63 on the difference between the Italian *Camenae* and Hellenistic *Musae*.
[43] See Haselberger (2002).
[44] His *Theystes* of 29 B.C.E. was commended by Quintilian (*Inst. Orat*. 10.1.98). It is recorded in the *didascalia* of codexes Par. 7530 and Casanatensis 1086 that the prize won was a million sesterces (La Penna 2009, 396).

Argonautica into Latin, had also attempted satire.[45] The "inventore" of satire is, of course, Lucilius, who wrote in the last half of the second century B.C.E.

Thus, to summarize, comedy, tragedy, epic, and the pastoral already had a reputed writer in the genre. Such was Horace's method of elimination. He also pays tribute to his fellow renowned poets, in his humble confession that he had no talent to compete with or occupy a seat alongside them in their respective genres. However, this did not mean that Horace did not want to occupy a place among them. He did. He desired to join in their ranks as the foremost in satire. Yet his ambitions extended beyond becoming a first-rate poet. It also entailed joining the Roman elite, and this is made more apparent when we think of the names which are *not* mentioned. Jasper Griffin has shed light on others who studied Lucilius and expressed an interest in satire: Pompeius Lenaeus, Curtius Nicias, Valerius Cato, and Furius Bibaculus.[46] The first two are not mentioned in Horace's works.[47] Scholars have pointed out that Horace, in his desire to join the elite ruling circle of Rome, did not want his name to appear alongside those of inferior social status: "Greeks, freedmen, *grammatici*."[48] Pompeius Lenaeus was a *grammaticus* and a freedman of Pompey. Curtius Nicias' origins are uncertain, but he was bred in Greek culture and was very possibly a freedman. Valerius Cato was a poet and *grammaticus*, and though he claimed to be a freedman the truth remains uncertain.[49] Bibaculus was Cato's friend and composed discourteous verses about Julius Caesar and Octavian rather than praise. The carefulness with which Horace, who reiterates time and again his origins as a freedman's son (see next section), distances himself from those of socially humble status demonstrates his ambition to make his ascent in the Roman social hierarchy by becoming a poet under a patron.

At the end of *Sat*. 1.10, Horace lists the names of those whose approval he wishes to obtain ("probet," 82; "laudet," 83). In the realm of poets, there are: Plotius Tucca; Varius; Maecenas; Virgil; the elegiac poet Valgius Rufus, who was consul in 12 B.C.E.; poet and historian Octavius Musa; and Aristius Fuscus (*Sat*. 1.10.81-83). Among politicians and aristocrats, he names: the Visci brothers, both senators; Pollio; the famous patron M. Valerius

[45] See Griffin 1993, 6 for his lack of mention of M. Terentius Varro, writer of the Menippean satires.
[46] Ibid., 4-5.
[47] Although Quintilian classified Bibaculus as an iambic poet alongside Catullus and Horace (*Inst. Orat.* 1.10.96), Horace calls him a "turpidus Alpinus" ("a bombastic Alpine [writer]"), in his depiction of Achilles' killing of Memnon in his *Aethiopis* and his epic on the Gallic Wars in *Sat.* 1.10.36-37. Horace also parodies him in *Sat*. 2.5.41.
[48] Griffin 1993, 4. Peter White 2007, 200 also notes the absence, apart from fictional figures, of Roman women as friends in Horace's poetry.
[49] Suet. *Gram.* 11, with Rawson 1985, 270.

Messalla Corvinus, of the Valerian gens and consul in 31 B.C.E.; his brother; C. Calpurnius Bibulus, most probably a step-son of Brutus; Servius, possibly the son of Servius Sulpicius Rufus; and Furnius, consul in 17 B.C.E. (85-86).[50] These were the men Horace wished to become acquainted with.[51]

In the same poem he expresses his scorn for actors and singers, who were regarded as holding lowly professions in society. Demetrius (10, 79, 90) is a trainer of actresses. Hermogenes Tigellius (*Sat*. 1.2.3; 1.3.4; 1.3.129; 1.4.72; 1.9.25; 1.10.18, 80, 90) is a musician who entertained Julius Caesar and Cleopatra; he was a freedman from Sardinia. In the final lines of this poem, which also closes the first book of *Satires*, Horace orders them both to go sing for schoolgirls (*Sat*. 1.10.90-91). The verb "iubeo" (91) already asserts Horace's authority, that he considers himself to be in a position to give orders to these men, and he makes the distinction that he is a writer for the elite whilst the actor and singer should entertain pupils in schools. Demetrius and Tigellius are never mentioned again after the first book of *Satires*.[52]

However, there is an irony here. Horace states explicitly that he does not intend to write *carmina* only to be studied in schools (*Sat*. 1.10.74-76). He makes his goal clear: "satis est equitem mihi plaudere" ("it is enough for me that one knight applaud") (76). He wants the approval of Maecenas and, by extension, the Roman upper class. Only, Horace here is quoting the words of an actress ("ut…Arbuscula dixit," 76-77). Arbuscula was a *mima* who was popular in Cicero's time.[53] He is thus admitting that his intentions are the same as those of actors and singers whom he openly despises.[54] What this reveals is that Horace is conscious of his inferior origins. He would not receive the gift of the Sabine farm until around 33 B.C.E., and at the time of his first publication he does not yet feel that his position is secure. He is still an underdog, struggling to break through the barriers of his humble background. By providing,

[50] Tucca and Varius prepared the publication of the *Aeneid* after the poet's death. Messalla (64 B.C.E. – 8 C.E.) was once proscribed in 43 B.C.E. but survived and transferred his allegiance to Mark Antony and then to Octavian. He was never quite on good terms with the future emperor and in fact Augustus is never mentioned in the poetry of one of his major clients, Tibullus. Messalla's brother was L. Gellius Publicola, consul in 36 B.C.E. Tucca, Varius, and Valgius Rufus also had as patron Maecenas.
[51] Zetzel 1980, 71 notes that the persona in the first book of *Satires* is "elitist and rude." The recurrence of these members also occurs in the poet's journey to Brundisium, in the accompaniment of Maecenas (*Sat*. 1.5.27, 31, 48), Plotius (40), Varius (40, 93), and Virgil (40, 48). Similar faces appear at Maecenas' dinner banquet in *Sat*. 2.8, attended by Fundanius yet which Horace missed (Maecenas, 16, 22; Fundanius, 19; Viscus Thurinus, 20; Varius, 21, 63), although by this time Horace had been comfortably accepted into this circle.
[52] The sole exception may be a slave named Demetrius who appears in *Ep*. 1.7.52. Note that the name Demetrius is also Greek, not Roman.
[53] Cic. *Ad. Att.* 4.15.
[54] But see also Rudd 1993, 77.

and publishing a list of the ranks of poets which he wants to join and of the Roman aristocratic patrons which he desires to be associated with, he makes his goal public. He is determined to succeed.

Horace was also calculating in his choices in one other respect, the *recusatio*,[55] here in his avoidance of epic. Sander Goldberg comments of this genre in ancient Rome: "epic was written for and eventually even written by the Roman elite whose education best equipped them to reap literature's rewards. Epic's claim to literary status is what we expect of it."[56] It was a promising genre to write in if one was aiming for fame and success. While Varro of Atax and Furius Bibaculus did compose poems on Julius Caesar's Gallic wars, Goldberg explains that there were dangers inherent in writing about historical and political matters and that "Roman poets of the 20s had learned to keep epic at a distance."[57] Unlike Virgil, who drew inspiration from Homer, Ennius, and Apollonius Rhodius and whose dream it was to compose an epic (*Ecl*. 6.3), Horace knew that he would not turn to epic. He is cautious about his newly secured position in the aristocratic circle. Although he would later branch out into other genres as well, his initial choice of genre was confined to satire.[58]

In *Sat*. 1.10, Horace had paid a humble tribute to epic writers who were also his literary friends. Some twelve years later around 23 B.C.E., he tells Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa, a noted military general and son-in-law of Augustus,[59] that his deeds would be better written in an epic by Varius ("Scriberis Vario… Maeonii carminis alite," *Carm*. l.6.1-2). He explains his reason:

nos, Agrippa, neque haec dicere nec gravem
Pelidae stomachum cedere nescii
nec cursus duplicis per mare Ulixei
        nec saevam Pelopis domum

conamur, tenues grandia, dum Pudor
imbellisque lyrae Musa potens vetat (10)

[55] See Nisbet and Hubbard 1970, 81-83; Nisbet and Hubbard 1978, 179-83; Lyne 1995, 31-39. See also Clauss (1985) for Horace's *recusatio* as a possible allusion to Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*.
[56] Goldberg 2005, 43.
[57] Ibid., 21. In describing the era of the civil war and consolidation of power that followed, Syme explains: "The signs of the melancholy future of eloquence were plainly to be read. Oratory would degenerate into the private practice of rhetoric: in public, the official panegyric. Freedom of speech could never return" (1939, 246). See also Feeney who describes Horace in *Ep*. 2.1 as a poet who was becoming "a pioneer in a new mode of unavoidably polite and (self-)restrained expression" (2009, 377).
[58] Although both satire and epic are composed in the hexameter, satire employs the plain style. For examples of elisions of monosyllables and repetitive pronouns in Horace that are more characteristic of the language of comedy rather than the high style of epic and tragedy, see Anderson 1982, 23-25. Cf. also Muecke: "Epic and satire can be presented as opposites on two interconnected grounds, style and purpose. Epic is written about heroes in the grand style, satire about scoundrels in the low style" (1995, 212).
[59] His third wife was Julia the Elder, a daughter of Augustus. His grandson was Gaius Julius Caesar, who became the Emperor Caligula, and his great-grandson was Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus, the Emperor Nero.

laudes egregii Caesaris et tuas
culpa deterere ingeni. (*Carm*. 1.6.5-12)

I attempt, Agrippa, slight as I am, not to tell these glorious accounts
nor the deep wrath of Achilles who was incapable of yielding,
nor the journeys of complex Ulysses across the sea,
nor the savage house of Pelops.

As yet, modesty and the powerful Muse of the peaceful lyre
forbid me to dilute your glories
and those of illustrious Caesar
due to the inefficiency of my talent.

Horace confirms his decision to not write epic, either on the Trojan War (5-7) as Homer had done. He will not write tragedy either, as Varius had done on Agamemnon and the house of Pelops (8). He gives lack of talent as his reason ("tenues grandia;" "culpa ingeni").[60] Although it seems on the surface a humble confession to admit one's limits and capacities as undeserving to write on a topic of such illustrious grandeur, we know that there are other factors that underlie this statement.

Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa (*c*. 63–12 B.C.E.) came from a prominent Roman family.[61] Although the family was not active in politics, he was acquainted with Octavian from his youth and was present alongside him at many of the major battles. His military career went as far back as the Battle of Munda, during Julius Caesar's campaigns against Gnaeus Pompeius in 46 to 45 B.C.E.[62] After the political alliance tranditionally known as the Second Triumvirate was established in 43 B.C.E., Agrippa began his political career as a Tribune of the Plebs and thus became a member of the Senate. Octavian appointed him as urban praetor in Rome, governor of Transalpine Gaul, then consul in 37 B.C.E.[63] Elected to serve as an aedile in 33 B.C.E., Agrippa joined Octavian's pursuit of Antony, and Agrippa's superb military and naval command contributed in large part to Octavian's triumph at the Battle of Actium on 2 September 31 B.C.E. Agrippa also served in suppressing an uprising during the Cantabrian Wars,[64] but that was only in 19 B.C.E., several years after the first three books of

[60] Cf. Seager's view that Horace's rejection of epic and tragedy is "an indirect assertion of a preference for other values: moderation and adaptability, loyalty and reconciliation, the sanctity of family life and a hope that men can sometimes put the evils of the past behind them and make a fresh start" (1993, 26).
[61] Agrippa became the son-in-law to Augustus, father-in-law to Tiberius, maternal grandfather of Caligula, and maternal great-grandfather of Nero. Maecenas was not on good terms with Agrippa, and this may be the reason why he is mentioned only in *Carm*. 1.6 and in a cursory remark in *Ep*. 1.12.26.
[62] Suet. *Aug*. 94.12.
[63] He served a second and third consulship with Octavian in 28 and 27 B.C.E.
[64] The long-lasting conflict in Hispania is mentioned by Horace in *Carm*. 2.6.2; 2.11.1; 3.8.22; and 4.14.41. Passing mention of Agrippa's conquest in 19 B.C.E. is found in *Ep*. 1.12.26.

Horace's *Odes* were published (23 B.C.E.).[65] Likewise, at this time Horace would not have known that Augustus provided for the education of all of Agrippa's children, the future members of the Julio-Claudian dynasty, or that he put Agrippa's remains in his own mausoleum despite the fact that Agrippa had built one for himself.[66] However, it would have been more than apparent to Horace, even when preparing the first three books of his *Odes*, that, as Agrippa was a close associate of Octavian both in politics at Rome and in military campaigns abroad, to write of Agrippa's feats would necessitate the depiction of Octavian as well. Octavian would have to be included as one of the characters.

Horace does not wish to take on such a heavy, and risky, burden.[67] He says that his Muse is "imbellis" (*Carm.* 1.6.10), peaceful and not fit for war.[68] His Muse, his poetic gift, lies not in epic, which treats national history, and therefore battle scenes, and which highlights heroes in war. So where does his "Musa imbellis" exercise her talent best? His answer is the conclusion to the poem:

nos convivia, nos proelia virginum
sectis in iuvenes unguibus acrium
cantamus, vacui sive quid urimur,
non praeter solitum leves. (*Carm.* 1.6.17-20)

I sing of banquets and the empty battles of eager virgins
with their sharpened nails in pursuit of the young men;
whether I am inflamed by anything,
I am none but my usual light self.

Horace prefers to sing of company and food at banquets ("convivia") and of games of girls chasing boys ("proelia"), not of military conquests. He wants to sing of "light" matters ("leves"). He likes to write lyric poetry. It is not that Horace denounces epic and war topics. He asserts that epic on contemporary history should be written, only he urges another poet to carry out the task. The reasons he gives for his refusal to compose an epic on Agrippa's deeds are, then: the inadequacy of his talent for epic and his preference for writing about love and not about war.

Horace employs a similar tactic when asserting his preference to compose lyric poetry in the *Ode* addressed to his friend and Virgil's patron Pollio.[69] However, rather than urging a

[65] See Nadeau (2008) on politics in the first three books of the *Odes*.
[66] Cassius Dio, 54.28.
[67] Although in *Carm.* 1.12, addressed to Augustus, he does contemplate composing verses on Romulus and the history of Rome (lines 33-48). However, Horace employs the verb "dubito" (*Carm.* 1.12.35), thus evading a firm declaration to do so.
[68] See *Carm.* 2.12, 2.13, and 4.15 for other instances of his refusal to write about war.
[69] Cf. Virgil, *Ecl.* 4.8.

fellow poet to compose epic, he advises Pollio to stay away from writing on recent historical events:

Motum ex Metello consule civicum
bellique causas et vitia et modos
ludumque Fortunae gravisque
principum amicitias et arma

nondum expiatis uncta cruoribus, (5)
periculosae plenum opus aleae,
tractas et incedis per ignis
suppositos cineri doloso.

paulum severae Musa tragoediae
desit theatris: mox, ubi publicas (10)
res ordinaris, grande munus
Cecropio repetes cothurno,

insigne maestis praesidium reis
et consulenti, Pollio, Curiae,
cui laurus aeternos honores (15)
Delmatico peperit triumpho. (*Carm.* 2.1.1-16)

The civil riot since the consulship of Metellus,
the causes, evils, and extent of war,
Fortune's sport,
the weighty friendships of the leaders,

and arms tainted with blood not yet expatiated,
a work full of dangerous gamble,
you handle and you advance through fires
covered by treacherous ashes.

May the Muse of grave tragedy be absent
only a little while from the theatres:
soon, when you will have set in order public affairs,
you will reclaim your sublime gift with the buskin of Cecrops,

Pollio, a singular protector
of gloomy defendants and of the advising Senate,
to whom the laurel brought forth
immortal honors in Dalmatian triumph.

Pollio, in addition to being a tragic playwright, was also a historian. However, his work on contemporary history, although it served as an important source for Appian and Plutarch, is now lost. It was from the time of Metellus' consulship in 60 B.C.E. ("ex Metello consule") that the tides of civil war infiltrated Rome. Pompey, Caesar, and Crassus formed the First Triumvirate. They took over the powers of the senate and the Roman Republic began to crumble. By the time this *Ode* was composed and published around 23 B.C.E., the Battle of Actium had taken place and Octavian had taken the imperial title of Augustus in 27 B.C.E. The fact that Horace mentions Cato's suicide after Thapsus in 46 B.C.E. ("atrocem animum Catonis," 24) and Jugurtha (28) gives us some indication of the content of the work, yet we do

not know the tone of Pollio's history nor which events were actually chronicled.[70] But Horace had his reasons to caution his friend.

Pollio was most likely of plebeian descent, and, although he would eventually withdraw from public life, as a young man he was active in politics and military campaigns. He sided with Julius Caesar in the civil war between Caesar and Pompey, but, following Caesar's assassination in 44 B.C.E., Pollio was defeated by Sextus Pompeius.[71] Despite his initial hesitation as to which side to take in the ensuing civil war between Antony and Octavian, in the end he joined Antony's forces.[72] However, when asked by Octavian to participate in the Battle of Actium, he was unable to rid himself of his deference to Antony and refused the request. A republican at heart, he never quite won Augustus' favor, or did not attempt to do so. That his work of history is based on very recent events is attested in Horace's claim that Pollio is walking "per ignis | suppositos cineri doloso" (7-8). The casualties and ruins lie in ashes. However, these ashes are *dolosi*, cunning and wily; their end was brought by treacherous means, and they lie in bitterness. Moreover, there is still fire ("ignis," accusative plural) lying beneath the ashes. On the surface the *cineres* may give an impression of destruction completed, a tragedy of the past. Yet matters have not quite cooled or calmed. Underneath, there is still fire, or metaphorically, enmity and rage. There is still the possibility that the remaining tensions may turn into violent conflict and provoke another civil war. Horace daringly, since this is a poem for publication, calls Pollio's history "periculosae plenum opus aleae" (6). This could well be taken to mean that the wars which Pollio describes are full of risks, with their treacheries, betrayals, and bloodshed. But it is not the content to which Horace refers. It is Pollio's producing such an "opus" that is a gamble and carries heavy risk.[73] For himself, Horace knows better than to dwell on the dangers of writing about politics and war.

Horace does not discourage the composition of history. Employing the same tactic as he did for himself in *Carm.* 1.6 to Agrippa, he presents his argument in such a way that the writer, Pollio, is presented as more skilled in a different genre, Attic tragedy ("Cecropio…

[70] Cf. Nisbet's and Hubbard's explanation that Pollio's lost *Historiae* had as its principal subject the civil war which began in 49 B.C.E. but that Pollio also attempted to describe the causes and the manner in which it happened (1978, 8 and 13).
[71] Cassius Dio, 45.10.
[72] Cic. *Ad Fam.* 10.32, 33.
[73] Cf. Pollio's expressions of fear before Augustus as one who has the power to proscribe, recorded in Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, 2.4.21.

cothurno," *Carm.* 2.1.12),[74] and that is why he dissuades him from writing about recent wars. He is only steering the writer towards the field in which his Muse exercises her talent best ("severae Musa tragoediae," 9). In addition, I think it very probable that Horace, as a good friend of Pollio, knew that he was not on the best of terms with Augustus. As if to remind the audience of his abilities as a statesman and a military leader, Horace in the *Ode* upholds Pollio's efforts in public affairs ("publicas res"). He highlights his consulship in 40 B.C.E.[75] ("consulenti") and his military triumph, alongside Octavian, on the Adriatic coast in 39 or 38 B.C.E. while serving as governor of Illyricum ("Delmatico triumpho").

Finally, as if to emphasize once again his own reasons for not turning to epic and history, he concludes the poem with a call to his own Muse to write about love:

sed ne relictis, Musa procax, iocis
Ceae retractes munera neniae,
mecum Dionaeo sub antro
quaere modos leviore plectro.[76] (*Carm.* 2.1.37-40)

But, brash Muse,
when the jests have been laid aside,
lest you take up again the gifts of Cean incantation,
seek with me, in the cave of Dione's daughter, verses with a lighter lyre.

Horace claims that he likes to joke and play and presents himself as leading a life free of cares. He states that it is only after he has played enough that he will call his Muse and turn to work. He is not so interested in lyric poetry in the style of Simonides of Ceos ("Ceae… neniae"), but wants to write about his favorite subject: love.[77] As in the conclusion to the *Ode* to Agrippa (*Carm.* 1.6.20), he states his desire to write, or sing, to a tune on a lighter lyre. He claims that he wants to write about lighthearted and merry matters. Indirectly, he is making the statement that he wants to deal with nothing serious and complicated like politics and wars. This is in fact ironic, because Horace in the *Odes* often alludes to political events in history and expresses concern and praise for Augustus' present campaigns.[78] What is important to recognize that, for Horace, his priority was to maintain his position as public poet. Thus he incorporates just enough material to prove his support for Augustus' regime, such as *Carm.*

[74] Cf. Virg. *Ecl.* 8.10.
[75] Although he later abdicated.
[76] *Plectrum*, figuratively the lyre, was said to have been invented by Mercury who was also related to patronage.
[77] Venus.
[78] For past wars, see, for example, *Carm.* 1.15, 1.37, 2.7, 3.3; for Augustus' efforts, see *Carm.* 1.2, 1.12, 1.35, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.14, 4.2, 4.4, 4.5, 4.14, and 4.15

1.37 on the fall of Cleopatra and Augustus' conquests especially in the third and fourth book of the *Odes*, but it is in fact with reluctance that he does so.[79]

It is not that Horace did not believe in the importance of celebratory poems on heroic national deeds. He encourages young Valgius to write about Augustus' exploits: "potius nova | cantemus Augusti tropaea | Caesaris" ("Let us sing with more vigor, of the recent trophies of Augustus Caesar") (*Carm.* 2.9.18-20). C. Valgius Rufus wrote elegies on the loss of love, but, although the verb is plural ("cantemus," "let us sing"), Horace is not willing to join in the authorship of poems on political matters which may interfere with the safety of his status.[80]

Horace says a similar thing to another youth, Julus Antonius (43–2 B.C.E.), son of Mark Antony:

concines maiore poeta plectro
Caesarem, quandoque trahet ferocis
per sacrum clivum merita decorus
fronde Sygambros. (*Carm.* 4.2.33-36)

You, a poet of a greater lyre,
shall sing of Caesar, when he,
glorious with a deserving garland,
drags the fierce Sygambri over the Sacred Hill.

Horace describes the works of lofty Pindar in the first half of the poem (1-27) and explains that he regarded his style as a model for his own poetry (27-32). The *Ode* is addressed to Augustus, but in the passage above Horace is speaking to Antonius. He heaps praise on him as a poet with a greater lyre than Pindar ("maiore poeta plectro"). By extension, he places Antonius above himself as a poet in ranking him above his own model, Pindar. He urges the young man to sing of Augustus ("Caesarem"). Given that Antonius married Augustus' niece Claudia Marcella Major and that he had written an epic on Diomedes, it may seem fitting that a man of so close a relation should sing of the emperor's recent conquests.[81] The poem was written in anticipation of Augustus' return from his campaigns in Gaul and Spain in 13 B.C.E. Horace imagines the celebratory scene as the emperor marches up the "sacrum clivum" (the Sacred Hill) to the Capitol with the captured Sygambri. However, Horace's role on this occasion is rather passive:

tum meae, si quid loquor audiendum,
vocis accedet bona pars et 'o sol
pulcher, o laudande!' canam recepto

[79] See, in particular, Lyne (1995) on this view.
[80] Valgius followed a political career and became consul in 12 B.C.E.
[81] Antonius himself served as praetor in 13 B.C.E., consul in 10 B.C.E., and Asian proconsul in 7 B.C.E. Although favored by Augustus, his scandal with Augustus' daughter Julia was uncovered in 2 B.C.E. Tried for treason, he received a death sentence and committed suicide.

Caesare felix. (*Carm*. 4.2.45-48)

Then if I have anything worth hearing,
a good part of my voice will rise, and I shall sing,
"O beautiful day! O this should be praised!,"
happy with Caesar's return.

He will willingly celebrate the emperor's feats and return to Rome, but he will not write about them. The image which we get is of Horace as a spectator in a large crowd of those cheering as Augustus parades his way up the Hill.

In the two *Odes* to his accomplished contemporaries, Varius and Pollio, Horace stresses that his talent and predilection lie in lyric poetry. In the *Odes* to Varius and Antonius, Horace avoids writing about national events by conferring the task to others, under the pretext of their being more talented than him. In the two *Odes* to the young poets, Valgius and Antonius, he urges them to sing of the emperor's contemporary deeds but again refuses to write such a poem or epic himself. However, the real reason is, as he confesses to Pollio, that writing contemporary history is too risky ("periculosae plenum opus aleae"). Horace's avoidance of epic, then, is an indication of his avoidance of writing that touches on powerful Roman military and political leaders, whose elite circle he has managed to join despite his origins and failed military career.[82] Even a sincere commendation runs the risk of being misinterpreted as a slight. However, Horace is clever enough to realize that no mention of them would do any good either. This may run the risk of provoking them on the grounds that the poet does not care to write about them. It is thus that he explains in his poetry his reasons for not undertaking epic, and, in order to demonstrate his belief that national heroes should be celebrated in verse, he encourages others to do so. Horace is determined to remain a poet, but in no way does he wish to jeopardize his hard-won position.[83] This firm stance did not change throughout his days as a client-poet:

Phoebus volentem proelia me loqui
victas et urbis increpuit lyra,
ne parva Tyrrhenum per aequor
vela darem. (*Carm*. 4.15.1-4)

Apollo snapped the lyre
on me wishing to speak of battles and conquered cities,
lest I set my puny sails
across the Etruscan Sea.

[82] For other instances, not mentioned in this section, of Horace's refusal to write epic, see *Carm*. 1.12.33-44, in which he expresses his hesitation (*dubito*) to write about Romulus, the Tarquins, and the Punic Wars, and *Ep*. 2.1.250-59, in which he supplies again the explanation of his insufficient talent for epic.
[83] For this idea, see, in addition to Lyne (1995), Anderson 1982, 36 and 122 and Goldberg 2005, 165. See Seager 1993, 24 for possibilities that Maecenas forbade Horace to write about politics.

These are the opening lines of the *Ode* addressed to Augustus and the last poem published in his literary career. In order to avoid dangerous risks under a powerful patron, he continued in his manner of the polite *recusatio* to the end of his career.

III. The Will to Succeed: "libertino patre natum"[84]

Horace's process of elimination with regards to poetic genre and topic was intricately entwined with politics. He nonetheless required a patron in order to pursue his poetic career and thus to enhance his status as being among the elite. Patrons were most often those with power and prestige in society, and as such, the system of patronage was bound up with political powers. In the previous section I touched on Horace's determination to succeed. There is more to be said on his ambitions as they relate to his humble background. W.S. Anderson has stated that Horace, as a freedman's son, knew "better than to involve himself in politics."[85] His astuteness, as discussed in the previous section, did not come about so easily. It was knowledge gained through various struggles prior to his finally settling on a career as a poet. However, as his status became secure in the aristocratic circle, he increasingly found himself the object of envy.[86] I wish to explore in this section the topics of patronage and success as seen from the angle of Horace's journey as a self-made man. While Horace was not quite a business man like Pope, I believe that there is a resemblance between them insofar as they were people of rather disadvantaged circumstances, so-called outsiders, who paved their roads to prosperity and recognition from the highest ranks by means of their poetry.

In this section I focus on how Horace looked back on the struggles of his early life as they are expressed in his poetry. As W.S. Anderson has pointed out, "Horace does not tell us about the difficulties he encountered in the years between the military disaster and his successful meeting with Maecenas, who became his friend and patron."[87] Rome of the 30s B.C.E., though still in the midst of civil tumult, presented many opportunities for social ascent hitherto deemed impossible. Ronald Syme has stated of Salvidienus Rufus and Agrippa: "ignoble names and never known before, they were destined for glory and history."[88] For

[84] *Sat.* 1.6.6.
[85] Anderson 1982, 122. See also Syme: "Republican *libertas*, denied to the *nobiles* of Rome, could not be conceded to a freedman's son" (1939, 254).
[86] Cf. Bowditch: "Status depends, to some degree, on the envy of those who possess less" (2001, 46).
[87] Anderson 1982, 60.
[88] Syme 1939, 129.

Horace, it was a period in which, in the words of Jasper Griffin, "The glittering career [in the army] had not materialised, and the promising young upstart came home with his tail between his legs."[89] He is fortunate enough to meet Maecenas, but in *Sat.* 1.6, Horace insists on the *libertinus* status of his father and claims that there are some who pester him about who his father was:

ut me, libertino patre natos (*Sat.* 1.6.6)

like me, sons born to a freedman father

'quo patre natus?' (*Sat.* 1.6.29)

'What father was he born to?'

quo patre sit natus (*Sat.* 1.6.36)

what father he may have been born to.

This reaches its climax as he repeats his humble background in two successive lines:

Nunc ad me redeo libertino patre natum,
quem rodunt omnes libertino patre natum. (*Sat.* 1.6.45-46)

Now I return to myself, son of a freedman,
whom all slander as the son of a freedman.

While upholding the moral virtues of his father in *Sat.* 1.4, the rank his father held in the class-based society of Rome was a different issue. Here Horace poses as one with frustration arising from the humiliation which he suffered between his military and poetic careers. As we shall see in the next section, he cleverly steers the poem into expressions of gratitude towards Maecenas who rescued him from his downfall.[90] At the time of the publication of *Sat.* 1.6, or the first book of *Satires* in 35 B.C.E., Horace had become a protégé of his wealthy patron, but Robin Nisbet suggests that it was not until Horace was comfortably settled in the gift of the Sabine farm that he was finally able to renounce "the angry convictions of his youth."[91] However, although there may be sincerity in his words, we must always keep in mind that this is Horace as he describes himself in his poetry. It is a part of his posturing, that he presents himself as one who has learned the pain of failure and who knows how to grit his teeth in times of humiliation. Horace insists that he was not a prim court poet who sashayed his way effortlessly into the ballroom of the Roman upper classes.

[89] Griffin 1993, 3.
[90] Anderson describes Maecenas as "a new kind of father" to Horace (1982, 60).
[91] Nisbet 1984, 9.

As mentioned earlier, Horace's success in gaining entry into the aristocratic circle may be seen if we compare the list, in *Sat*. 1.10.81-90, of those whose favor he wishes to gain, with the list of those present at the dinner party which, though having missed it himself, he describes in *Sat*. 2.8. Significant changes, sure signs of progress for the poet, had occurred between the publication of the first book in 35 B.C.E. and the publication of the second in 30 B.C.E. It was still another few years later in 23 B.C.E. that his first three books of the *Odes* were published, and in *Carm*. 2.7 he addresses a fellow soldier Pompeius, who was there alongside Horace when they experienced the defeat at Philippi. The unraveling of his own story takes place gradually. Anderson states of this *Ode*: "From the vantage point of success twenty years later, Horace no longer interpreted Philippi as a personal disaster, but as a divine blessing… By the time he wrote *Carm*. 2.7 (at least a decade after the early satires), he could represent his survival as miraculous preservation."[92] In the poem, emphasis is placed on the togetherness of the soldiers in extreme circumstances ("mecum," 1; "tecum," 9), and the central theme of the *Ode* rests on friendship (27-28). It is not only that Horace has overcome the "personal disaster" of Philippi, but also that he no longer feels any reservations about publicly revealing that he had fought on the side of Brutus, a name which he explicitly mentions (2). Any unambiguous mention of a real historical figure who had become an enemy of the current political power carries risk.[93] It is important to recognize that, even in full cognizance of the fact that Maecenas and Augustus would inevitably be his readers, Horace did not feel that he was jeopardizing his position in any way. It took many long years not only for Horace to become a client-poet under a patron, but also for him to feel confident that he would remain in their favor.

Securing and maintaining good connections with patrons were an important aspect of a literary career in ancient Rome. However, patronage was not a system that involved only the patron and poet. As Phebe Bowditch has pointed out, it was in fact a "triangular relationship of poet, patron, and 'public' audience."[94] We turn once again to Horace's relationship with the public, not so much in terms of readers, but more in terms of other writers and parasites who

[92] Anderson 1982, 60.
[93] See Moles (1987) for the idea that Horace in fact depicts Brutus as an incompetent military general in *Carm*. 2.7. Another example may be *Sat*. 1.7. The focus of the poem is not on politics, but it is apparently an early piece and thus the fact that Brutus' name appears twice (18, 33) seems rather risky. Horace's reason for the insertion of the poem in his first collection is not easily discernible. Fraenkel, on the grounds that it is Horace's shortest satire, argues that the poet simply "decided to fill up his book of satires by the insertion of a few additional pieces" (1957, 119). Rudd has called the satire a "failure" and suggests a broad range of dates, between 40 and 35 B.C.E., for its composition (1966, 66). H.R. Fairclough 2005, 89 is of the opinion that the satire must have been written before the Battle of Philippi in 42 B.C.E.
[94] Bowditch 2001, 3.

wished to enjoy the advantages of a higher life.[95] Previously, I have discussed Horace's anger against those who pointed their finger at him when he was rendered destitute in the early 40s B.C.E. As he regains his reputation, this time as a poet, Horace begins to notice that the tides have reversed and that he is now the object of envy.

Horace met Maecenas around 38 B.C.E., and apparently it did not take long for word to go around town that he was connected with one of the most important figures of Rome. Already in *Sat*. 1.9, Horace describes a fellow, whom he knows only by name ("notus mihi nomine tantum," 3) and who claims to be a scholar ("docti sumus," 7), who, instead of deriding him for his humble birth, follows him through the main streets of Rome, all the while pleading for a propitious introduction. The man, whom Horace only identifies as "quidam" (3), has already heard that Viscus and Varius are among his friends (22-23). He even contemplates abandoning an appointment with a plaintiff over a lawsuit (35-38, 40-41) so that he can continue to follow Horace. Horace reproduces the man's plea:

… 'Maecenas quomodo tecum?'
hinc repetit: 'paucorum hominum et mentis bene sanae;
nemo dexterius fortuna est usus. haberes
magnum adiutorem, posset qui ferre secundas,
hunc hominem velles si tradere.' (*Sat*. 1.9.43-47)

"How does Maecenas behave with you?"
After this, he demands anew: "Of few men and of thoroughly sound judgment,
nobody made more skillful use of his fortune.
You might have a grand aide, who could bring you secondary roles,
if you wish to hand over this man."

Maecenas the aristocratic patron is whom he ultimately wants to reach. As a direct encounter seems unlikely, his tactic is to gain an introduction by acquainting himself with Horace (45-47), who, from whatever source, he has learned is an established client of the great patron. As one can see, status brings status. That is, to have connections with someone of aristocratic status can enhance one's own status, even if it does not mean that one becomes an aristocrat. Overall, Horace recounts the episode of the run-in with this man as a rather unpleasant experience. However, while it is true that he feels pestered, the encounter itself is not a threatening confrontation. Nor does Horace receive harsh criticism from the follower. Matters do not remain as calm as his status and career advance.

In the second collection of the *Satires* five years later, Horace claims that his continuing client-patron relationship with Maecenas invites unwelcome remarks:

[95] See Damon (1995) for the origin of "parasite" in ancient Greek culture, and subsequently in Roman comedy and satire.

an, quodcumque facit Maecenas, te quoque verum est
tantum dissimilem et tanto certare minorem? (*Sat*. 2.3.312-13)

Whatever Maecenas does, do you also do,
although the truth is that you are so dissimilar and rank so much less?

Sat. 2.3 is Horace's longest satire and it is in dialogue form, with Horace and Damasippus as the speakers. Damasippus, who appears in Cicero's epistles, is a dealer in works of art and property. In this poem, Horace presents him as a broker whose speculations have failed and who is now facing bankruptcy.[96] The poem was composed around the time Horace received the gift of the Sabine farm in 33 B.C.E., and his relations with Maecenas were getting better and stronger. Damasippus is aware of this (*Sat*. 2.3.10 and 308), and he makes it clear that the poet should not assume that he will avoid envy ("invidiam," 13). In this passage, he accuses Horace of living an aristocratic life with Maecenas, as the poet, it is to be presumed, accompanies his patron and engages in many entertainments and activities of elite society. As Damasippus points out, their social status could not be more different ("dissimilem") and Horace undeniably occupies the inferior position ("minorem"). However, this should not be construed as one of the familiar attacks on his origins. Horace did not have aristocratic rank, but he managed to become one of the lucky few to join Roman high society as a client of an aristocratic patron.

In yet another satire from the second book, Horace describes how he is recognized by the public as a regular companion of the knight Maecenas:

Septimus octavo propior iam fugerit annus
ex quo Maecenas me coepit habere suorum
in numero, dumtaxat ad hoc, quem tollere raeda
vellet iter faciens et cui concredere nugas
hoc genus, 'hora quota est?', 'Thrax est Gallina Syro par?',
'matutina parum cautos iam frigora mordent' (45)
et quae rimosa bene deponuntur in aure.
per totum hoc tempus subiectior in diem et horam
invidiae noster. ludos spectaverat una,
luserat in Campo: 'Fortunae filius!' omnes. (*Sat*. 2.6.40-49)

Already the seventh year, nearer the eighth, will have fled,
from when Maecenas began to have me in his crowd,
at least in consequence of this, as one whom he would wish
to take on his coach when making a journey,
and to whom he would wish to confide trivia of this sort:
"What time is it?" "Is the Thracian chicken a match for Syrus?"
"The cold spells of the morning are nipping those who aren't careful enough;"
and these are deposited thoroughly into a leaky ear.
Through all this time and continually, I have been increasingly subject to envy.
Did he watch the games together, did he play in the Campus: "Son of Fortune!" All say.

[96] Cic. *Ad Att*. 12.29, *Ad Fam*. 7.23; Hor. *Sat*. 2.3.18-26.

Horace counts the years since he met Maecenas and was included in his circle (40-41). Like many other social exchanges, patronage was intricately linked with power and money and as such, we cannot exclude entirely the possibility of exploitation by the powerful, of those from inferior backgrounds. However, as we shall see in detail in the next section, it seems that Horace shared a genuine friendship with Maecenas. Horace is a constant companion on the road (43-44), and the patron turns to the poet to ask mundane, quotidian questions such as the time (44) and the results of a cockfight (44) and to mumble passing comments on the weather (45). [97] Companionship was a part of the patron-client relationship, but these scenes demonstrate the casual and relaxed manner in which Maecenas interacts with his client.

Under such circumstances, envy is again something which he cannot help but notice ("invidiae," 48). Horace states that now he perceives that jealous eyes are on him at all times: "per totum hoc tempus… in diem et horam" (47). Those eyes are curious and Horace is aware that they are on the watch for every public appearance he makes with his patron (48-49).[98] However, envy does not always take the form of malevolent remarks. Horace also realizes that people treat him with admiration. He is regarded as a lucky man: "Fortunae filius!" (49). Horace goes on to describe that some tell him that he is a being close to the gods (*Sat*. 2.6.52), that is, to the powerful political rulers of Rome, and they assume that, because of such connections, he has heard the most recent information on wars and policies from the topmost leaders (50-58). Horace claims that all he can think of is to leave the city and return to his beloved country estate ("o rus," 60), but he must also have felt pride and pleasure in being able to stand so high in the estimation of others. He is an object of both envy and admiration.

In the second book of *Satires*, which corresponds to the years in which his reputation and his bond with Maecenas are solidified, Horace wavers between contentment at how his life has turned out ("bene est," *Sat*. 2.6.4), and the envy expressed in the form of stinging remarks, an unwelcome consequence of his joyous success. In contrast to *Sat*. 2.6, in which he basks in the peaceful calm of his new status and country farm, he describes his inconsistent behavior, as told by his slave Davus:

… si nusquam es forte vocatus
ad cenam, laudas securum holus ac, velut usquam (30)

[97] Bowditch explains some of the duties expected from a client-poet: "greeting their patron in the morning *salutatio*, providing companionship on a journey or at a dinner, or listening to the literary efforts of their superiors" (2001, 25). Similarly, Horsfall comments on *Sat*. 1.5: "The presence of clients and friends in the entourage of great men on such journeys is entirely traditional" (1981, 2).
[98] The *lex Roscia* of 67 B.C.E. reserved fourteen rows of the theater to the *equites*. Based on this, Augustus' *lex Iulia theatralis* provided for separate sections in the theater for different social classes. See ibid., 93 and references.

vinctus eas, ita te felicem dicis amasque
quod nusquam tibi sit potandum. iusserit ad se
Maecenas serum sub lumina prima venire
conviviam: 'nemon oleum fert ocius? ecquis
audit?' cum magno blateras clamore fugisque. (35)
Mulvius et scurrae tibi non referenda precati
discedunt. (*Sat*. 2.7.29-37)

If by chance you are called nowhere for dinner,
you praise carefree vegetables and, as if shackled when you go anywhere,
thus you claim that you are happy and you love yourself,
because you do not have to drink anywhere.
If Maecenas were to call you late at twilight to come to his place as a guest:
"Does no one bring me lantern oil more quickly? Does no one at all hear me?"
You babble with great clatter and you flee.
Mulvius and his jesters depart,
having said curses which must not be reported to you.

Sat. 2.7 revolves around a dialogue between Horace and Davus. It is the Saturnalia in Rome, and Davus says that, though a willing and obedient slave, he has many things which he wishes to point out to his master (*Sat*. 2.7.1-2). One of his observations is on Horace's hypocrisy. He praises the good old times but, if given the choice, he would refuse to return to those days (22-24). The passage cited is an example. Davus sees his master happily dining at home on a simple, meager diet. Yet if he were to receive an unexpected invitation for a dinner party at Maecenas', he would swiftly call for the lantern and go out into the night. Even if he had guests at his own house, such as the parasite Mulvius, he would quickly abandon them to be at Maecenas' side. Understandably, this makes Mulvius upset, and Davus, as the slave who is presumably left to care for them at the house with an absent owner, witnesses the rambling curses of Mulvius, the exact words of which he dares not reveal to his master. Davus accuses Horace for his inconsistency, but perceives that his master is overly compliant to Maecenas, his master's master.

This is similar to the biting remark of Damasippus previously seen in *Sat*. 2.3.312-13. We must take into account that both Damasippus and Davus are Horace's own creation. The speeches of these characters serve to show Horace's awareness that in the eyes of certain others he appears to be willingly servile to his patron. The accusatory tone of Damasippus and Davus contains indignation, which stems from envy. There is no expression of admiration. Through the characters of Davus and Damasippus, Horace demonstrates that he is aware of this.

Circumstances change again as the poet further enhances his reputation and his place in the aristocratic milieu. The first three books of the *Odes* were published another seven

years later around 23 B.C.E. Horace describes how the rich now look to become friends with him:

at fides et ingeni
benigna vena est pauperemque dives (10)
me petit: nihil supra
deos lacesso, nec potentem amicum

largiora flagito,
satis beatus unicis Sabinis. (*Carm.* 2.18.9-14)

But there is faith, and a bounteous vein of talent,
and the rich seek me, though poor:
I do not incite the gods for anything more,
nor from an influential friend

do I demand anything in larger quantities,
I am happy enough with my one and only Sabine lands.

Horace states that the rich seek him: "dives | me petit" (10-11). Once "an ambitious young poet eager for patronage" who pursued aristocrats, he is now the one to be sought out by the wealthy.[99] The *Ode* is one of many poems by Horace which advocates a simple life and preaches against a blind and avid accumulation of capital as one's goal in life. The poem, nevertheless, is not a criticism of the moneyed upper classes. While Horace cites good faith and his poetic gift as his merits, he maintains a humble attitude in calling himself poor: "pauperem" (10). On the one hand, this may be construed as his show of humility before the wealthy of noble birth, but it also serves to accentuate his belief in the simple life. Horace maneuvers his statements in a very clever manner. He makes clear the inferior position which he occupies, declaring himself a poor man (10), and thus silently upholds the wealthy, including his patron Maecenas. He thanks Maecenas for the Sabine farm, as he loves the country, but, citing his philosophy of frugality, he insists that he has enough and wishes for nothing more (11-13). Horace walks the fine line between thanking his patron for the gifts received and refusal of more. This delicate balance between gratitude and resistance will be the focus of the next section.

IV. Horace's Gratitude and Resistance: From Maecenas to Augustus

In the previous section, I discussed patronage as it relates to Horace and the perceptions of others due to his success. The price for his success is that he becomes a prime target of envy,

[99] Anderson 1982, 56. See Chapter 6 for Horace's declaration that he has lived among the great ("me | cum magnis vixisse," *Sat*. 2.1.75-76) and Pope' rendering ("I live among the Great," *Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.133).

but the advantage is that he has influential friends to take his side. This section will concentrate on a discussion of the poet's relations with the patrons themselves. In the beginning, I will explain the nature of Roman patronage in the first century B.C.E., namely the use of *amicus* instead of *patronus* and *cliens*. Following this, I will discuss the *amicitia* between Horace and Maecenas. I shall introduce passages from his poetry in which he expresses unaffected gratitude and praise towards Maecenas.[100] On the other hand, there are passages in which he openly expresses resistance to his patron's requests. These differ fundamentally from the previously discussed mode of *recusatio*, as the resistance which he exhibits is devoid of hesitation or fear. Rather, they serve as evidence of the sincerity with which Horace communicated with his patron. I shall demonstrate that the two seemingly opposed aspects, of gratitude and resistance, combine to become manifestations of the genuine friendship shared between Horace and Maecenas.

At the conclusion of this section, I will embark on a discussion of Horace's relations with his new patron, Augustus. In his poetry, there are differences in expression and tone in the ways in which he presents Maecenas, an *eques*, and Augustus, the *princeps*. In contrast to the relaxed style of his interactions with Maecenas, Horace knows that he has a much more precarious foothold once Augustus becomes his new and primary patron in his later career. In the discussion I wish to show how Horace's two patrons exemplify different types of patronage that existed in ancient Rome. No patron-client relationship was one and the same. The differences which Horace expresses towards his two patrons in his poetry will serve to illustrate this, and the discussion will also serve as a prelude to the next three chapters which deal with Horace's relations with politics and the new ruler Augustus.

I have touched briefly on Horace's sentimental tone in *Sat*. 2.6.40, in which he counts the years since he has known Maecenas. Mention of his patron was frequent in his early poetry as well, and in the oft-quoted autobiographical poem, *Sat*. 1.6, Horace embarks on a fairly long tale of his first encounters with Maecenas:

nunc quia sim tibi, Maecenas, convictor, at olim
quod mihi pareret legio Romana tribuno.
dissimile hoc illi est, quia non, ut forsit honorem
iure mihi invideat quivis, ita te quoque amicum, (50)
praesertim cautum dignos assumere, prava
ambitione procul. felicem dicere non hoc
me possim, casu quod te sortitus amicum;
nulla etenim mihi te fors obtulit. optimus olim

[100] Albeit my insistence on the sincerity of the friendship, I do not completely deny that there are aspects in which "the poet's relationship to his powerful friend and protector was a problem that dogged Horace for his entire career" (Traina 2009, 304; see also ibid. for his extensive references on the Horace-Maecenas relationship).

Vergilius, post hunc Varius dixere quid essem. (55)
ut veni coram, singultim pauca locutus
(infans namque pudor prohibebat plura profari),
non ego me claro natum patre, non ego circum
me Satureiano vectari rura caballo,
sed quod eram narro. respondes, ut tuus est mos, (60)
pauca. abeo; et revocas nono post mense iubesque
esse in amicorum numero.

Magnum hoc ego duco
quod placui tibi, qui turpi secernis honestum,
non patre praeclaro sed vita et pectore puro. (*Sat.* 1.6.47-64)

Now, because I belong to you, Maecenas, my companion,
because I once served as tribune to a Roman legion.
The former is different from the latter, because, although perhaps
anyone may rightly envy me for the office, but not for you being my friend,
you who are particularly careful to take in the worthy, those far from improper ambition.
I would not be able to declare that I was lucky in this,
that I won you as a friend through mere chance;
for no accident presented you to me;
once the excellent man Virgil, and after him Varius, said what kind of man I was.
When I came in person, having spoken singly only few words,
for speechless shame kept me from saying more,
that I am not the son of a famous father,
that I do not ride the countryside on a Saturnian horse,
I tell you what I was. You answer little, as is your manner:
I depart, and nine months later you call me back
and order that I be counted among your friends.
I regard this a great honor, that I pleased you,
you who distinguish the honest from the foul,
not by a noble father, but by the way of life and pure heart.

Already in his first collection of poetry, Horace refers to Maecenas as his *amicus* (50, 53). They became "friends." The Latin terms *patronus* and *cliens* were not used to refer to the parties involved in literary patronage in Rome.[101] Part of this lies in the fact that poets such as Horace, Tibullus, and Propertius were affluent enough to not require financial compensation through their poetry.[102] Instead, poets were considered to be *amici*, participating in both social and household activities, such as in the morning *salutatio*.[103] As there was no official code or system, the relationship is hard to define.[104] We know that the relationships of *amicitia* were reciprocal. The poets secured an audience, and the patrons had a medium for publicity. The

[101] White 1993, 30-31 provides three definitions for *patronus*: an orator or lawyer of a defendant in a case, a slaveowner who has manumitted a slave, or a sponsor of a corporation or town. He explains that a *cliens* is one who receives the services or protection from a *patronus*.
[102] See Gold 1987, 6.
[103] For use of the term *amicus* by other Roman writers, see White 1978, 80-81.
[104] See White 2007, 196-97 and 1993, 5-14; and Saller 1982, 1. Regarding Horace and Maecenas, Horsfall, citing Horace's language in *Sat.* 1.6.61 that Maecenas summoned him back ("revocas") and ordered him ("iubes"), argues that the "line between *amicus*-'friend' and *amicus*-'client' should not be drawn" (1981, 5). On the other hand, Konstan, tracing the concept of friendship in Antiquity as far back as Aristotle, argues the contrary: "[Horace] regarded himself as Maecenas' friend. And friendship was something other than clientship" (1995, 329). See also Konstan (1997).

poets gained entry into a circle that was socially superior to their own, and they at times even received gifts such as Horace's Sabine estate. For the patrons, it increased their status to have associations with literate and cultured writers and philosophers and to show that they could afford to provide them with luxurious gifts. We also know that these relationships were voluntary, and in the first century B.C.E., it was allowed for a poet to have more than one patron, and patrons, more than one poet.[105] Horace considers himself to have been accepted as *one* member in Maecenas' circle: "in amicorum numero" (62).

Despite Horace's accentuation on the difference in social status, the passage shows the growing *amicitia* between the two. Horace in the lines preceding this passage explains that he was frequently jeered at as a freedman's son (45-46). He cites two reasons for the cause of envy by others: first, because Maecenas is now his companion ("convictor," 47), and second, because he had once risen to the rank of tribune in Marcus Brutus' army (48). As he sees it, the military rank is indeed an honor ("honorem," 49) for which others may understandably feel jealous ("invideat," 50), but the friendship with Maecenas ("amicum," 50) is a different matter. Maecenas is someone who looks out for merit in others ("dignos," 51) and for those who are not blinded by perverse ambition ("prava… ambitione," 51-52). These are words of praise which Horace offers to his patron regarding his intellectual insight and moral character.

Furthermore, Horace knows that others think that luck played a significant role in his meeting with Maecenas. The pestering follower in *Sat*. 1.9 ("nemo dexterius fortuna est usus," 45) as well as many others ("'Fortunae filius!' omnes," *Sat*. 2.6.49) emphasized the poet's "fortuna." However, Horace refutes this ("nulla… fors," *Sat*. 1.6.54). He claims that he feels that it was no chance encounter ("sortitus," 53). It is not that he was a lucky man, he insists, but he attributes it instead to the goodness of his fellow friends (55) and to the proper judgment of his patron (63).[106] Although, because of his modesty as well as a hint of shame ("pudor," 57), Horace could only mutter a few words (56-57), he managed to tell him honestly of his origins (58-60). Horace may well have felt that such a confession was a mistake, for he did not hear from Maecenas again until nine months later (61). As elsewhere in the poem, Horace insists on his birth status (45, 46, 58, and 64). He demonstrates his relief and admiration that the aristocrat valued his honesty ("honestum," 63) and judged him not by

[105] Gold 1987, 8 and 74 explains that this was not so in the third and second centuries B.C.E., when a one-to-one system of literary patronage prevailed. In the first century B.C.E., rather than individual patronage, literary circles evolved in which aristocrats and poets interacted with each other. It also occurred that if a poet fell out of favor with one patron, he would find another supporter. See also Reckford 1997, 586.
[106] Jasper Griffin 1993, 14 has noted the significance of Virgil in Horace's life; he is the addressee of *Carm*. 1.3, after Maecenas (*Carm*. 1.1) and Augustus (*Carm*. 1.2).

his origins but by the purity of his heart and lifestyle ("non patre praeclaro, sed vita et pectore puro," 64). Horace met Maecenas around 38 B.C.E. and the publication of this first book of *Satires* took place in 35 B.C.E. The lines are laid out in the present historical tense, because Horace remembers it as if it only happened yesterday and because the friendship does not belong to the past but is still the present. One can also sense that it is filled with the poet's hope that it will only get better and will be long-lasting. As much as I have concentrated on Horace's posturing as a humble social climber in the previous section, there is genuine sincerity to be detected in this passage, as Horace attempts to verbalize the gratitude and appreciation he feels for his newly found patron.

More than a decade later, Horace still looks back on the turbulent period of his life, here in more metaphorical language:

sed me per hostis Mercurius celer
denso paventem sustulit aere. (*Carm*. 2.7.13-14)

But swift Mercury lifted me, trembling in fear,
up in the thick sky and through the enemies.

Describing the state of affairs following the Battle of Philippi, he recalls being afraid ("paventem," 14). Yet Mercury, the inventor of the lyre and hence patron of poets, rescued him from the enemies and transported him into his new life as a poet.[107] One cannot help but overlap Maecenas with the image of Mercury in this passage.[108] The gratitude which Horace felt towards Maecenas remained in the poet for a long time even years after his reputation as a poet was firmly established.

Maecenas' name occurs frequently in Horace's poems, and his name often appears as the addressee in the opening poem of Horace's collections. *Sat*. 1.1 is addressed to him, as are *Epod*. 1, *Carm*. 1.1, and *Ep*. 1.1. The first lines of *Carm*. 1.1 are:

Maecenas, atavis edite regibus,
o et praesidium et dulce decus meum. (*Carm*. 1.1.1-2)

Maecenas, born of royal ancestors,
o both my protection and delightful glory.

As in the opening of *Sat*. 1.6, the patron's noble ancestry is highlighted. The difference in social position between his patron and himself is a contrast that Horace draws quite often. Horace also presents his own status as one of no noble rank in *Carm*. 2.20.5-6. Horace remained wealthy enough to procure a quaestorship, but it is still difficult to assess how the

[107] See Rudd 2004, 111n.
[108] Lyne 1995, 120 suggests a political metaphor with Mercury as Octavian who later pardoned the soldier Horace.

combined factors of being the son of a *libertinus,* elite education, fighting on the opposing side, and loss of assets could have affected his prospects. The poet does assume a submissive attitude in the face of his patron. However, there is also gratitude and respect, as he does not forget to include what Maecenas means to him. Horace calls him his protection ("praesidium," 2). He feels secure that Maecenas is and will be on his side. He inserts praise as well by calling his patron his glory ("decus," 2).[109]

The conclusion of this *Ode* also concerns Maecenas:

quod si me lyricis vatibus inseres,
sublimi feriam sidera vertice. (*Carm.* 1.1.35-36)

But if you include me among the lyric bards,
I shall knock the stars with my head aloft.

Horace dreamily discloses his poetic ambitions, of what an honor it would be if he could be counted among the nine Greek lyric bards – Alcman, Alcaeus, Sappho, Stesichorus, Pindar, Bacchylides, Ibycus, Anacreon, and Simonides.[110] What is important here is that Horace seeks recognition from Maecenas. It is evident to all that it is not Maecenas who judges whether a poet will join an ancient literary canon or not, and yet it is his judgment that counts for Horace. It is an indication that Horace believes that his patron has poetic taste. His claim that if he could receive such recognition from Maecenas, he will soar high in the sky in his joy and excitement, is a hyperbole. However, while this can be taken as adulation, I believe that it serves to demonstrate the ease with which the poet felt that he could interact with his patron.

I have thus far stressed Horace's positive descriptions of his patron in his poetry. However, no matter how much we attempt to grasp the true intentions of a writer in analyzing the tone and diction of his words, I feel obliged to concede that expressions of gratitude and praise nonetheless contain some amount of blandishment, that the elements of compliment and flattery are inseparable, or at least, quite often indistinguishable. I therefore do not wish to make an unfounded exemption for Horace, and certainly not on the grounds that he offers descriptions only of the noble deeds and good character of his patron. Nevertheless, in order to illustrate my argument that the client-patron relationship between Horace and Maecenas entailed one of special friendship, I introduce here certain passages which I believe only a devoted friend would write to his companion. We have already seen Horace's abhorrence of his past life as a soldier and his depressed state at his failed military career. To return to the

[109] See also *Carm.* 2.17.4 and 3.16.20.
[110] See Feeney 1993, 41-42.

battlefield would be the last thing which he would wish for, and yet he says the following to Maecenas:

libenter hoc et omne militabitur
bellum in tuae spem gratiae,
non ut iuvencis illigata pluribus (25)
aratra nitantur mea
pecusve Calabris ante sidus fervidum
Lucana mutet pascuis,
neque ut superne villa candens Tusculi
Circaea tangat moenia. (30)
satis superque me benignitas tua
ditavit. (*Epod*. 1.23-32)

I will willingly be a soldier
in this and every war
in the hope of being of your service,
not so that my plows may labor
with more heifers attached,
or that the livestock may shift
from Calabrian to Lucanian pastures before the hot star,
or that a shining villa may border
on the Circaean walls of upper Tusculum.
Your generosity has enriched me enough and beyond.

If it was for Maecenas ("in tuae spem gratiae," 24), the poet openly declares, he would serve in any and every war ("omne… bellum," 23-24). To be engaged in war would necessarily mean that he would be risking his life, but he claims that he would do it willingly ("libenter," 23). A few years later, Horace does extol the virtues of Lollius, the addressee of *Ep*. 1.2 and 1.18, who has served as a young soldier in the Cantabrian War of 25-24 B.C.E., but, except for the support which he shows for the campaigns of his new patron Augustus, which we shall see later, the poet never showed eagerness for war.

Furthermore, he explains that it is not reward which he seeks (25-30). He clarifies that by serving Maecenas ("in tuae spem gratiae," 24), he does not mean to ask for cattle ("iuvencis," 25), vast pastures ("pascuis," 28), or an extravagant villa ("villa candens," 29). He rules out as motive a furtive request for property by clarifying that such cannot be the reason, as his patron has given him enough, and more than enough ("satis superque," 31). Most of all, given all that he witnessed and suffered firsthand as a soldier, it is a bold statement that he would willingly return to those experiences for his patron.

Another yet more poignant statement is found in the next book of *Odes*:

ille dies utramque

ducet ruinam. non ego perfidum
dixi sacramentum: ibimus, ibimus,
utcumque praecedes, supremum
carpere iter comites parati. (*Carm*. 2.17.9-12)

That day will drive both of us to ruin.

I have not taken a false oath:
we shall go, we shall go,
whenever you take the lead,
to make the final journey as prepared companions.

For us who have the advantage of hindsight in looking back on history, we recognize this immediately as an ironic prophecy, as, if we are to believe in the accuracy of Suetonius' *Vita Horati*, Horace died on 27 November 8 B.C.E., only fifty-nine days after the death of Maecenas.[111] They did not quite make the "supremum… iter" (11-12) together, but their deaths took place only two months apart. Horace is not a poet who cannot wait to be freed by death from the obligations of a client to his patron, and he insists that he is disclosing his honest thoughts ("ego perfidum… dixi sacramentum," 9-10). He hopes to stay with Maecenas ("utramque," 8) until their very last day ("ille dies," 8), and he imagines a distant future in which they will both depart from the world (10). There is a repetition of "ibimus, ibimus" (10), the verb is in the future tense and, more significantly, in the first person plural. It is because Horace regards his patron and himself as "comites" (12). He considers Maecenas a companion.

Horace also cares for Maecenas' current duties and his well-being in the present:

tu civitatem quis deceat status
curas et urbi sollicitus times
quid Seres et regnata Cyro
Bactra parent Tanaisque discors.

prudens futuri temporis exitum
caliginosa nocte premit deus (30)
ridetque si mortalis ultra
fas trepidat. quod adest memento

componere aequus. (*Carm*. 3.29.25-33)

You worry about which constitution may be proper for the state and,
anxious for the city, you fear
what the Chinese and Bactra under Cyrus' reign may plot,
and the discordant Tanais.

The god foreseeing future time
covers the outcome in misty night,
and laughs if a mortal is startled by what is beyond his right to know.
Stay calm and remember

to settle what there is at present.

[111] According to the same account in Suetonius, Horace bequeathed, verbally, everything to Augustus.

Just as Agrippa was a right-hand man to Augustus in some of the major naval battles, Maecenas was for a long time a close associate. He was put in charge of the affairs of state at home while Augustus set out on military campaigns abroad, and this *Ode* describes one such instance.[112] Horace expresses concern about his patron-friend who worries about ("curas," 26) and even fears ("times," 26) what may happen to the Roman state ("civitatem," 25) and city ("Urbi," 26), and exhausts himself in his endeavors to keep everything well and safe in Augustus' absence. While Parthia could be a real threat to Rome, Bactra and Tanais were not, even though they were a matter of concern for Roman territories in the East. Furthermore, an invasion by the Chinese was by no means realistic.[113] Horace inserts it in order to illustrate the extent of Maecenas' overly anxious state. He explains to him that it is not a mortal's task but the duty of the god ("prudens… deus," 29-30) to oversee events which may take place in the future (29). He advises Maecenas to focus only on what is at hand in the present and to remember to keep a balanced mind (32-33). Horace reassures him and provides sound counsel as a compassionate man who cares for the well-being of his friend.

It is not, however, only kind words that the poet offers his patron. We shall now look at Horace's resistance to Maecenas which is expressed in his poetry. Not every example is serious, such as the excuse which the poet gives in *Epod.* 14.5-8 for not submitting iambics which he had promised to his patron. He cites "deus, deus" (6) as the reason for his tardiness. "Deus" here is Amor, the god of love. Horace is telling his patron that he was distracted in a love affair and that therefore he could not keep up with his writing. Nevertheless, many of the instances in which the poet assumes a defiant tone towards his patron involve an assertion of independence.

In the first *Epistle* addressed to Maecenas, Horace writes:

ac ne forte roges quo me duce, quo Lare tuter,
nullius addictus iurare in verba magistri,
quo me cumque rapit tempestas, deferor hospes. (15)
nunc agilis fio et mersor civilibus undis
virtutis verae custos rigidusque satelles;
nunc in Aristippi furtim praecepta relabor
et mihi res, non me rebus, subiungere conor. (*Ep.* 1.1.13-19)

And lest by chance you ask, under which ruler and in which hearth I protect myself,
obligated to swear allegiance to the words of no master,
where and at any time misfortune seizes me, I am deposited a guest.
Now I become active and I plunge into the civil tides,

[112] See also a similar passage in *Carm*. 3.8.16-28 in which Horace describes the wars in Dacia, Parthia, Spain, and Scythia between 29-26 B.C.E. and tells Maecenas not to worry too much about public affairs as he is, after all, a private citizen ("privates," 26).
[113] Cf. Rudd: "The threats from the Chinese are meant as fantastic" (2004, 213n.).

keeper of true virtue and a firm follower;
now I stealthily sail back to the precepts of Aristippus
and I try to yoke matters to me, not to be yoked by matters.

This is a daring statement to make, one which at first glance does not seem to be words appropriate for a client who is socially, and perhaps financially, dependent on his patron.[114] Horace knows that being a client means that he is protected ("tuter," 13) by one of superior status ("duce," 13). And yet he claims that he should not need to pledge to comply with the words of a master ("nullius addictus iurare in verba magistri," 14).[115] He then glides into the philosophic teachings of the Greek Aristippus (*c*. 435–*c*. 356 B.C.E.), founder of the Cyrenaic school and calls himself a "hospes" (15), a guest who belongs nowhere and to nobody. Rudd has noted the military language in this passage, but I believe that they contain echoes of the poet's own history as well.[116]

Engulfed by the tides of the civil war, he was once active in public service as a soldier ("agilis fio et mersor civilibus undis," 16). Line 16, headed by "nunc," describes one type of life. It was a life which Horace once chose to lead. The second "nunc" (18) signals a change. What Horace believes in now, following the sayings of Aristippus (18), is: "mihi res, non me rebus, subiungere conor" (19). He wishes to adapt to and control every circumstance, not to be controlled by it. Pursuit of joy and pleasure is acceptable, so long as one is not overtaken by one's own passions and can remain content with what one has at present.[117] The metaphor of the yoke illustrates unmistakably Horace's dilemma. Not only is it an image of a heifer attached to a heavy plow which he must pull, but, in the larger picture, a farmer, an owner, stands behind it. The heifer is not controlled by the plow but by the owner who determines his tasks and place. Horace does not wish to become like a heifer with no choice over his actions. "Conor" (19) suggests that this outlook towards life is not one which Horace has mastered yet but is work in progress. Nevertheless he makes his intentions clear to his patron.

In yet another letter addressed to Maecenas, Horace actually makes demands on his patron:

[114] Cf. Traina: "The entire first book [of the *Epistles*], and not just the first epistle, is also a *recusatio*, both direct and indirect, the longest and most difficult that the poet would address to Maecenas (2009, 306).
[115] See ibid., 292-93 and references for the meaning of "addictus" as an insolvent debtor who as a result becomes a slave to his creditor.
[116] Rudd 1989, 90-92. Many accounts about Aristippus are found in Diogenes Laertius. See Moles (2002) which discusses the influences of various philosophic schools, including Panaetian (Stoic), Epicurean, Aristippean, Cynic, and Socratic, in Horace's first book of *Epistles*. See also Moles (2007) for Horace and his relationship with different philosophic teachers in his other works. Moles' conclusion that, "Ultimately, Epicurean withdrawal is where Horace's own heart lies," applies not only to matters of philosophy but also in patronage and politics (2002, 157).
[117] See *Ep*. 1.17.23-24.

si me vivere vis sanum recteque valentem,
quam mihi das aegro, dabis aegrotare timenti,
Maecenas, veniam, dum ficus prima calorque
dissignatorem decorat lictoribus atris,
dum pueris omnis pater et matercula pallet. (*Ep*. 1.7.3-7)

If you wish me to live in good health and be properly capable,
the generosity which you bestow me when ill, Maecenas,
you will bestow me when *in fear of* becoming ill,
while the first figs and heat adorn the undertaker with his black lictors,
while every father and poor mother turn pale in worry over their children.[118]

In the opening of the letter, Horace apologizes for telling his patron he would stay in the country only for five days when he has in fact passed the whole of August there (1-2).[119] In another gesture of resistance, Horace argues that Maecenas must take heed of the poet's health. The poet himself concedes that Maecenas showed understanding when he is ill (4), but Horace here takes his request one step further. He says that the same attitude of benevolence should be shown to him when he is, not sick, but fearful ("timenti," 4) that he may become sick. In addition, it seems that, though in full cognizance of the tardy return (1-2), he still gives excuses to further delay the date. In the repetition of "dum… dum…" (5-7), he gives a description of funerals and images of children in danger of dying from the scorching heat, as if the same dark end would befall him if he were to attempt a voyage back to Rome now.

Later in the same letter, he imposes some unrealistic conditions on his patron:

dignum praestabo me etiam pro laude merentis.
quod si me noles usquam discedere, reddes
forte latus, nigros angusta fronte capillos,
reddes dulce loqui, reddes ridere decorum et
inter vina fugam Cinarae maerere protervae. (*Ep*. 1.7.24-28)

I also will maintain myself worthy of serving for your merit.
But if you will be unwilling that I should depart elsewhere,
you must restore healthy lungs, dark hair on my narrow brow,
you must restore your affectionate speech, restore the grace to smile,
and, amidst cups of wine, to grieve for the flight of brash Cinara.

Just as with the apology at the beginning of the letter, Horace first reasserts his duties. Like a good client to his patron, he announces that he intends to prove himself capable of serving his patron and winning his approval (24). However, with the clause "quod si…" (25), the tables are turned and the poet exhibits in no way a subservient attitude. Horace proposes that if Maecenas does not want him to go away, perhaps to another patron, he must restore his health

[118] My italics.
[119] Bowditch points out Horace's play on his absence of five days, in the sixth month (August), and seventh epistle (*Ep*. 1.7) and sees it as an instance of Horace cleverly "conflating literary or epistolary time with 'actual' time" (2001, 182).

(25-26), sweet manner of speech (27), and the willingness to smile (27). He should also make "nigros… capillos" grow back on Horace's bald head and graying hair (26).[120] It is as if Horace, the client, has the upper hand. These are at any rate impossible demands, for he is asking for restoration of youth in both Maecenas and himself.[121] Horace was forty-five years old at the time of the publication of this book of *Epistles*. Almost two decades had elapsed since he met his patron, and, though expressing the regretful wish that they were both still young, what he really hopes for is that their friendship will last. Overall, it is hardly conceivable that the letter would have truly upset Maecenas.[122] Their friendship indeed lasted a lifetime, as, in his last will and testament, Maecenas wrote to Augustus: "Horati Flacci ut mei esto memor" ("Be as mindful of Horatius Flaccus as you are of me").[123]

The statements of resistance which I have introduced serve, on the one hand, as testimony to the ease with which the poet could speak to, even complain of his patron friend. However, we also know that, with the rise of the new emperor Augustus, certain changes took place. Not only does Augustus have a larger presence in Horace's later works, as in the *Carmen Saeculare*, the fourth book of the *Odes*, and *Ep*. 2.1, but Maecenas recedes into the background until he is rarely, if ever, mentioned.[124] Towards the end of the first book of *Epistles*, Horace addresses Lollius and gives him advice,[125] based on his years of living in the elite Roman circle and one which the young aristocrat is about to join:[126]

> Dulcis inexpertis cultura potentis amici:
> expertus metuit. (*Ep*. 1.18.86-87)
>
> The cultivation of a friend in power is sweet to those who have not experienced it;
> he who has tried has come to fear it.

These are evidently words of wisdom, but they are words which weigh heavily. Horace as a social climber once belonged to the category of the "inexpertis" (86), but after years of

[120] See Fairclough 2005, 296n. See also *Ep*. 1.20.24.
[121] See Traina 2009, 306-7, on the observation that *Ep*. 1.1 focuses on the poet's psychological health and *Ep*. 1.7 on the physical.
[122] Cf. Fraenkel: "Maecenas had many weaknesses, but lack of *magnanimitas*… was not among them. Nor did Horace ever waver in his profound attachment to him" (1957, 339).
[123] Suet. *Vit. Hor*.
[124] Various reasons have been suggested for this. Suetonius tells us that it was on account of Maecenas disclosing to his wife Terentia the discovery of a conspiracy in which her family was involved (*Aug*. 66). Others include power struggles with Agrippa and a planned withdrawal as literary patron, implemented by the regime; see Bowditch 2001, 58 and references. Kenneth Reckford 1959, 198 suggests three possibilities: Maecenas was no longer needed by Augustus as a diplomat; he did not want to be burdened by the responsibilities of a public life; or his health was failing. Horsfall reminds us that when Horace does mention Maecenas in one of his later poems, *Carm*. 4.11.19, on Maecenas' birthday, "it is with the greatest affection" (1981, 7).
[125] Cf. Line 67.
[126] Lollius was probably the son of the Lollius who served as consul in 21 B.C.E.; cf. *Ep*. 1.20.28.

successfully being on the right side of those with power, his tone is not one of optimistic cheerfulness but grave. A prudent man, Horace does not give personal anecdotes with specific names. He is at once sincere, in his effort to support the young man, and serious, as one who also knows the dangers and precautions required for those entering high society. We must remember that Horace himself is not done with his career. He may have felt that, with the rise of Augustus as ruler and new patron, the true and easy friendship which he enjoyed with Maecenas is coming to an end. The last poem in which Maecenas figures as the addressee is *Ep*. 1.19.[127] No ode in the fourth and final book, published in 13 B.C.E., is addressed to Maecenas, and the second book of his *Epistles* in 12 B.C.E. is addressed no longer to Maecenas but to Augustus, Florus, and the Pisones, respectively. While his words reveal the wisdom gained through experience which he imparts to young Lollius, there is also a sense in which Horace speaks to himself, namely, to beware of his new patron.

Scholars have noted the entrance of Augustus in Horace's literary career as his new patron.[128] Jeffrey Tatum has stated that, unlike Maecenas, "the emperor could never actually be just like any other (even powerful) *amicus*," and Francis Muecke has described Octavian, before he took on the imperial title of Augustus, as one "with whom he [Horace] is not on intimate terms."[129] However, this is not to say that Horace was dejected and that he felt only intimidation before the new ruler and patron. Relations may not have been as cold and distant. If we are to believe in the accuracy of Suetonius' *Vita Horati*, Augustus wrote a letter to Maecenas requesting to take Horace away from his patron and engage him as a secretary in his imperial realm. Suetonius records that it was in fact the poet himself who declined this proposal but that, far from upsetting the emperor, Horace was offered special privileges at Augustus' home and that the emperor called him with affectionate nicknames. In the account, the two are presented as being on good terms and if anything, it seems that it was Augustus who sought friendship with the poet, not the reverse.

Nevertheless, poets took precautions when it came to Augustus. I shall briefly introduce as examples Horace's contemporaries, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid, but first it must be noted that although there may have been pressure from patrons to produce poetry, patrons did not command poet-friends to write on a particular subject or in a specific genre.

[127] The last epistle of the book, *Ep*. 1.20, is addressed to the book itself.
[128] See, for example, Ellen Oliensis who states that in the second book of the *Epistles*, "Horace's only 'patron' is Augustus" (1998, 12).
[129] Tatum 2009, 236; Muecke 1995, 217.

These came in the form of literary requests, which were a fairly common practice.[130] Suetonius in the *Vita Horati* claims that Augustus bid Horace to compose the *Carmen Saeculare* and that the epistle to Augustus was instigated by Augustus' discontented remark that no poem has been addressed to him, Horace does not speak of such accounts in his poetry.[131]

Like Horace, Tibullus and Propertius allude to the confiscation of property in their elegies (1.1.41-42 and 4.1.127, respectively). In *Eleg*. 1.7, Tibullus celebrates his principal patron Messalla's victories in Egypt yet maintains that he will refrain from war and concentrate on pastoral themes in his elegies. Although perhaps due to the restrained relations between Messalla and Augustus, Tibullus never mentions Augustus in his poetry.

Propertius had as chief patrons Tullus, most likely nephew of Lucius Volcatius Tullus who was consul in 33 B.C.E., and Maecenas. Only two poems out of ninety-two total, *Eleg*. 2.1 and 3.9, are addressed to Maecenas. Throughout both poems he declines his patron's request to write about wars and conquest, citing that his talent is better fit for Callimachean verse. In these poems Propertius mentions Augustus (2.1.25-6; 3.9.27), but only to highlight Maecenas' association with the *princeps*.[132] Propertius also writes about Augustus' family members in 3.18 and 4.11, but he is careful not to make personal associations to Augustus.[133]

Ovid's exile to Tomis in 8 C.E. is shrouded in mystery. Ovid's expressions of wrongdoing are scattered throughout books 1, 3, and 4 of his *Tristia*. His *Amores* and its implications on adultery did not vie well with Augustus' newly implemented marriage laws.[134] However, as Howard Erskine-Hill suggests, Ovid may have been banished because he witnessed, or was involved in, a family secret, perhaps regarding Augustus' granddaughter Julia who was also banished in 8 C.E., and Augustus needed to rid the poet who came to know too much.[135]

Ovid was exiled long after Horace's days, and Horace was much closer to Augustus, and Maecenas, than say, Propertius. Horace too is wary, but he does his best to celebrate the rise of the new Roman leader. The first poem in which Augustus is the addressee is *Ep*. 2.1,

[130] White 1993, 65-73 cites examples by Cicero to the historian Lucceius (*Ad Fam*. 5.12) and Pliny the Younger to Tacitus (*Epist.* 7.33), as well as others which exhibit more pressure.
[131] See White 2007, 200n.
[132] See Gold 1987, 168. See also Stahl (1985). Cf. Horsfall who states that, unlike Virgil and Augustus, "there is no evidence for contact between Propertius and Augustus" (1983, 162).
[133] White 1993, 202-3 shows that poets, inlcuding Horace (*Ep*. 1.3, 1.8, 1.9, 1.12, 2.2; *Carm*. 4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 4.14), began to write about Augustus' family in the early 20s, although he states that the reasons are uncertain.
[134] See *Tristia* 2.
[135] Erskine-Hill 1983, 20.

but there is passing mention of the ruler on the rise in numerous places in Horace's previous poems. In many of these, Augustus is depicted as one of the divinities. As early as the first book of *Odes*, Horace invokes Jupiter and asks him to protect and rule with Augustus (*Carm.* 1.12.49-52). However, whereas in the *Ode* Horace describes Augustus as being inferior to Jupiter ("te minor," *Carm.* 1.12.57), the poet's depiction of the emperor's position changes with time:

Iustum et tenacem propositi virum
non civium ardor prava iubentium,
non vultus instantis tyranni
mente quatit solida neque Auster,

dux inquieti turbidus Hadriae, (5)
nec fulminantis magna manus Iovis:
si fractus illabatur orbis,
impavidum ferient ruinae.

hac arte Pollux et vagus Hercules
enisus arcis attigit igneas, (10)
quos inter Augustus recumbens
purpureo bibet ore nectar. (*Carm.* 3.3.1-12)

Neither the vicious heat of urging citizens,
the face of a threatening tyrant, the south wind,
the stormy leader of the restless Adriatic,
nor the great hand of thunder-hurling Jove

shakes in his solid will the man,
just and firm in his purpose:
if the universe were to be shattered and were to fall,
the ruins will strike him, fearless.

With this skill Pollux and wandering Hercules
climbed and reached the fiery summit.
Augustus, reclining among them,
will savor nectar with rose-tinted lips.

Horace asserts that a man who knows justice and remains steadfast in his mind (1) cannot be destroyed, not even by mighty Jove's thunderbolts (6). He cites as examples the mythological heroes Pollux and Hercules (9).[136] Horace claims that Augustus will join the ranks of the divinities.[137] Moreover, he is not depicted as a timid newcomer, but as reclining in their company and sipping on sweet nectar, drinks reserved for the gods (11-12).[138] Horace paints an image of the emperor as one who will rightfully belong in this company.

[136] See also *Ep.* 2.1.5-10 and Chapter 7.
[137] This image of Augustus has often been compared to Romulus; see Bowditch 2001, 109 and references.
[138] On "purpureo ore," Rudd 2004, 147n. suggests it may refer to a god's perpetual youth (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 2.593, describing Venus) or because nectar was red in color.

In *Carm*. 3.5 Horace celebrates Augustus' military campaigns and in the poem Augustus is linked with the term *divus*:

... praesens divus habebitur
Augustus adiectis Britannis
imperio gravibusque Persis. (*Carm*. 3.5.2-4)

Augustus, present, will be made a god
when the Britons and the oppressive Persians
are added to the empire.

The term "divus" (2) was reserved for Roman emperors who, upon their deaths, were deified. As will be discussed in Chapter 7, Augustus will not officially be proclaimed a deity until after his death. For now this honor remains in the future tense ("habebitur," 2), but Horace presents it as if the deification is guaranteed already at present ("praesens," 2).[139] The tensions between the Parthians and Roman leaders date back to the days of the First Triumvirate. The Roman army was defeated at Carrhae in 53 B.C.E. and Marcus Licinius Crassus was killed. Augustus was to restore peace with the Parthians in 20 B.C.E., but this has yet to happen.[140] It is a statement of encouragement for Augustus and appraisal of his military prowess. Horace, himself a veteran, is usually considered more of an anti-war poet who certainly feared renewals of a civil war on his native land. Nevertheless, he clearly demonstrates his support for Augustus' military campaigns abroad, whatever his sincerity.

Thus far we have seen that, even prior to the fourth book of *Odes*, supposedly composed under Augustus' orders, Augustus was already present in Horace's works and lines of praise were delivered to him through his poetry.[141] The fourth book of *Odes* consists of fifteen poems, and the last poem, which is also the very last work in Horace's career, is justly addressed to Augustus. The other poems in this book in which the addressee is explicitly Augustus are *Carm*. 4.5 and 4.14. We might expect the first poem of the book to be addressed to Augustus, but such is not the case. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to assume that Horace neglected the emperor. He did not. The poet carefully weaves together the theme of Augustus and his divine status throughout the book. *Carm*. 4.1 is addressed to Venus. It gives no mention of the emperor or politics. It is primarily, and obviously, a poem about love. Horace reveals his own consciousness of feeling too old for love and yet being unable to let go of it. However, when we look at the book as a whole, there is a reason why Venus stands at

[139] Cf. Nisbet and Rudd: "*praesens* is a religious word… that describes god's presence on earth" (2004, 83).
[140] Cf. *Ep*. 1.12.27-28, 2.1.256; *Carm*. 4.14.49. See also Chapter 6.
[141] According to Suetonius' *Vita Horati*, Augustus bade the poet to compose the *Carmen Saeculare*, the fourth book of *Odes*, including a poem celebrating his stepsons Drusus and Tiberius, and a letter addressed to the emperor (i.e., *Ep*. 2.1).

the head of the collection and it has nothing to do with Horace or his love life. The first line contains an invocation to Venus, and it is with Venus that the book closes (*Carm*. 4.15.32). Aeneas, the legendary founder of Rome, was the son of Venus, and Augustus was regarded as being descended from Aeneas. The notion of divinity, however slightly, is always linked to Augustus.

The opening of *Carm*. 4.5, which is addressed to the emperor, illustrates this:

Divis orte bonis, optime Romulae
custos gentis, abes iam nimium diu;
maturum reditum pollicitus patrum
sancto concilio, redi.

lucem redde tuae, dux bone, patriae. (5)
instar veris enim vultus ubi tuus
affulsit populo, gratior it dies
et soles melius nitent. (*Carm*. 4.5.1-8)

Descendant of the good gods, best guardian of Romulus' race,
you have been away too long now;
Return, you had promised an early return
to the venerable council of senators.

Restore light, good leader, to your homeland.
For when your face, like spring, has shone on the people,
a more pleasant day passes,
and the sun gleams more graciously.

The first words, "Divis orte bonis" (1), signal his descent from Aeneas, and at present he is rightfully in charge of the Roman people, the race of Romulus (1-2).[142] Augustus is portrayed as if the embodiment of divine light which shines on the Roman people (6-8). Horace then swiftly turns to praise of Augustus' feats and fulfillment of duties. He commends the emperor's efforts at imperial expansion, and, as in *Carm*. 4.2 discussed earlier, he urges Augustus' campaign in Gaul and Spain from which he returns in 13 B.C.E.[143] Horace at once praises Augustus' military command abroad, and commends him as a worthy leader ("dux bone," 5) in Rome.

Poems addressed to Maecenas carried a lighter tone. Horace felt free to engage in jest in his poetry for Maecenas, the most outrageous examples including his telling his patron that he smells of garlic (*Epod*. 3) and providing as excuse a private love affair for his slackness in writing (*Epod*. 14). With Augustus, it seems that it was the emperor who took liberties in interacting with Horace in a friendly manner, such as his nicknames for the poet, and he

[142] See *Ep*. 2.1.5 and Chapter 7 for comparison of Augustus to Romulus on the subject of deification.
[143] For other instances of Horace's expression of concern for Augustus' safety, see *Carm*. 1.35.29-30 and also 4.5.27-28.

tolerated the poet's refusal of an offer in his imperial office.[144] Horace, it seems, never felt the ease to engage in carefree chatter as he did with Maecenas. He kept his distance with the emperor and remained prudent. While never committing himself to a large-scale epic, he was always cautious to include praise of the emperor's political achievements as well as his divine status. The last lines which he produced in all of his poetry attest to this:

> Troiamque et Anchisen et almae
> progeniem Veneris canemus. (*Carm*. 4.15.31-32)

We shall sing of Troy and Anchises and
the progeny of motherly Venus.

Horace stayed true to his position as a poet under a powerful patron and closed his literary career vowing to sing for the emperor.

This chapter has been an attempt to illuminate the ways in which Pope, in the eighteenth century, and Horace, in the first century B.C.E., sustained a career as a poet. It was hard to be an independent poet in eighteenth-century England and to sell one's own books, particularly when agents sometimes turned into foes as a result of strained negotiations. It was equally hard to be a court poet in ancient Rome and to live among the great, especially if one was dependent on them socially, and perhaps financially. For Pope, there was a choice, but, as I have shown, contemporary client-poets suffered their own agonies under the system and Pope refused to be dependent. For Horace, there existed no other option but to rely on patronage. Pope understood this, but, albeit the differences in era and circumstance, what he saw and admired in Horace was his struggle to maintain an independent spirit. For both Pope and Horace, the society in which they lived and those with power in that society, though at first glance unrelated to literature, were not negligible factors in their careers. Patronage was indeed central. In the next three chapters, we shall see that other, and perhaps more, difficult issues shaped their careers and poetry: law and politics.

[144] Suet. *Vit. Hor*.

Chapter 6

Politics and Censorship: *Sat*. 2.1 and *The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace Imitated*

In the previous chapters I have established that Horace's patronage under Maecenas, although fundamentally differing from the path of independence which Pope took, entailed not a strict hierarchy of an aristocrat and a submissive client but also showed signs of true friendship. As a result of the trust borne from such a friendship, I have shown that Horace did exercise some freedom. Ultimately, he was dependent on Maecenas' approval of his poetry for his well-being, yet he felt free enough to not write at times as much as his patron wished, citing ill health and even jokingly making personal excuses of being caught in a love affair (*Ep*. 1.7.3-9, 24-28; *Epod*. 14.5-8). However, the nature of the concept of patronage changes once Augustus enters the scene. Horace had begun his career in full cognizance of his modest background and had sagaciously resolved to stay away from politics. However, as Augustus comes into power and becomes a new patron of the arts for the empire, Horace's earlier resolution is not an option for him anymore.

At the very beginning of the Horatian *Imitations*, Pope states: "*The Occasion of publishing these* Imitations *was the Clamour raised on some of my* Epistles."[1] The "Clamour" refers to the fierce and copious criticism which he received upon the publication of his *Epistle to Burlington*, published in December 1731, in which he criticizes aristocratic values and arrogance. The "answer" which Horace gives and which Pope echoes is the resolution to write. Yet underneath that resolve lies a discussion of what constitutes good poetry, and the first *Satire* in the second book, in a somewhat comic dialogue between the poet and a lawyer, concerns the balance between poetry and the law, and in this case specifically, censorship.

When Horace published this satire in 30 B.C.E., Cicero's unfortunate death had taken place in 43 B.C.E.[2] and the Battle of Actium in 31 B.C.E. would have made decisive the future ruler of Rome, but the empire had yet to be established and Augustus, as a new patron and censor, does not figure in this poem. The situation was vastly different for Pope who in large part had already made public, through various means, his aversion towards the court and the new Hanoverian regime. He draws parallels, however, with the Horace of the last "free" years of patronage under Maecenas in the absence of Augustus.

[1] *TE*, 4:3.
[2] Cicero is never mentioned in Horace's works – neither is Propertius or Ovid.

Presented in dialogue form, the scene of Horace's *Sat*. 2.1, and Pope's *Imitation*, is a dialogue between the respective poet and his lawyer. The lawyers Trebatius and Fortescue are concerned about the safety of their poet and friend, respectively Horace and Pope, that he remain within the boundaries of the law. Both poets argue for their desire to write. Horace employs his tactic of *recusatio*. He persists in his pursuit of poetry, but he does not want to write panegyric, which is what Trebatius recommends in keeping with the law and the favor of the powerful. He cites lack of talent as the reason for his refusal. This does not mean that he will not write. It is only that his poetic capacities are no match for the grandeur of a political leader. Pope similarly refuses to write for the king. His reason, however, is that the king and the royal family do not even read poetry, and he thus converts his argument into a license to write whatever he desires. Horace cites Lucilius as a model and admires the freedom with which he wrote on any topic he pleased. As we shall see, he understands that the same degree of liberty in writing could not be granted to him. However, Pope, when affirming the importance of praising virtue and exposing vice, does not hesitate to claim to write like Lucilius, in the manner in which he exercised his freedom. In the dialogue, the case is settled for Horace and Trebatius once the lawyer recognizes that his client is aware that he must take precautions to keep himself within the boundaries of the law, which also implies not inciting the future emperor. Pope also ends his dialogue on a note of triumph, having convinced his lawyer of his cause. Pope suggests that he will write poetry "Such as Sir Robert would approve" (153), yet his intentions may not be as sincere as he claims.

The relationship between poetry and politics was what initiated the Horatian *Imitations* for Pope. Pope accurately detected the ambivalent feelings of Horace finding himself a poet under the emperor and he recognized that Horace was not a servile, or a willing, flatterer to the court and political powers. However, it is important that, ironically, the very reasons which ultimately prompted him to compose these *Imitations* drove him to renounce them, as the possibilities of being taken to court increased and fears for his safety mounted in the late 1730s. There was also the dominating view of Horace as a servant to the powerful. I shall explore in the final chapter the reasons which led him eventually to label Horace, and Virgil, pleasers of the court in his epitaph.

I. "Ultra legem:"[3] An Answer from Horace

[3] *Sat*. 2.1.1-2.

We shall first take a look at Pope's advertisement to the very first of his Horatian poems:

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.*[4]

The "Epistles" were the *Moral Essays* or the *Epistles to Several Persons* – to Cobham (1734), to a Lady (1735), to Bathurst (1733), and to Burlington (1731) - which were collectively published in the *Works* of 1735.[5] The order of the letters were rearranged for the collection (as listed above), but at the time of Pope's first Horatian *Imitation*, only the *Epistle to Burlington* was published (14 December 1731), and the *Epistle to Bathurst* (15 January 1733), shortly before the *Imitation*. A significant part of the "Clamour raised" was due to Pope's mention of Timon in the *Epistle to Burlington* (99-168), which provoked fierce speculative criticism that it was a character in disguise of the Duke of Chandos.[6] Pope repeatedly denied that it was an attack on the wealthy politician and patron; modern scholars have generally agreed that Timon's Villa was meant as a generalized image of a stately mansion and not of one belonging to a specific living individual.[7]

The topic of this "Clamour" is brought up again in the first Horatian *Imitation* in which the lawyer character Fortescue advises Pope not to "Abuse the City's best good Men in Metre" (39). The lawyer explains: "A hundred smart in Timon and in Balaam: | The fewer still you name, you wound the more" (42-43). Pope had claimed that Timon was not an attack on the Duke of Chandos; it was only a general statement, not an attack on an individual. Neither was Balaam an attack on a living person, as he is a Biblical figure who appears in the book of Numbers. However, the character Fortescue warns that even if they were meant to be representative figures with no direct link to a real being, readers will attribute a "hundred" possible identities and will suspect that they in fact are invectives. It is therefore no use to name "fewer," as naming even one can generate a "hundred" possibilities and as a result offend "more." Pope as author was fully aware that inserting names, even if they are not of specific individuals, can invite "Clamour," or unpleasant criticism. Yet he does not stop. The significance of Pope's defiant answer, "I will Rhyme and Print" (100), modeled on Horace's

[4] *TE*, 4:3.
[5] See Leranbaum (1977) for the larger scheme of the composition of these epistles.
[6] Cf. McLaverty: "Pope dramatized the reception of *To Burlington* [in the first two Horatian *Imitations*] until it left him stark choices: silence, acquiescence, defiance. The defiance chosen involved both guile and an unusual measure of self-risk. Pope stayed in the game of public satire by staking his own reputation and personality on the result" (2001, 174).
[7] See *TE*, 3.2:164-68. In the Argument of the third edition of the *Epistle to Burlington*, Pope made an address to Chandos himself, repeating that Timon is not a character in disguise to attack him. Pope wrote yet another defense in prose, *A Master Key to Popery*, but this was not published in his lifetime (until 1949). The text is found in *ibid*., 170-82 and in *Prose Works*, 2:410-30.

"quisquis erit vitae scribam color" ("Whatever be the color of my life, I will write," *Sat.* 2.1.60), will be discussed shortly.

Pope also admits in these opening lines that Horace's Answer was better "than any I cou'd have made in my own person." It is a tribute to the ancient poet in that Pope places Horace above himself as a poet who can skillfully express his thoughts in verse. This shows the respect which he had for Horace's abilities as a poet and the attachment which he felt through sharing many of the same ideas. We must also recognize that Pope uses the authority of Horace to support his own arguments in the poem.

Before we leap into Horace's "Answer," we shall begin at the opening of the Horatian *Imitations*. If there is an "Answer" that Pope adopts from Horace, then there must also be a question. That question, or the case, is presented as follows. First, Horace:

Sunt quibus in satira videar nimis acer et ultra
legem tendere opus. sine nervis altera quidquid
composui pars esse putat similisque meorum
mille die versus deduci posse. (*Sat.* 2.1.1-4)

There are some to whom I appear too harsh in my satire,
and strain the work beyond the law.
The other half thinks that whatever I have composed was without toil,
and that a thousand verses like mine could be spun in a day.

Horace describes two types of criticism which he claims to have received. The first is that his "satura" is "nimis acer,"[8] severe to such an extent that it goes beyond lawful bounds: "ultra legem." This concerns the content of his poetry, the first book of the *Satires* published five years earlier, and it becomes the central theme of this poem.[9] The second is about his habits of writing, specifically the speed at which he writes. He is offended that some believe that he is able to write "mille die versus," a criticism he had specifically stated against Lucilius in the previous book of *Satires*.[10] Despite the show of his easygoing attitude and seeming laziness,[11] it does not please him to see that the audience takes these statements at face value and fails to see him as a serious poet. It is his plea that his poetry be considered a product of hard work, not random ideas strung together in verse.

Pope presents his situation:

[8] Cf. Muecke: "If *nimis acer* means 'too biting' it is hard to see how Horace can break the law of the genre through this particular quality" (1995, 206).
[9] See Rudd 1966, 128. For the idea that Horace did not receive criticism for his first book of *Satires*, see Fraenkel 1957, 147 and Griffin who states that Horace only "wishes to be thought a ferocious satirist" (1993, 11). Joanna Martindale 1993, 57 has also pointed out that Horace's claim of criticism which he describes in *Sat.* 1.4 may be fictional.
[10] *Sat.* 1.4.9-10.
[11] See the opening of this chapter on his fear of illness as well as his private love affair.

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, (5)
Lord *Fanny* spins a thousand such a Day. (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.1-6)

Instead of faithfully following Horace's opening statement of "Sunt quibus in satura videar nimis acer," he expresses doubt about whether his readers regard his satires as "too bold": "I scarce can think it, but am told" (1). This comment operates on many levels. Pope is being sincere in saying that he finds it hard to believe that his satires are "too bold." He believes that he is merely exposing the vices, including those of specific individuals, of his society, and that there is nothing wrong with doing that as a satirist. He also claims that it is secondhand information. The phrase "[I] am told" uses a passive verb. He feigns that news of the criticism was fed to him by someone else, as if he by habit never pays attention to anything said or written about him. I say that Pope is pretending because he is a writer who had made many enemies in person and had suffered from severe and malicious criticism on paper almost since the start of his literary career in the 1710s.[12] He was thus in reality very attentive to the reception and sales of his own works as well as the writings of others, as he subscribed to newspapers and new publications. Let us turn for a moment to the end of his Advertisement for this poem:

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 Satyrist for a Libeller; whereas to a true Satyrist nothing is so odious as a Libeller.[13]

On the one hand Pope "can scarce think" that his satires would be seen as "too bold" for he is doing what a satirist should do. On the other hand, there is an ironic tone in which he says this, as he "can scarce think" that the literary society and the reading public are such "Fools" to mistake him, a "Satyrist," for a "Libeller," who merely piles up cruel invectives against others solely for the pleasure of attacking and offending.

As a "true Satyrist," then, Pope does not hesitate to print names. "Peter" (3) is Peter Walters the money-lender, whom Pope also satirized in the *Epistle to Bathurst*.[14] He is being ironic in stating that Peter is "wise" (3); he is rather a treacherous broker, more wily than wise. "Chartres" (4) is Francis Charteris, the notorious criminal who had once received a death

[12] See Sherburn (1934) and Guerinot (1969).
[13] *TE*, 4:3.
[14] See Erskine-Hill 1975, 103-31.

sentence for a rape case, although he was acquitted later.[15] This is a character whom we would expect anyone to depict in negative terms, but Pope claims that the audience finds his descriptions "much too rough," as if both the usurer and villain should be painted in a softer and more positive light. If a certain number of his readers think that his satires are "too bold," some on the contrary find that the "Lines are weak" (5). Weak lines would not be good satire either, for the vices shown in the scenes and characters should be moving enough so as to steer the public to change them for the better. In Horace's opening lines, the poet explains that some think that his lines are written hastily and carelessly, as if a thousand of them were written per day. Pope reverses this and actually makes a criticism of another writer: Lord Fanny (6). He, of course, is Lord Hervey. First disagreeing with the criticism that his "Lines are weak," Pope points his finger at Hervey and attributes the writing of a thousand such "weak" lines to his long-time enemy.

Horace states that he received criticism about the content of the first book of *Satires*, that some parts were too "acer." As his poetry has been pointed out to be "ultra legem," the poet sees a potential problem here and so he decides to consult a lawyer. Hence the poem turns into an imaginary dialogue between the poet and his lawyer friend. Pope follows suit. After the case is presented, the poets ask their lawyers for legal counsel (*Sat*. 2.1.5; *Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.8-10). The question is what they should do about this criticism of their poetry being "ultra legem." Both Horace's Trebatius[16] and Pope's Fortescue provide the same and simple answer: Trebatius' "Quiescas" ("You should stop," 5) and Fortescue's "I'd write no more" (11). That is their initial answer. Then follow the protests by the poets (*Sat*. 2.1.6.7; *Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.11-14) who claim that they will not be able to sleep if they are forbidden to write. The lawyers give practical advice to exercise and to take wine and medicine as a cure for insomnia (*Sat*. 2.1.7-9; *Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.15-20).[17] However, lawyers that they are, they offer an alternative. First, Trebatius:

aut, si tantus amor scribendi te rapit, aude
Caesaris invicti res dicere, multa laborum

[15] See Simpson (2004).
[16] Cicero was a friend of Trebatius, and he was the dedicatee of Cicero's *Topica*. Through Cicero's introduction, Trebatius became a prominent lawyer for Julius Caesar and later Augustus; see Cic. *Ad Fam.*, 7.5-22, with Bauman 1985, 123-36. For Trebatius' close relationships with the political rulers of his time, see also Muecke 1993, 99-100 and 1995, 207-8; Galinsky 1996, 288-331. Williams 2009, 145-46 has suggested that Trebatius and Horace came from the southern Italian regions of Venusia and Lucania and that they were family friends, even going so far as to say that Trebatius may have acted as Horace's patron upon his arrival in Rome. See also Fraenkel 1957, 146.
[17] Trebatius may have had some medical knowledge, or, at least about overeating; see Cic. *Ad Fam*. 7.20.3. Dacier in his 1709 edition construes Horace's request, "praescribe" (*Sat*. 2.1.5), to be one asking for medical advice; see McLaverty 2001, 162.

praemia laturus. (*Sat*. 2.1.10-12)

Or, if so great a passion for writing overtakes you,
dare to recount the deeds of the invincible Caesar,
as it will bear you handsome rewards for your labors.

There are still a few more years until Octavian assumes the title of Caesar Augustus, but the Battle of Actium had taken place before the publication of this book of *Satires* in 30 B.C.E. There was probably anticipation already of Octavian's being instituted as the supreme leader of Rome. We can eliminate Julius Caesar as a possibility, for he had been assassinated in 44 B.C.E.; he would not have been there to bestow ample rewards on the poet. Yet again, this is Horace writing an imaginary dialogue. Although uttered by the character Trebatius, this is an indication that Horace knew that once established as the absolute ruler, there might be no choice but to write commendatory poems about Octavian.[18]

In Pope's version, his character Fortescue suggests the same alternative as Horace's Trebatius:

Or if you needs must write, write CAESAR's Praise:
You'll gain at least a *Knighthood*, or the *Bays*. (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.21-22)

This "CAESAR" for Pope, of course, is George II, whose middle name was Augustus. Among many other individuals whom Pope names and satirizes, including the members of the royal family ("Carolina," 30; "Amelia," 31), Caesar is the only name that is capitalized throughout, in his English version as well as in the Latin parallel text. Far from being a demonstration of deference, the capitalization is intended to highlight his scorn and disgust towards the new king. It is a contempt that Pope wishes not to disguise but to show openly. In addition to this being a mark of his audacity, it may be useful to remember that this is also the sort of audacity which Pope exhibits in the Horatian *Imitations*. The name, and not of any individual but the king of the nation, is clearly printed and even capitalized. This is a stark contrast to the hyphens and other symbols which he later uses, especially in the *Dialogues*, to hide the real identity of the people he mentions.

Pope of course does not in the least wish to write "CAESAR's Praise." Fortescue explains that the "multa praemia" would be that he may be knighted or appointed Poet Laureate ("the Bays"). There is, however, an irony involved here. Pope would never qualify to hold either of these positions because of his Catholic faith. In real life, William Fortescue,

[18] For the link between *Sat*. 2.1 and politics, see Fraenkel (1957); LaFleur (1981); Muecke (1995). Michèle Lowrie notes that as opposed to "scribere" (*Sat*. 2.1.16), the verb most often used to designate composition of satire, "dicere" (ibid., 11) is a "strong word of poetic utterance that accords with the seriousness of praise poetry" (2005, 411). See also Habinek 1998, 71-73.

though an ally of Walpole who was appointed Master of the Rolls in 1741, was an adept lawyer who had represented Pope in a number of legal disputes concerning the publication of his works. It was Fortescue who gave him counsel to offer the second term of rights for the *Works* of 1717 to Lintot, and, seeing the bitterness which ensued over the *Iliad* contract, he was most likely the one to whom Pope turned when drafting the contract for the *Odyssey*.[19] It is hard to imagine that this legal expert with whom Pope entrusted many important matters would not have known that his client was Catholic. Neither could it have been that he was ignorant of the legal restrictions in England which forbade Catholics from holding public office. Let us look at this again, then. Pope lacks the desire to write "CAESAR's Praise" because he has no respect for the king. I suspect that it is a tactic Pope employs to insert the detail as Fortescue's words. It may have been awkward for him to openly admit his religious faith. His lawyer friend may or may not have known of this particular aspect of the poet's status, so he puts it in the words of the lawyer to signal that even if, contrary to his will, he were to write a laudatory poem which by chance the king approved of, there would be no reward in return. It serves to assert that there is nothing for him to gain in writing for the king for whom he does not feel respect anyway.

Horace was one who could in theory anticipate *praemia*. However, his reply carries a tone of evasiveness:

> Cupidum, pater optime, vires
> deficiunt. neque enim quivis horrentia pilis
> agmina nec fracta pereuntis cuspide Gallos
> aut labentis equo describit vulnera Parthi. (*Sat*. 2.1.12-15)
>
> My strength fails me, excellent father, though I am eager.
> for not everybody can describe the shuddering columns with centurions,
> the dying Gauls with broken spearheads,
> or the blows of the Parthian as he slips from his horse.

We have already seen Horace use this explanation in the first book of *Satires*.[20] By saying that he is by all means "cupidum" but is lacking in talent ("vires deficiunt"), he can evade giving a clear yes or no, but he manages to convey that the answer is in fact a no. He lists recent events of Rome's conquests and diplomatic negotiations which would make suitable themes for laudatory poems. The diplomatic negotiations with the Parthians, Julius Caesar's legacy of unfinished conquest, will not reach a resolution until 20 B.C.E.

[19] See Foxon 1991, 237 and 240-41.
[20] For this as another example of *recusatio*, see Stack 1985, 35-36 and McLaverty 2001, 162-63.

As if he suddenly realized that a refusal would not be deemed acceptable, even on account of deficient poetic abilities, Horace explains:

> Haud mihi deero,
> cum res ipsa feret. nisi dextro tempore Flacci
> verba per attentam non ibunt Caesaris aurem,
> cui male si palpere, recalcitret undique tutus. (*Sat*. 2.1.17-20)

> I will by no means rush myself, until the opportunity presents itself.
> If not at the right time, the words of Flaccus will not penetrate Caesar's careful ear,
> if you flatter him in the wrong way, cautious as he is,
> he may oppose from all sides.

This is apparently quite an honest opinion from Horace on his views not about Octavian's public feats but about his character. The new ruler has "attentam aurem." He is attentive and careful as to what should be sung about him. However, lest this observation be taken as criticism of Octavian, Horace, continuing with his humility ("vires deficiunt"), presents it as if his words ("verba Flacci")[21] will not be heard if he does not time them well ("nisi dextro tempore"). If not timed well, his song of praise will be discarded. But there is more, and Horace becomes more audacious in his depiction of Octavian. He is bold to employ the verb "palpere," as he implies that writing for the ruler is to *flatter* or to *coax* him. Furthermore, one must be careful not to flatter wrong way ("male"), for if it is deemed unsatisfactory by Octavian, he may object ("recalcitret"). Far from awaiting "praemia," there is punishment to be expected if the poet's words fail to please Octavian. At all costs Horace avoids explicitly stating, "Yes, I will write praise for Caesar" or "No, I will not." He does state that he is enthusiastic ("cupidum"), and thus leans towards the affirmative, but he then piles on conditions ("cum," 18; "nisi," 18; "si," 20). All in all, without ever saying so directly, Horace's opinion is clear: he does not want to write "Caesaris invicti res."

Pope is more overt:

> What? like Sir *Richard*, rumbling, rough and fierce,
> With ARMS, and GEORGE, and BRUNSWICK crowd the Verse?
> Rend with tremendous Sound your ears asunder, (25)
> With Gun, Drum, Trumpet, Blunderbuss & Thunder?
> Or nobly wild, with *Budgell*'s Fire and Force,
> Paint Angels trembling round his *falling Horse*? (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.23-28)

[21] Horace plays a pun on his own name, Quintus Horatius Flaccus. "Flaccus" as an adjective can also mean "flap-eared." Lowrie sees a comparison of Octavian with a horse and mentions Gaius' *Digest* on horses: "At si, cum equum permulsisset quis uel palpates esset, calce eum percusserit, erit actioni locus (But if, when someone strokes or caresses a horse, it strikes him with its hoof, there will be an opportunity for a suit)" (cited and trans. by Lowrie) (2005, 418). Pope plays on this animal metaphor, by representing George II not as a horse but as falling from a horse.

The first word he emits in response to his lawyer's suggestion to "write CAESAR's Praise" is an exclamatory "What?" Such a project is simply out of the question for Pope. As in the opening of this poem, Pope again inserts names of contemporary individuals where Horace does not. While Horace limits himself to the description of events, of the subjugation of Gaul and the Parthian negotiations, Pope names those who wrote works on George II. Sir Richard Blackmore was a royal physician who wrote lengthy epics which earned ridicule from other poets.[22] Satirizing Blackmore, Pope makes it clear that it is not only "GEORGE," his "CAESAR," but also the entire house of Brunswick which deserves his contempt.[23] He is against the current royal house which is Hanoverian, not English. Eustace Budgell, on the other hand, is described with an oxymoron: "nobly wild."[24] Pope also uses an alliteration to further describe him. Budgell had "Fire and Force," thus implying that he had a tendency to be a bit too fierce. In a mocking tone he recalls Budgell's *Poem upon His Majesty's Late Journey to Cambridge and Newmarket* (1728), in which the writer recounts an accident of George II falling from his horse at the Battle of Oudenarde.[25] This episode is not one that offers the bravest image of a king. Pope explains that the "Angels trembling" are not flittering above in care and concern for George II, but over the king's "Horse." He thus tries to illustrate that nobody really cared for the king. Even the "Angels" worried over the well-being of the horse, not of the royal rider.

The character Fortescue, hearing the contempt in which his client holds the king, offers yet another alternative: to write some pastoral about the other royal members, "Carolina" (Queen Caroline) (30) and "Amelia" (31).[26] Pope with equal vehemence dismisses this advice:

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. (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.33-36)

[22] See *TE*, 4:345-46.
[23] Cf. Carolina (30) and Amelia (31).
[24] Eustace Budgell (1686-1737) attended Oxford University and contributed to Addison's *Spectator*. Several years following the publication of Pope's first Horatian *Imitation*, Budgell committed suicide in London, after a long litigation in which he was accused of embezzlement.
[25] McLaverty provides a keen observation on Pope's "falling horse:" "The Latin 'labentis equo' is not a falling horse; it is the Parthian slipping, not his horse. Pope's reference is to the shooting of George II's horse from under him" (2001, 163). Another accident which involves a royal member and a horse is the death of William III in 1702, when he fell from a horse. Queen Anne succeeded the throne upon his death. See Erskine-Hill 1996, 2.
[26] For Queen Caroline, wife of George II and strong ally of Walpole, see *TE*, 4:350. Amelia (1710-1786) was the third child of the couple (*ibid*., 342).

To the lawyer's suggestion to write lyric that "sweetly flow[s]" for the royal ladies (32), Pope replies that they will not even hear ("few Verses touch their nicer Ear"). Whereas Horace describes that his poetry will not reach Octavian "nisi dextro tempore," Pope implies that there is no right time for the royal family. The Poet Laureate was required to compose official odes "twice a Year," at the New Year and on the king's birthday. However, even at such occasions of "dextro tempore," Pope explains that the royals "scarce can bear" to hear poems recited. It is not a question of finding the right opportunity. It is their lack of appreciation for the literary arts which Pope presents as the problem. Thus, just like the other royals, George II "scorns the Poet's Lays," and he does not count on them to sing his praise. He instead places his trust on "History" to record his public achievements. "History" refers to the office of historiographer royal, a position specially created for James Howell in 1661. Pope mockingly states that his king "justly" turns away from poets and relies on the historiographer royal, thinking that their histories would be diffused more widely than the works of celebrated poets. Pope had the advantage of looking at Roman history with retrospective insight. Although Horace could not have known this, poets such as Ovid could be banished if they touched the wrong nerve of the absolute ruler. But at least Augustus understood that talented and renowned poets could be, as Horace described of himself, "utilis urbi" (*Ep*. 2.1.124) to the state and to his reputation. By describing a king who does not even see that poets can have influence on the public and posterity, Pope places him below the Roman emperor who, if he exploited the poetical talents of his state, at least understood their power and importance.

II. Lucilius: "I will Rhyme and Print"[27]

We have thus seen how Horace, in his own elusive manner, refuses to write for the ruler-to-be. Horace explicitly cites a model he wishes to follow: Lucilius (*c*. 180–103 B.C.E.). Pope has thus far in large part followed Horace's original. He makes a departure in this section on models. Whereas Horace explains to his lawyer the manner and qualities of Lucilius which he desires to adopt, Pope does not name a model but instead fashions himself as Lucilius.

Horace had already made mention of Lucilius in his first book of *Satires*. Lucilius was widely studied in Horace's time and he very probably read the century-old satires in his schooldays. However, Horace points out certain faults:

nam fuit hoc vitiosus: in hora saepe ducentos,

[27] *Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.100.

ut magnum, versus dictabat stans pede in uno.
cum flueret lutulentus, erat quod tollere velles. (*Sat*. 1.4.9-11)

For he was faulty in this: he was often dictating two hundred lines in an hour,
as if a great thing, standing on one foot.
When he was flowing muddily, there were lines which you would wish to remove.

Horace claims that Lucilius' defect was that he wrote too much in too short a time ("in hora saepe ducentos").[28] This is part of the case which Horace presented at the beginning of the poem, that the public sometimes sees him as being able to write poetry of high quality without time and labor (*Sat*. 2.1.2-4). His description of Lucilius standing on one foot ("stans pede in uno") while composing poetry evokes a comic image, and Horace implies that his predecessor did not write seriously nor with care. As a consequence, his verses are "muddy" ("lutulentus"). Horace also states that one would wish to remove some of the lines ("tollere").[29] This could be that there are too many monosyllabic and bisyllabic short words crammed into a line in order to make a hexameter verse. The poems may have become too wordy that one may want to eliminate certain lines. Thus Horace cites haste and quantity as Lucilius' faults as a poet. Using the same expression "muddy" ("lutulentum"), he reiterates this point in the last poem of his first collection of *Satires*:

At dixi fluere hunc lutulentum, saepe ferentem
plura quidem tollenda relinquendis. (*Sat*. 1.10.50-51)

But I have said that this man runs muddy,
that he often carries more that should be removed than kept.

Too many words written too quickly are "muddy." They lack clarity. Horace keeps insisting that there were many lines and words which should be removed. His reason is: "est brevitate opus" ("[Poetry] needs brevity") (*Sat*. 1.10.9). It is not speed that is required, but concision.

Horace's criticisms of his predecessor result from the differences in style which were fashionable and accepted in their respective eras. Horace acknowledges this:

… ille,
si foret hoc nostrum fato delapsus in aevum,
detereret sibi multa, recideret omne quod ultra
perfectum traheretur, et in versu faciendo
saepe caput scaberet vivos et roderet unguis. (*Sat*. 1.10.67-71)

If he were by fate to slip into our present time,
he would file away much of his writing,
would cut down all that was drawn out beyond perfection,
and in composing his verses would often scratch his head and gnaw fresh at his nails.

[28] Horace aligns himself with the Callimachean argument for restraint and brevity; see Chapter 5 and Gowers 2012, 157.
[29] Cf. Anderson: "[Horace thought that] Lucilius was a facile poet who was content to enclose anything within the six feet of the hexameter" (ibid., 25).

Had it been in "nostrum aevum," Horace admits, Lucilius would have removed ("detereret," "recideret") all those words which trailed too long ("traheretur"). Unlike Horace, Lucilius often wrote his verses to be recited at banquets.[30] One of the chief characteristics of Roman satire is the use of personal pronouns. Lucilius' conversational tone conveys one who talks freely and cheerily in a setting of a *convivium* or a *cena*. The words appear to flow out of the speaker's mouth as the thoughts come to mind. Thus, in what W.S. Anderson calls "loose dinner remarks," they can be redundant, there is vulgarity and archaisms, and there is scant attention to word order.[31] Almost two centuries later in the "nostrum aevum" of Horace, poetic taste has changed. Refinement and attention to regularity were deemed important. Horace eliminated to a large extent obscenity, elision of monosyllables which was common in comedy, and Greek terms[32] – all of which Lucilius had employed in abundance. Artistic discipline, what Horace refers to as "perfectum" in the passage above, was now required for poetry. Likewise in the passage, scratching one's head and biting one's nails yield the image of a writer spending long hours in composition, selecting each word with the utmost care, and lost in deep contemplation of the word order of each verse. This was the image of an ideal poet in Horace's time.[33]

In *Sat*. 2.1, the figure of Lucilius is in fact first mentioned not by Horace himself but by his lawyer Trebatius:

Attamen et iustum poteras et scribere fortem,
Scipiadam ut sapiens Lucilius. (*Sat*. 2.1.16-17)

But you could still write of a figure both just and brave,
as sensible Lucilius did of Scipio.

Trebatius describes Scipio[34] as a just and brave ruler and military general, and he suggests that if Horace feels incompetent to sing of Caesar's "res," of military conquests and feats, he could still write about his personal qualities. Horace's reply, as seen in the previous section (*Sat*. 2.1.17-20), is that Octavian is not quite like Scipio. Again, without explicitly stating as such, Horace implies that he does not deem his leader as being quite "iustum" and "fortem."

[30] Ibid., 18.
[31] Ibid., 21-23; citation from 23. See also Goldberg 2005, 156. See *Inst. Orat*. 10.1.94 for Quintilian's praise of Lucilius' *libertas* in terms of freedom of speech. See Anderson 1982, 15-17 for Lucilius' *libertas* in connection to the wine God *Liber* (*Sat*. 1.4.89-90) and Lucilius resembling a drunken man's speech.
[32] Cf. Anderson's comment that Horace "avoided violent borrowing of new Greek words, never constructed a Latin-Greek hybrid, and never quoted Greek at all" (ibid., 22). But Feeney 2009, 370 points out the use of "critici," a transliteration from the Greek, in *Ep*. 2.1.51, as opposed to the conventional Latin "iudex;" see also his references.
[33] Cf. Poets of Horace's time held in high regard Cinna for spending nine years to complete the epyllion *Zmyrna*.
[34] Publius Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus Africanus Numantinus (185–129 B.C.E.).

Moreover, he has an uneasy feeling that the Scipio-Lucilius relationship between a political ruler and a poet is different from his own patron-client relationship, to be anticipated in the near future, with Octavian. The closest equivalent we can identify in Pope's *Imitation* is the other alternative suggested by Fortescue that, if Pope does not wish to write about George II, he could write about the other members of the royal family (29-32). But there is no true parallel. As we shall see, this is due in part to his fashioning himself as Lucilius instead of bringing up a model as Horace does.

Horace has a different vision with regards to Lucilius than the one suggested by Trebatius:

... me pedibus delectat claudere verba
Lucili ritu, nostrum melioris utroque.
ille velut fidis arcana sodalibus olim (30)
credebat libris neque, si male cesserat, usquam
decurrens alio neque si bene; quo fit ut omnis
votiva pateat veluti descripta tabella
vita senis. sequor hunc. (*Sat*. 2.1.28-34)

I like to put words in meter in Lucilius' manner,
who was more skilled than either of us.
Once upon a time, he entrusted his secrets in books, as though to loyal friends,
neither faltered when things went wrong,
searching for another purpose elsewhere, nor when things went well;
so it is that the entire life of the old man may be exposed, as if inscribed on a votive tablet.
I follow this man.

Horace believes in quality over quantity and thus rejects the outdated style of Lucilius' verbosity. It is the hexameter ("pedibus") and satire which he wishes to adopt from Lucilius. In this, he pays homage to his predecessor that he was better than himself and his addressee Trebatius ("nostrum melioris utroque"). He then describes what he admires in the satires of Lucilius: the openness with which he shared his life in his writings. Furthermore, for Horace that level of sharing is one which is comparable to trusted friends ("velut fidis… sodalibus"). As we have seen in the previous chapter on patronage, friendship is of primary importance for Horace who may have lost or not have had family.[35] Horace goes on to say that Lucilius, though writing personal poetry as if to intimate friends, by publishing them in books, made his life public, as if on a votive tablet ("votiva… tabella"). Anderson has stated that Roman votive tablets "did *not* correspond to reality" and that they were often "a poor version of life." Linking the metaphor of the votive tablet to the famous phrase "Ut pictura poesis" (*AP*, 361), he states that Horace here reinforces the difference between himself and Lucilius. Like a

[35] For the importance of friendship for seventeenth- and eighteenth-century imitators, see Chapter 2, and for Pope, see Chapter 9.

painter, the poet should demonstrate artistic skill and aesthetic quality and not produce a collection of sloppy writing, a low form of art like votive tablets, as Lucilius did.[36]

I take this passage to be a further extension of Horace's *recusatio*, refusing to write about political leaders and their feats. He declares that he would like to expose both the "bene" and "male" of his entire life ("omnis… vita"), as he would to his closest friends ("fidis… sodalibus"). In concentrating on the personal as a subject for his writing, he skillfully diverts the reader from wondering whether he would be willing to write about public affairs. It is as if Horace, in claiming that his subject is already chosen, implies that therefore he cannot change his course and devote himself to composing commendatory poems of the powerful. It is another instance in which he employs his tactic of evasion. At this point in his career, as in his first and previous publication of the first book of *Satires*, he wishes to continue writing satire and, specifically, satire in the manner of Lucilius: "Sequor hunc."

Pope suppresses this statement by Horace, as if he has no model to follow. Whereas Horace openly places himself as the inferior one compared to his predecessor Lucilius, Pope does not do so. One may recall from the previous chapters that Pope was always conscious of the presence of his great predecessor Dryden. Pope's refusal to cite Dryden, as Horace does with Lucilius, reveals his desire to surpass Dryden.[37]

In the *Imitation* he himself becomes Lucilius:

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, (55)
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: (60)
My Foes shall wish my Life a longer date,
And ev'ry Friend the less lament my Fate. (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.51-62)

[36] Anderson 1982, 31-32; citation from 32.

[37] Pope compared himself with Dryden already in 1729. See, for example, Appendix VI in the *Dunciad Variorum*, titled "A Parallel of the Characters of Mr. Dryden and Mr. Pope," in which Pope hints at his superiority over Dryden. He writes: "Mr. DRYDEN understood no *Greek* or *Latin*," and on the facing page: "Mr. POPE understood no *Greek*" (*TE*, 5:216 and 217). See also the discussion below on *Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.111-114 in which Pope implies his desire to write with the freedom which he thought that Dryden enjoyed. Cf. "An Allusion to Horace" (1680) by John Wilmot, the Second Earl of Rochester, in which Rochester openly criticizes Dryden. Though himself known to be a libertine Restoration satirist who frequently used obscene language, Rochester poses as a sophisticated writer on equal standing with Horace to denounce Dryden, just as Horace criticizes Lucilius. See Love (1999) for the poem and commentary.

William Shippen, a leading Jacobite, and Montaigne, whose works and essays Pope admired, are the closest he comes to providing a model. Shippen, a member of the House of Commons, represents public affairs which Pope intends to expose, whereas Montaigne deals more with the spiritual, the inner and private side of life.[38] Pope makes clear that he will reveal both his public and private sides and thus will hide nothing.

Adopting Horace's depiction of Lucilius, Pope admits that he has flaws and that indeed his life has been mottled with bitter experiences ("male," *Sat*. 2.1.31): "for Spots I have." In order to ensure that these "Spots" will not remain concealed but will "appear" (55), the "Medium" will be his poetry and it will be an "impartial Glass."[39] This mirror is the equivalent of Lucilius' "votiva tabula" as described by Horace. At first glance, it seems that Pope's "Glass" would indeed be "impartial," as a mirror provides an accurate reflection and no "Spots" can be hidden. However, this "Glass" is not as "impartial" as Pope claims it to be, for he concedes that he makes selections.[40] His Muse "intends… to expose myself, my Foes, my Friends" and to "Publish the present Age." So far this seems as if Pope's poetry will be an "impartial Glass." Yet he adds a condition: "*but* where my Text | Is Vice too high, reserve it for the next."[41] If the "Vices" which he sees in the "present Age," of contemporary events and living individuals, are too risky and scandalous, he deems it wiser to leave them to the next generation to point them out. Although we do not sense in Pope a true fear of danger at this moment, it reveals Pope's feeling that he does not wish to invite more criticism. It is an irony, then, that his Horatian *Imitations* do come to an end five years later due to fear for his safety, as if this small thought were a prophecy that would eventually be fulfilled.

Safety is a concern which does not escape the minds of either poet. Horace explains the purpose of writing by comparing his pen to a sword:

… sed hic stilus haud petet ultro
quemquam animantem et me veluti custodiet ensis (40)
vagina tectus; quem cur destringere coner
tutus ab infestis latronibus? o pater et rex
Iuppiter, ut pereat positum robigine telum
nec quisquam noceat cupido mihi pacis! at ille
qui me commorit (melius non tangere, clamo) (45)
flebit et insignis tota cantabitur urbe. (*Sat*. 2.1.39-46)

But this pen, unprovoked, shall by no means aim at anyone living,
and shall protect me, just as if a sword kept concealed in its scabbard;

[38] Walpole appraised Shippen as a man devoid of corruption; see *TE*, 4:383.
[39] Cf. Thomas Maresca 1964, 370-71 who cites "the unspotted mirror of God's majesty" (ibid., 370) from Wisdom 7.26 and argues that Pope is applying Christian ideas.
[40] Cf. McLaverty: "The glass is 'impartial'; it shows all. But not all will be shown" (2001, 165).
[41] My italics.

why should I try to unsheathe it, when I am safe from harmful robbers?
O Jupiter, father and king,
let the weapon laid aside perish with rust,
let no one harm me, I who long for peace!
But he who accosts me (better not to meddle with me, I shout),
shall weep, and, exposed, shall be sung in the entire city.

Horace compares his pen ("stilus") to a sword ("ensis"), but his principal argument is that if he is writing attacks on anyone, it is in an act of defense and not offense. He denies making an offensive attack with his pen ("haud petet," 39). For him it is a source of protection ("custodiet," 40). Although when an offense is directed at him, that "stilus" can turn into an "ensis," he asks why he should do so, as long as he is safe ("tutus," 42). He even beseeches Jupiter, the highest of all gods, in a supplication that he be kept safe from offensive attempts and that thus his weapon ("telum") remain unused ("positum"). His diction in these lines is indicative of his defensive stance: "haud petet" (39), "custodiet" (40), "tutus" (42), and "cupido mihi pacis" (44). However, Horace the pacifist, if in need, can make use of the "ensis" as a "telum" for counterattack. With the conjunction "at," the tone changes slightly and this seeker of peace turns into someone who can indeed shout ("clamo") to fight against harm. Still, this is only a warning that he gives. "Flebit" (46) and "cantabitur" (46) are in the future tense. He presents them as possibilities, not as events that have actually taken place. The verbs "to weep" and "to sing/ to be sung," while they may cause damage psychologically or to one's reputation, do not connote violence.[42] Horace's explanation is that any attack of his is in fact counterattack, his manner of defense, and it is not a declaration of the intention or a justification to write invectives.

Whereas Horace uses a general term, "infestis latronibus" ("harmful robbers"), to signify those who may cause him offense, Pope's version carries political overtones and even names specific individuals:

Satire's my Weapon, but I'm too discreet
To run a Muck, and tilt at all I meet; (70)
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: (75)
But touch me, and no Minister so sore.
Who-e'er offends, at some unlucky Time
Slides into Verse, and hitches in a Rhyme,
Sacred to Ridicule! his whole Life long,
And the sad Burthen of some merry Song. (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.69-80)

[42] C*antare*, employed here by Horace, is the frequentative form of *canere* and indicates repeated or intense action. See Lowrie 2005, 416.

Pope states upfront that "Satire," his writing, is a "Weapon." Unlike Horace, it is not a sword that he draws when in danger. Pope positions himself more in a stance of offense than defense. In a somewhat ironic tone, he calls himself as being "too discreet" to resort to silly behavior at every injustice he notices ("To run a Muck, and tilt at all I meet"). The desire for invective is there, but he says that he will be "discreet" enough to limit his targets to "Thieves, Supercargoes, Sharpers, and Directors." Thieves and sharpers, or swindlers, make money by stealing or cheating. Supercargoes and Directors, here designating the directors of the South Sea Company, are wealthy tradesmen and business tycoons. The common thread that ties them together is that their profits were not always made by honest means. Pope then goes on to decry the ineffectiveness of the "*Army*." The standing army in England met with Tory opposition that it was a threat to national liberty.[43] "*Army*," "Swords," "Pikes," and "Guns" are symbols of war and open violence, ideas which do not figure in Horace's original. Although Horace never discusses the specific content of his verses, Pope, from corrupt wealth in "Thieves,… Directors," and the national army, now moves on to speak about politics. Pope agrees with Horace's "cupido mihi pacis" and says that "Peace is my dear Delight," yet even the Prime Minister Walpole is not exempt from his invectives: "But touch me, and no Minister so sore." Pope is indiscriminate and his only criterion is: "Who-e'er offends." In Pope, Horace's supplication to Jupiter that he may never need to attack in defense turns into a right "to Ridicule" those who deserve their vices to be exposed. For Pope, it is not only peace and safety for himself but also for his English nation.

Much of the debate in this poem has been centered on whether or not to write for the king or emperor, and Horace's evasiveness on this option has been highlighted. However, one thing which the poet confidently claims in the affirmative is his resolution to write:

... seu me tranquilla senectus
exspectat seu Mors atris circumvolat alis,
dives, inops, Romae, seu fors ita iusserit, exsul,
quisquis erit vitae, scribam, color. (*Sat*. 2.1.57-60)

Whether quiet old age awaits me
or death with its black wings hovers about,
rich, poor, in Rome, or as luck prescribes, exile,
whatever be the color of my life, I will write.

Horace has cleverly left it ambiguous whether he will write Caesar's praise. As if to assert that not writing eulogies on the ruler does not mean that he will not write altogether, he firmly says: "scribam." His devotion to poetry is made manifest in the previous line: "dives," "inops,"

[43] See *TE*, 4:11n.

"Romae," and "seu fors ita iusserit, exsul." In the biographical and autobiographical accounts we have of Horace, we do not receive the impression that it was his primary goal to become a poet. However, by the time of the composition of this poem, his literary career was flourishing. It is as if, now that his career is on a safe track, he finally realizes the depth of his passion. He claims that he will write, whether "dives" or "inops." Although he would never be "dives" in the sense of joining the aristocracy or entering a public career, he is provided with a comfortable living by his patron friend. If that is his condition of "dives," "inops" would signify the life he would have if he fell out with his patron. Without a patron to support him financially, he could indeed be reduced to a state of misery. Yet he says that even then he will write: "scribam."

The next pair of juxtapositions is even more daring: whether he is in Rome ("Romae") or in exile ("exsul"). Where the poet may be geographically is evidently linked to his relations with the powerful. For Horace to be in Rome would signify that he remains in the elite circle of Rome through his patronage, whether this be with Maecenas, or Augustus later on. In terms of his poetry, this would mean, not necessarily that he writes praise of the Roman leaders but, that at least he writes nothing that offends. Horace is also well aware that if he does offend, his fate could very possibly be "exsul." He would not know of Ovid's exile, but he would certainly have known of Cicero's unfortunate end. Even for someone who has won such favors, he knows that "fors" could still steer him to change the course of his life forever. Nevertheless, even with all such possibilities in mind, Horace insists: "scribam." This is another demonstration of his *recusatio* of complacently writing about the Caesar, solely in order to keep himself safe.

Pope expands on Horace's declaration:

What-e'er my Fate, or well or ill at Court,
Whether old Age, with faint, but chearful Ray,
Attends to gild the Evening of my Day,
Or Death's black Wing already be display'd (95)
To wrap me in the Universal Shade;
Whether the darken'd Room to muse invite,
Or whiten'd Wall provoke the Skew'r to write,
In Durance, Exile, Bedlam, or the Mint,
Like *Lee* or *Budgell*, I will Rhyme and Print. (*Hor. Imit. Sat.* 2.1.92-100)

The phrase "well or ill at Court" is somewhat tongue-in-cheek, as he had by this time already established his career without a patron and must have been well accustomed to conducting business transactions on his own. Thus there is really no way that he would attempt to be "well… at Court." Pope, expanding on Horace's expression of the color of life ("vitae…

color"), paints the future of his life as a poet, with all its uncertainties. He contrasts images of light and dark. In lines 93-94, he presents the light and imagines a "chearful Ray" beaming on him as his life comes to an end in old age. This evokes an idea of serenity. The contrast is provided in the next couplet, with colors of the dark: "Death's black Wing" and "Universal Shade." It is worth noting here the difference in age between Horace, author of the original, and Pope, writer of the *Imitation,* when they composed the poems. Horace would have been around thirty-five years old, and thus his images of "senectus" or of "mors" would not have been of immediate concern to him. Pope, however, was forty-four years old, a middle-aged man. Coupled with his fragile health, he would not have been surprised if death was "already" (95) hovering over him to take him into the "Universal Shade." It creates an irony, then, that Pope quite literally translates Trebatius' exclamation of "O puer" in his reply to Horace (*Sat*. 2.1.60). Pope's Fortescue says, "Alas young Man!" and that he is still in the "Flow'r of Age" (102, 103). Aside from the comic effect that this produces, perhaps Pope wants to suggest that he will never retire from writing.

The second contrast of light and dark appears in the next couplet: "darken'd Room" (97) and "whiten'd Wall" (98). After giving a glimpse of his age and the possibility of a death not too far away, Pope reasserts that it is nevertheless his poetry that remains his primary concern. His life revolves around the act of writing. Even when his pen is put down in the "darken'd Room" of the night, he will "muse" (97). It is his period of contemplation. When it is light again, in the room of "whiten'd Wall[s]" he will pick up his pen again "to write" (98). Thus he reaches his declaration that he will "Rhyme and Print." Under Durance, in "Exile" like his close friends Atterbury and Bolingbroke, even if deemed mentally ill and confined to Bedlam, or sent to the Mint for debtors, Pope asserts that he will write. Unlike Horace who refrains from naming specific individuals, Pope gives the examples of Nathaniel Lee (1653-1692), a dramatist who was hospitalized in Bedlam from 1684 to 1689, and Budgell, a writer whose cousin Addison obtained a post for him in Ireland but lost it when he satirized the Viceroy. The naming of real people in his poetry triggered many criticisms and attacks, but here the fates of these doomed individuals, which Pope claims could potentially be his, produce a powerful effect that cannot be achieved by using fictional characters. The fact that Pope, fully aware that such tragedies had befallen on writers in reality, still says "I will Rhyme and Print" reinforces the vigor of his declaration. It is not only that he will write ("Rhyme"), but he is also determined to publish ("Print") and thus to bear the pain of attacks and face the danger of the law.

To Trebatius' reply that he fears "maiorum ne quis amicus | frigore te feriat" ("lest a friend of one of the great slaughter you in cold blood," 61-62), Horace continues with the example of Lucilius. Here we see Horace's vision of an ideal system of patronage between a political ruler and a poet:

Quid? cum est Lucilius ausus
primus in hunc operis componere carmina morem
detrahere et pellem, nitidus qua quisque per ora
cederet, introrsum turpis, num Laelius aut qui (65)
duxit ab oppressa meritum Carthagine nomen
ingenio offensi aut laeso doluere Metello
famosisve Lupo cooperto versibus? atqui
primores populi arripuit populumque tributim,
scilicet uni aequus Virtuti atque eius amicis. (70)
quin ubi se a vulgo et scaena in secreta remorant
virtus Scipiadae et mitis sapientia Laeli,
nugari cum illo et discincti ludere, donec
decoqueretur holus, soliti. quidquid sum ego, quamvis
infra Lucili censum ingeniumque, tamen me (75)
cum magnis vixisse invita fatebitur usque
Invidia et fragili quaerens illidere dentem
offendet solido. (*Sat*. 2.1.62-78)

What? When Lucilius first dared to compose poems in this literary style,
to strip the skin with which every glorious man passed before the eyes of all,
though foul inside, was Laelius
or he who won his deserved renown from vanquished Carthage
really offended by the gifted poet, or aggrieved when Metellus was slighted,
when Lupus was overwhelmed by slanderous verses?
But he assailed the leaders of the nation and the people tribe by tribe,
evidently favorable to Virtue alone and her friends.
In fact, when the virtue of Scipio and the calm wisdom of Laelius
had withdrawn from the masses and the stage into their private quarters,
they talked nonsense with him and relaxed and fooled around, as usual,
while the vegetables were being cooked.
Whatever I am, ever so below the fortune and talent of Lucilius,
yet my Envy, though unwilling, will always acknowledge
that I have lived with the great,
and, in looking to smash the tooth on something fragile,
it will hit against something solid.

Horace questions whether the leaders Scipio Aemilianus and Gaius Laelius Sapiens felt affronted ("offensi") when they read Lucilius' lampoons ("est Lucilius ausus | in hunc operis componere carmina morem") or similarly offended when they saw that other distinguished figures, Metellus and Lupus, became targets of his invectives. Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus was consul in 131 B.C.E. A famous speech which he gave extolling the institution of marriage was parodied by Lucilius ("laeso… Metello").[44] L. Cornelius Lentulus

[44] Suet. *Aug*. 89; Gell. 1.6. For the parody by Lucilius, see Gruen 1992, 285-87.

Lupus also received "famosis versibus" from Lucilius.[45] Lupus was contemporary with Lucilius and held various public offices until his death in 126/125 B.C.E. Elected consul in 156 B.C.E., his career plummeted a few years later when he was convicted of extortion, but he managed to rise again rapidly. In 147 B.C.E., he was elected censor and then *princeps senatus* in 131 B.C.E., a position which he held for the remainder of his life. A notorious judge who was also corrupt, he appears alongside L. Hostilius Tubulus, praetor in 142 B.C.E., and C. Papirius Carbo, consul in 120 B.C.E., who were equally noted for their unethical conduct.[46] Though holding high office and seemingly glorious ("nitidus") on the outside, Lucilius attempted to expose how they were foul inside ("introrsum turpis"). Horace employs a somewhat grotesque image for this act: to strip their hides ("detrahere… pellem").[47]

Yet such, in the eyes of Horace, at least, was how Lucilius' manner appeared to be. His predecessor was indiscriminate in pointing out the vices of his society: "primores populi arripuit populumque tributim."[48] After this comes the line which struck Pope so deeply that he capitalized the words in his *Imitation*: "uni aequus Virtuti atque eius amicis." One important aspect to realize here is that "virtus" itself was an aristocratic value, traditionally connoting military prowess.[49] One cannot ignore the fact that Lucilius' freedom which he used to promote virtue by exposing vice derived from his social standing. He was an aristocrat by birth. As Sander Goldberg has pointed out, this was a status that "vastly enhanced his creative license."[50] Himself an aristocrat, he needed no patron to befriend, please, and to beseech for support.[51] He was descended from a family of landowners who held property in Suessa Aurunca, near the borders of Latium and Campania. His brother was most likely Luclius Hirrus, who served as senator, and his niece, Lucilia, married Pompeius Strabo and bore a son who was to become known in history as Pompey the Great. Although serving in war alongside Scipio Aemilianus, he, like Maecenas, did not pursue public offices and remained an *eques*.

[45] For Lupus and Lucilius, see Gruen 1992, 284-85. But see also Stack who identifies him as Publius Rutilius Lupus (1989, 52).
[46] See Golberg 2005, 160.
[47] Goldberg has pointed out that this may also be a pun on the name Lupus as a wolf (*lupus*) (ibid., 160n.).
[48] See Muecke (2005) and for the laws lampooned by second century B.C.E. poets, including the *lex Fannia* and *lex Licinia*, see Gruen 1992, 304-6.
[49] Goldberg 2005, 152 and 167; Earl 1967, 20-36.
[50] Goldberg 2005, 170. For Horace's limited *libertas*, see ibid., 165-73; Ruffell 2003, 35-44; Freudenburg 2001, 44-51. See DuQuesnay 1984, 30 for the view that Horace exercised *libertas* under the friendship of Maecenas yet one that also entailed being "traditional and responsible" as a client.
[51] For the income and social status of a poet in Lucilius' time, see White 1993: 5-14. For Lucilius' life and literary career, see Coffey 1976, 35-38; Gruen 1992, 274-80.

For a poet to come from the landed aristocracy was an exception, for Latin poets often had obscure origins and non-privileged backgrounds. Livius Andronicus was most probably brought to Rome as a slave from Tarentum. Terence was similarly a slave from Carthage, who was educated and later freed by his master Varro. Plautus, Naevius, and Ennius came not from Rome but from the provinces of Italy. Caecilius came from Insubrian Gaul. Horace belonged to this category of men and not to that of Lucilius. As such, although he remains elusive as to whether he will write about Caesar or not, he knows that the one thing which was possible for Lucilius but not for him is to freely mock and criticize distinguished leaders.[52]

Nevertheless, it is not the license granted to Lucilius to write invectives against the ruling elite which Horace yearned for. It is friendship that counts for Horace, more specifically friendships with his superiors which are based on trust and sincerity. His lawyer in the dialogue advises him to write about the righteousness and bravery of Scipio ("iustum… fortem," 16), as the wise Lucilius did ("sapiens," 17). Since in Horace's time, Lucilius' satires were acknowledged as political propaganda for the Scipionic Circle,[53] Trebatius may be saying that Lucilius was "sapiens" in befriending the political powers and integrating them into his poetry. However, to this Horace again gives a grudging answer by listing the difficult character traits of Octavian and how hard it would be to please him. In the dialogue Horace makes it seem that Horace the author makes his dialogue partner miss a point, which then serves to highlight his real wish of building a genuine friendship between himself and his patron. Thus, after claiming, "Sequor hunc," he finally manages to depict his ideal image of a poet and ruling elite which also explains why he saw in Lucilius a perfect model. It is to be able to "nugari" and "ludere" (73) with the leaders in a relaxed environment and in their private time, joking and playing free of care as they waited for their convivial meal (73-74). Horace had indeed found such a companion in his first patron, Maecenas. The mention of "nugari" and "ludere" also recalls to mind Lucilius' episode of chasing Scipio around a table with a dinner napkin in one hand.[54] This is comparable to Horace warning Maecenas of the potential evils of eating garlic in *Epod.* 3. Both Lucilius' and Horace's anecdotes are comic and exude an air of easy companionship. Perhaps this is what Horace wished to replicate, the friendship which he had cultivated with Maecenas and that of Lucilius with Scipio and

[52] See, among others, Gold 1987, 39-54.
[53] See Anderson 1982, 32-33. The Scipionic circle included not only Lucilius but also others including the playwright Terence, the Greek historian Polybius, and the Stoic philosopher Panaetius.
[54] Cf. Cic. *De Orat*. 2.22.

Laelius, but he has an uneasy premonition that such amicability would not be possible with the future Augustus.

The scene is set in which Horace needs to find a way to appease his lawyer who has become rather concerned about his client who would not quite agree to write about the "res" or the "iustum" and "fortem" qualities of the newly rising Roman leader. Thus he says to show that he is mindful of his own position: "infra Lucili censum ingeniumque." He not only acknowledges that, in homage to his predecessor as a satirist, he falls short of him in "ingenium" but also in "censum" - in wealth, status, and social standing. He understands that "ingenium" and "censum" are intricately intertwined in pursuing a poetic career and that the license to Lucilius because of his "censum" will not be available to him. However, having found the right patron in Maecenas, having published his first collection of *Satires*, and having received the Sabine farm, Horace's standing as a poet is now quite secure. In order to convince his lawyer of his safety, Horace, again cleverly evading the question of whether or not to write about Octavian, reverts back to the initial question of what he should do with those who have criticized his satires as being too harsh (1-4). Even those critics seething with envy, personified here as "invidia" (77), will admit, albeit grudgingly, that he lived, or currently still lives, among the great: "cum magnis vixisse invita fatebitur" (76). Once fragile ("fragili," 77) in his standing as a freedman's son, he has managed to join the elite circle and earned enough distinction that, even if the envious were to attempt to chew him up with their fangs ("inlidere dentem," 77), they will only bite into something hard ("offendet solido," 78). Horace is "solido," immune to attack, so long as he lives under the protection of the "magnis" (76).

Once more Pope departures from Horace as he continues to position himself as Lucilius:

What? arm'd for *Virtue* when I point the Pen, (105)
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? (110)
…
And I not strip the Gilding off a Knave, (115)
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. (120)
TO VIRTUE ONLY and HER FRIENDS, A FRIEND,
The World beside may murmur, or commend.
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, (125)
Chiefs, out of War, and Statesmen, out of Place.
…
Envy must own, I live among the Great,
No Pimp of Pleasure, and no Spy of State,
With Eyes that pry not, Tongue that ne'er repeats, (135)
Fond to spread Friendships, but to cover Heats,
To help who want, to forward who excel;
This, all who know me, know; who love me, tell;
And who unknown defame me, let them be
Scriblers or Peers, alike are *Mob* to me. (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.105-40)

As if to recall that the concept of "virtus" was associated with military prowess in war, Pope begins his claim that he is "arm'd for *Virtue*" with his "Pen" as his sword. The introduction of the word virtue at the outset, which does not appear in Horace's original, signals that he takes up the position of Lucilius. Virtue, to recall, was an aristocratic value as well, and, like Lucilius, he wishes to strip the skin ("detrahere… pellem") from the outwardly glorious figures ("nitidus") who, on the inside, are foul ("introrsum turpis"). Pope expands on Horace's description to add more violent images. "Detrahere… pellem" becomes "strip the Gilding off a Knave." In transforming "nitidus" to "Gilding," he manages to convey that distinguished figures in society, shining in glory, are also (and only) extremely wealthy. The act of uncovering their hidden quality of "introrsum turpis" becomes "[to] bare the mean Heart." Pope adds more, as he says that with his "Pen" he will "Brand the bold Front of shameless, guilty Men" and "Dash the proud Gamester in his gilded Car." These are scenes that involve physical violence and imply punishment more than the mere exposure of vice in satirical verse.

While Horace names prominent figures lampooned by Lucilius, Pope cites predecessors, distinguished writers who were able to write fairly freely under their patron kings:

Could pension'd *Boileau* lash in honest Strain
Flatt'rers and Bigots ev'n in *Louis*' Reign?
Could Laureate *Dryden* Pimp and Fry'r engage,
Yet neither *Charles* nor *James* be in a Rage? (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.111-114)

Boileau wrote under his patron Louis XIV. Boileau exercised the freedom to attack "in honest Strain" those whom he considered were "Flatt'rers and Bigots."[55] Similarly, Dryden, whom Pope admired greatly, became Poet Laureate in 1668 under Charles II and was also appointed historiographer royal in 1670. Before the Catholic James II ascended to the throne in 1685, he

[55] But see also Weinbrot 2005, 208-10 for the idea that had become fairly common for the English to name Boileau, regarding his relationship to Louis XIV, as an example of a dishonest flatterer.

wrote *The Spanish Friar* (performed in 1680, published 1681) about an immoral priest and *Religio Laici* (1682) from the standpoint of a follower of the Church of England. While under Charles II and James II, at least, the Laureate Dryden was able to write freely, without his royal patrons being in a "Rage."[56] Horace in the original evokes his predecessor and gives examples of Metellus and Lupus whom the satirist criticized. Likewise, Pope provides examples of predecessors who could write freely under their patron kings. Horace mentions Lucilius as a positive example to illustrate what his predecessor was able to do, thus making the argument that he should be able to do the same, and Pope follows suit by citing Boileau and Dryden.

Pope, of course, does not have a king as his patron and is not, and never will be, appointed Poet Laureate: "Un-plac'd, un-pension'd, no Man's Heir, or Slave." Such is the freedom which Pope possesses and the ultimate point of connection which he sees with Lucilius. Pope's reason for assuming the character of Lucilius instead of Horace in this speech is not out of sheer vanity. There is a point which he wishes to communicate, a personal conviction as well as a firm declaration, which he finds not in Horace speaking of himself but in Horace describing his predecessor Lucilius: "TO VIRTUE ONLY and HER FRIENDS, A FRIEND." The original "aequus" (70) in Latin is difficult to translate into English. Literally, it means "equal," "fair," "favorable," or "sympathetic," yet Pope finds the term "FRIEND," an ingenious equivalent which also maintains coherence as the discussion moves on to the theme of friendship. Pope still remains in Lucilius' shoes. Just like Rome's first satirist, he swears allegiance to virtue as the highest value. Moreover, this applies to all humans, regardless of social rank, and the wealthy, though shimmering in gold on the outside ("gilded Car," 107; "Gilding," 115), will not be let off the hook.

In the next lines in which Horace depicts the friendship of Lucilius with Scipio and Laelius in their leisure time, Pope is neither Horace nor Lucilius. He is himself, relating his own friendships. His "*Grotto*" (124) is his small villa at Twickenham, and it is where he entertains his closest friends: "There, my Retreat the best Companions grace" (125).[57] Although never in favor of the king or the leading political faction, Pope did have a large

[56] Dryden was later forced to step down from his laureateship and public offices altogether when the Protestant William of Orange assumed the throne and his newly embraced Catholicism created a conflict of interest.
[57] See Stack 1985, 53-55 for his discussion on Stoic retreat. Mack explains that Pope's grotto serves to keep him apart from the world "of stratagem and compromise and money-grubbing and self-interest" (1969, 66), but Weinbrot depicts it as a "dark salon" which "united the worthy, neglected, and defeated, not the triumphant" (1979, 10).

number of friends from the nobility. "Chiefs, out of War, and Statesmen, out of Place" came to congregate at his home (126). First he relates of the Statesman "out of Place:"

There *St. John* mingles with my friendly Bowl,
The Feast of Reason and the Flow of Soul. (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.127-28)

Henry St. John, or Viscount Bolingbroke (1678-1751), whom Pope usually referred to as Lord Bolingbroke, enjoyed a successful public career in the first half of his life. A Tory statesman, he was appointed Secretary of State in 1710, a position from which he was dismissed upon the accession of George I in 1714. Exiled to France in 1715, he was pardoned and returned to England in 1723. He then joined the opposition forces against Walpole, but, seeing that his efforts were fruitless, he returned of his own accord to France in 1735 and came back to England only for a temporary visit in 1738-1739. Pope's equivalent of "virtus Scipiadae et mitis sapientia Laeli" (*Sat*. 2.1.72) is: "The Feast of Reason and the Flow of Soul." Acquainted with the Lord before his exile in 1715, Pope invited him on numerous occasions as a guest at Twickenham and also paid many visits to his estate at Dawley Farm during his return in the years 1723-1735. He was impressed by his older friend's extensive knowledge of philosophy and politics and was influenced by him on many subjects. It is a bit ironic that Pope should mention a friend who, though once a distinguished statesman, fell out with the king and was exiled, as it is the opposite of the scene which Horace paints of Lucilius mingling in play with Scipio and Laelius, the leading political rulers of Rome. Perhaps Pope wanted to pay tribute to his friend of many years for his suggestion that he compose the *Imitations*, and it was probably important for Pope that he name a friend whom he genuinely admired and trusted.

The second friend, a chief "out of War," is a retired military general:

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*. (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.129-32)

Charles Mordaunt (1658-1735), first Earl of Monmouth and third Earl of Peterborough, is most often referred to by Pope simply as Peterborough.[58] In 1705 he led his forces to capture Barcelona and in the following year completed the conquest of Valencia with only 280 horses and 900 soldiers. Pope commends his friend's agility in conducting the campaign as one whose "Lightning pierc'd th' Iberian Lines" and who swiftly "conquer'd Spain." The two shared a passion for landscape gardening, and the terminology related to gardening,

[58] See *TE*, 4:372.

"Quincunx," "Vines," and "Plain," nicely intermingle with "forms," "ranks," and "tames," verbs relating to war and conquest. Peterborough too retired from his career in the army when George I assumed the throne. He may have been frequently in Pope's mind as Pope attended Peterborough in his final illness, which proved to be long and painful. Peterborough would be one of the many dear friends whom Pope was to lose in the 1730s during the composition of the Horatian *Imitations*.

Having named as friends these distinguished men who once held prominent offices, Pope, though unlike Horace in that he did not have an aristocratic patron and unlike Lucilius in that he had no political rulers as friends, can nevertheless safely claim: "I live among the Great" (133). He is indiscriminate when it comes to social standing. Asserting that he himself is "No Pimp of Pleasure, and no Spy of State" (134), he says that it is those who do not know him who attempt to "defame" him. As such, whether they are "Scriblers or Peers," they are an impudent crowd whom he considers as no different from a "Mob." One final point which I wish to touch on is the theme of friendship. Horace mentions only once an explicit term: "amicis" (70), when relating Lucilius' determination to expose vice and extol virtue. His depiction of Lucilius enjoying the company of his friends Scipio and Laelius is only four lines long (71-74). In Pope's rendering, however, we have: "FRIENDS" (121), "FRIEND" (121), "Companions" (125), "friendly" (127), and "Friendships" (136). Pope's definition of friends is those "who know me [him]" and "who love me [him]" (138). For Pope, who had neither an aristocratic patron friend like Horace nor political rulers as friends like Lucilius, and who at this period in his life was distressed by the deaths of his friends and final illness of his mother, friendship was very important.

III. Law of Libel: "Such as Sir *Robert* would approve"[59]

Horace presents the figure of the lawyer Trebatius as knowing that there is some significance in the poet's claim of "cum magnis vixisse" (76). Patronage may restrict his freedom, but the protection provided by Maecenas also yields some power.[60] Though not completely immune, he knows that he can expect some leniency, as the client of a patron who was also a close

[59] *Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.153.
[60] Lowrie 2005, 420-21.

associate to Octavian. However, Trebatius is still cautious,[61] and he warns his client of the legal consequences of libel:

Treb.
sed tamen ut monitus caveas, ne forte negoti (80)
incutiat tibi quid sanctarum inscitia legum.
si mala condiderit in quem quis carmina, ius est
iudiciumque.

Hor.
Esto, si quis mala; sed bona si quis
iudice condiderit laudatus Caesare? si quis
opprobriis dignum latraverit integer ipse? (85)

Treb.
Solventur risu tabulae, tu missus abibis. (*Sat*. 2.1.80-86)

Treb.
But nevertheless beware, as a reminder,
lest by chance your ignorance of the sacred laws incite any trouble.
If a man were to write harmful poems,
there are the laws and the court.

Hor.
Let that be the case, if someone writes harmful poems;
but if a man, commended by Caesar's judgment, were to write good ones?
If a man were to bark at something worthy of reproach, while blameless himself?

Treb.
The records will be discarded with a laugh, you shall depart free.

What constitutes "mala…carmina" (82) as mentioned by Trebatius and the "mala" and "bona" (83) by Horace becomes a matter of debate in this last advice which the lawyer gives to his client. By bringing up *sanctae leges*, the jurist makes an allusion to the Twelve Tables. Cicero explains that Roman schoolboys, including himself, were expected to memorize them by rote.[62] They contained a law against magic spells[63] and a libel law. Cicero states that infringement of the law on spells, Table 8.1, included capital punishment.[64] Neither Trebatius referring to "mala…carmina" (82) nor Horace of "mala" (83) is about to introduce black

[61] See Tatum 2009, 236 for his view that protection under Maecenas may appear satisfactory to a poet yet would be an "extra-legal and extra-literary" argument in the eyes of a jurist.
[62] Cic. *De Leg*. 2.59.
[63] Table 8.1; see Lowrie 2005, 407 and Tatum 2009, 236-37. Crawford 1996, 1:40 and 2:677-79 argues that the two laws were the same. For ideas that Horace distinguished between the two yet merged them as if they were one in his poem, see C.O. Brink 1982, 196-99; Cloud 1989, 67. Lowrie has pointed out the link between satire and the Twelve Tables in the use of *carmina* as a standard term for poetry in Horace' time but means spells in the Twelve Tables (*carmina*, 2.1.82) (2005, 413). Rudd states that Horace could not have taken this seriously as "Educated people in [Horace's age] regarded superstition as vulgar" (1994, 62).
[64] Cic. *De Rep*. 4.10.12. But Erich Gruen 1992, 295-96 has shown that there are no recorded cases of such a sentence, only those of libel lawsuits, including a case in which the tragedian Accius brought a suit, and won, against an actor for slander and a comparable case which Lucilius brought but lost.

magic. The libel law, on the other hand, forbade any *carmen* which brought disgrace or damage to another's repute, and the penalty could be capital punishment.[65] However, by Horace's days the Twelve Tables, which date back to the fifth century B.C.E., were not the only set of laws in enforcement. The praetor's edict served to supplement the Twelve Tables.[66]

Some scholars have assumed that Horace is jokingly speaking of the law of the genre, of the place of satire in poetry, while others have argued that Horace takes the law of libel seriously.[67] Trebatius worries about the poet's ignorance of the laws ("tibi…inscitia," 81). However, just as Trebatius was a jurist learned in literature, so Horace and other writers of his era were adept in law.[68] Horace is not engaging in a serious discussion with his lawyer about the law of libel. He understands that it is not about the law itself but, rather, under whose judgment the law ultimately operates: "iudice Caesare" (84).[69]

As is clear from the *libertas* which Lucilius enjoyed,[70] class hierarchy was a factor that could not be ignored in the Roman Republic, a tradition which continued into Horace's time. This made justice difficult to administer as members of the higher class used their privileges to turn the ruling in their favor. In an effort to enhance equitableness, new legislation was introduced to curb such practices by Roman praetors which had become a common and more or less acceptable norm. Unsurprisingly, the senate did not approve of this change. In lieu of praetors who were apparently not models of impartiality, jurists were established in order that the court system could be improved in such a way as to eliminate as much as possible the advantages previously enjoyed by those of senatorial rank. However, as the Triumvirates were

[65] Cic. *De Rep*. 4.12. Cf. *Ep*. 2.1.152-54. See, for example, LaFleur 1981, 1790-1826 who sees that the dangers of a legal action was real.
[66] Cic. *Leg*. 1.17. For the praetor's edict, the "actio iniuriarum," see Muecke 1995, 29-10 and Rudd 1986, 56.
[67] Fraenkel (1957), Muecke (1995), Oliensis (1998), and Lowrie (2005), note the lack of seriousness. Cf. also Rudd's famous phrase of "shadow-boxing" for this poem (1966, 128). See also Anderson who argues that "Trebatius… by his misunderstandings, launches the discussion in the wrong direction" (1984, 37), that while Trebatius is concerned strictly about legal issues, Horace by *bona carmina* is speaking of "'good' in both an ethical and aesthetic sense" (ibid., 41). Contrary views have been expressed by Leeman (1982), Tatum (2009), McGinn (2001), and Freudenburg (2001).
[68] For Trebatius' knowledge of literature, see Cic. *Ad Fam*. 7.6, 12, 16; he was also an Epicurean (*ibid*., 7.12; Gell. 7.12). Conversely, for writers' knowledge of the law, see Crook 1967, 8.
[69] That a judgment be handed by one person was not as unusual. See Lowrie 2005, 409, and Crook 1967, 74-78 for the general procedures of a civil case, in which a praetor presided over the preliminary hearing (*in iure*) to determine the laws and possibility of a settlement, followed by the judgment (*iudicium*), which may be sentenced by a jury but was more usually by a single judge (*iudex unus*). The fact that for Horace there is only one judge is another difference between him and Lucilius, as Lucilius did not have a "Caesar" in his time. Horace's phrase "iudice Caesare" also symbolizes the diminishing *libertas* as Rome transforms itself from Republic to Empire. In Pope's case in eighteenth-century England, the sole judge was not George II but, rather, Sir Robert Walpole.
[70] No litigation over defamation was brought against him.

formed and proscriptions[71] instilled fear of being made a target by those in power, the *ad hominem* clause once again infiltrated the legal system as well. In relation to legislation and literature, Arnaldo Momigliano considered that Naevius was the last writer to be prosecuted.[72] There was possibly a law during Sulla's reign in which the *lex maiestatis* included defamation, and the *lex maiestatis* by Augustus which explicitly included slander in poems and books did not come into effect until 12 C.E. Horace stands in a period between the two. Nevertheless, Momigliano pointed out that although Horace did not actually live under that Augustan law, it must have already been understood in Rome in Horace's days that freedom of speech was a delicate matter in which one should give utmost consideration for one's own safety.[73] The once hoped-for *aequitas* in the Roman legal system, interrupted by the proscriptions and civil war, is never quite established in Augustus' reign either.

Horace, as we know, was always aware of his origins. By birth he comes from the lower order and thus, in the case of a libel lawsuit, senatorial privilege would not be an available option for him. There is a hint that he attempts to skirt around this, as he has recourse to asserting that he has established good connection with the "magnis" (61, 76) and is therefore a part of the elite circle. However, his lawyer in the dialogue never defines in detail what he truly means as "mala…carmina" in his warning: "si mala condiderit in quem quis carmina, ius est | iudiciumque" (82-83). According to Suetonius' account (*Aug*. 89.3), it was "ingenia" which were important to Augustus. For a poet, this would be the quality of his verse. If it was talent which counted most for Augustus and if he was searching for them "omnibus modis," Horace stood a chance to vanquish his inferior background and rise to glory by means of his poetic talent. Complete *libertas* may not be attainable, since he must live up to the criteria imposed by the ultimate judge, "iudice Caesare" (84). If he composes verse of poor quality, he may not win a favorable judgment by the emperor. And if by a stroke of bad luck there should be litigation for slander, despite his connection with the "magnis," the fate of the freedman's son is uncertain. Yet as long as he avoids these two possibilities, and exerts his talent to write verses of good quality ("bona," 83), he may actually be praised

[71] When Caesar wrote invectives against Asinius Pollio before Actium, Pollio chose to remain silent; see Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, 2.4.21. See also LaFleur (1981).
[72] Momigliano 1942, 123.
[73] Ibid.. Goldberg reminds us that it was not only during Augustus' reign: "Romans of all periods were accustomed to limits on where, what, and how they spoke" (2005, 201).

by Caesar ("laudatus," 84).[74] In addition, according to Suetonius, Augustus felt offended by writing in which he was presented as degraded ("obsolefieri"), but that does not mean that he expected all writers in all fields ("carmina, historias, orationes, dialogos") to write large-scale panegyrics. So long as he is careful, Horace can envisage a future in which he may be commended by Caesar ("laudatus") without having to commend him.

If Trebatius never explains what he considers to be "mala… carmina" (82), save that they would be poems which may invite prosecution ("ius est | iudiciumque," 82-83), Horace does not quite define what he means by "bona" either. Yet the jurist, interpreting his client's "bona" to signify poems which will win Caesar's praise ("iudice… laudatus Caesare," 84), asks no more whether they will be on "Caesaris invicti res" (11) or on his justness and bravery, as Lucilius wrote of Scipio (16-17), and he is finally relieved. Concerned about the safety of his client, all he needs to know is that Horace's poetry will win Caesar's approval. In that assumption, there is no litigation, as there are no grounds for prosecution. The case will not be pursued but will be discarded with a laugh ("Solventur risu tabulae," 86), and his client will walk out free of charge ("tu missus abibis"). Suddenly, the issue becomes one so trivial to a lawyer that he can dismiss it with a laugh. Horace's concern, as it pertains to poetry, is not to be taken seriously in the eyes of an administrator of the law. Horace's first book of *Satires* may have been criticized as being *ultra legem* in going beyond the limits of what constitutes good poetry, but it does not concern any *lex* of politics and government policies. Horace as the writer of this dialogue gives himself freedom and presents himself as having a jurist's affirmation that he will never be entangled with the law. "Solventur" and "abibis" are in the future tense, as Octavian has yet to consolidate power and his exact ways of ruling the new empire are unknown. The future tense equally represents Horace's hope that he will remain safe, that no litigation will be brought against him, and that the new ruler will not object ("recalcitret undique tutus," 20).

Like Horace's Trebatius, Pope's lawyer Fortescue gives final warning advice:

F.
But still I say, beware!
Laws are explain'd by Men – so have a care.
It stands on record, that in *Richard*'s Times (145)
A Man was hang'd for very honest Rhymes.
Consult the Statute: *quart.* I think it is,
Edwardi Sext. or *prim. & quint. Eliz*:
See *Libels, Satires* – here you have it – read.

[74] Cf. Lowrie: "Horace turns the tables ever so deftly: although Caesar comes up in Trebatius' suggestion as an object of poetic praise (2.1.11), the panegyric representation instead makes him the one to praise the poet, '*iudice… laudatus Caesare*' (praised with Caesar as the judge; 2.1.84)" (2005, 421).

P.
Libels and *Satires!* lawless Things indeed! (150)
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, (155)
My Lords the Judges laugh, and you're dismiss'd. (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.143-56)

Whereas Trebatius was concerned that Horace's ignorance of the laws could invite unwanted legal trouble ("ne… incutiat… inscitia," 80-81), Fortescue does not question Pope's knowledge of the laws. His warning is based on the fact that "Laws are explain'd by Men" (144). What Fortescue knows as a law professional, and which Pope may be unaware of, is the manner in which laws are enforced and legal cases are settled.

However, the examples which Fortescue gives are incidents and laws from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Here Pope plays on Trebatius' mention of the Twelve Tables ("sanctarum legum," 81), whose effects were obsolete in Horace's time. Put in the mouth of the lawyer figure, the first example is that there was a man who was "hang'd" in "Richard's Times" (145-46). Richard is King Richard III (1452-1485), who reigned for a brief period in the final years of his life, 1483-1485. Fortescue refers to a poet and Wiltshire gentleman named Collingbourne who was hanged at Tower Hill in 1484. What Fortescue calls "very honest Rhymes" (146) are this poet's verses which satirized the king and his counselors. The lawyer then proceeds to recite 3/4 Edward VI, c. 15; 1 Elizabeth I, c. 6; and 5 Elizabeth I, c. 15, early acts against seditious material.[75] However, unlike the Twelve Tables whose legal effectiveness had more or less vanished by Horace's day, the first law of defamation in England remained in the law books until the Statute Law Revision Act of 1888.[76] Pope the author sets the scene in which the lawyer has reason to caution his client, as, if we look at the development of censorship in England, some writers indeed suffered dire consequences as a result of writing too freely.

The history of censorship in Europe runs almost parallel to the invention of printing. The first secular censorship office was established in 1486 by the electorate of Mainz and the imperial city of Frankfurt. It was the result of the Archbishop Berthold von Henneberg's request that the town council of Frankfurt cooperate with the church authorities in eliminating

[75] For these laws, see *TE*, 4:19n.
[76] Kropf 1974, 155.

certain publications at the exhibition at the Lenten Fair in 1485.[77] The ecclesiastical authorities, including universities, had long had their own system of suppression of heretical and schismatic material. However, although it aimed to halt publications such as translations of the Bible, overall church censorship had a tendency to be lenient and tolerant, including towards obscene writings. The advent of the printing press coupled with the rise of the Protestant Reformation led the Catholic Church to call for an ever tighter control of printed books. In particular, Pope Innocent VII in 1488 and Pope Alexander VI in 1501, in their attempt to implement uniform censorship throughout Christendom, introduced preventive censorship and required that all non-theological books be subject to ecclesiastical examination before publication. It was in 1559 that Pope Paul IV, formerly Cardinal Caraffa and a fierce advocate of the Inquisition, issued the first *Index librorum prohibitorum*, a list of banned books, of which at least one contained a defense of Lutheran doctrines.

This rigorous control of printed books, first promulgated by church officials, was soon adopted by political authorities. Royals and political leaders in Germany and Italy followed suit in suppressing individual publications. In England, Henry VIII was the first monarch to present a list of banned books in 1529, and in 1538 he prohibited the importation of English books which had been printed abroad. In an effort to suppress unwanted political propaganda, legislation was passed in 1559 which established that all books be inspected by six members of the Privy Council and approved before publication. In the wake of the establishment of the Church of England, Catholics resorted to underground printing of their religious books. Puritans suffered a similar fate in that the only way to publish their material was by clandestine means. Severe penalties were sometimes inflicted. John Stubbs, a Puritan, wrote in 1579 *The discoverie of a gaping gulf whereinto England is like to be swallowed*, which contained critical remarks about Queen Elizabeth. The printer and agent were set free, yet Stubbs as author and his publisher had their right hands chopped off.[78] Furthermore, in 1586, a decree was issued by the star chamber which limited the number of printers and required that all books be subject to authorization by the archbishop of Canterbury or the bishop of London.

In addition to curbing seditious publications, the law also facilitated the circulation of ideas and rumors which served the interests of the crown by actively publishing propaganda

[77] Steinberg 1996, 130.
[78] Parmelee 1994, 854.

material through their own presses.[79] Censorship by both the church and political authorities continued well into the seventeenth century. Hobbes's *De cive*, for example, was published in 1642. The work was listed in the Roman Index in 1654, and as late as 1683, by which time multiple editions had been published, Oxford University ordered that all copies be burned.[80]

Writers and presses alike attempted to combat such impositions, and one of the ways was to use a feigned imprint. Many French treatises were clandestinely published abroad, often in Protestant Holland, to escape censorship in France. In order to conceal this fact, a fake imprint giving the name of a French printer and city was printed on the book. Montesquieu's *Lettres persanes* were published in Holland in 1721 yet bore the imprint of "Cologne chez Pierre Marteau." His *Considérations sur la cause de la grandeur des Romains et de leur décadence* was published in Amsterdam in 1724 and his *Esprit des lois* in Geneva in 1748. Rousseau's books were likewise published in Holland, *La Nouvelle Héloïse* (1761) and *Du Contrat social* (1762) in Amsterdam and *Emile* (1762) at The Hague.[81] Pope employed a similar strategy by indicating in the imprint of the *Dunciad* that the work was first printed in Dublin before it was reprinted in London. The imprint is found on the title page of the duodecimo edition of the *Dunciad* of 1728, but the information is in all probability false.

Movements to remove the system of censorship occurred throughout Europe in the eighteenth century, but it was only in 1766 that censorship was abolished in Sweden. It was the first country in Europe to abolish the practice, and many other European countries as well as the United States gradually lessened the centuries-long control of printed matter.[82] However, in Pope's time, active censorship was still exercised, especially by political authorities, and writers had good reason to take precaution.

S.H. Steinberg states of the particularity of political and moral censorship:

> Censorship for political and moral reasons has probably made itself more obnoxious and ridiculous than censorship for ideological reasons. After all, a trained theologian can without much difficulty decide whether or not certain propositions fall within the teaching of his church. In the field of politics and morals, however, posterity usually finds it very difficult to account for the complete lack of discrimination between good, indifferent and bad writers, even between defenders and opponents of a cause.[83]

This falls in line with the earlier statement by Pope's figure of Fortescue that "Laws are explain'd by Men" (144). It is one thing to know what laws of censorship exist. It is yet another to be able to foresee how the authorities will interpret them, should one's verses be

[79] Ibid., 855.
[80] Steinberg 1996, 135.
[81] Ibid., 132.
[82] See Clegg (2008).
[83] Steinberg 1996, 135.

placed under scrutiny. In his early career, Pope wrote the Prologue for Addison's *Cato* (1713) in which he changed the phrase "Britain, arise" to "Britons attend," upon Addison's pleading that it might arouse suspicion of sedition. Addison feared that Pope's word "arise" could be taken as encouraging Britain to stir up another revolution.[84]

The caution with which contemporary writers chose each word should have been nothing new to Pope. However, part of the confidence exuded by Pope in this *Imitation* stems from the fact that he had previously been successful in finding loopholes in the libel laws. Cleverly using the innuendo clause, Pope knew that the initials of living authors which he listed in the *Peri Bathous* published in March 1728 would not be deemed, at least not legally, as rendering them identifiable. Similarly in the *Dunciad* of 1728, even if Lady Mary Wortley Montagu was to bring the issue to court, Pope's use of the fictitious name "Sappho" to mock her for having smallpox would have been virtually impossible for the plaintiff to prove. Pope was never charged for these actions.[85] We shall now see the conclusion to his imaginary consultation with his lawyer.

Pope presents Fortescue's definition of "mala" (Trebatius' words in Horace's original, *Sat*. 2.1.82) as verses which government authorities could regard as seditious material. The reader is made to sense a hint of ambivalence with regard to how censorship is carried out in the country when one looks at the lawyer's statements, that "Laws are explain'd by Men" and that "A Man was hang'd for *very honest Rhymes*"[86] (144, 146). Pope attempts to show that impartiality and justice do not figure in the court system. In the dialogue, the least a lawyer can do is to provide honest advice to his client, that is, to disclose the corrupt legal system which he knows as a professional. Pope presents himself, the poet, as agreeing with the lawyer, as he exclaims that libels and satires are "Lawless Things" (150), writings composed without respect for the law.

However, it is ironic for Pope, who had stated earlier in the dialogue that "Satire's my Weapon" (69), to suddenly revert back to the "Epistles" for which he received criticism and which occasioned the consultation, albeit imaginary, with his lawyer.[87] Pope suggests turning to the composition of some "Epistles" in his quest to bring "Vice to light"[88] (151), but also

[84] *TE*, 6:98.
[85] For the legal definition of innuendo and use of names in *Peri Bathous* and *Dunciad*, see Kropf 1974, 155-66.
[86] My italics.
[87] See the Advertisement to the poem in *TE*, 4:3.
[88] But Cf. Stack 1989, 58 for the relationship between Pope's statement, "TO VIRTUE ONLY and HER FRIENDS, A FRIEND" (121), and the term "Virtue" which carried political connotations in the 1730s as a word which the Opposition used to contrast it with Walpole's "Vice."

works which would not come under the scrutiny of political or church authorities, as they would be "Such as a King might read, a Bishop write" (152). Most importantly, they would be verses "Such as Sir Robert would approve" (153). Pope as the author has cleverly set the final scene, as this is exactly what the lawyer has longed to hear from the poet throughout the dialogue, and at this point he makes the lawyer interrupt his speech and instantly declare that "The Case is alter'd" (154). It will no longer be worthy a court case: "the Plaintiff will be hiss'd" (155) and "My Lords the Judges [will] laugh" (156). The lawyer tells his client, "you may then proceed" (154) and the satire swiftly comes to a close with his words, "you're dismiss'd" (156).[89]

In a letter to Swift shortly after the publication of this poem, Pope further offers his views on the difference between satires and epistles:

> 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.[90]

By "*Libels* and *Satires!* lawless Things indeed!" (150), Pope may well have had in mind the sharply critical and biting verse satires by his recent predecessors, the Restoration writers such as the Earl of Rochester. Compared to these satires, epistles tended to be more erudite, serious, and moralistic. Pope himself describes epistles as being "grave" (151). However, this also meant that, though more high-minded and moralizing, epistles treated themes in a general manner and could be seen as being insipid. It is thus that, according to Pope, Swift regards epistles as "dull." For Pope, it serves him well to call his poems epistles rather than satires. He knows that if his writings could be classified as "grave *Epistles*" (151), then it is more likely that "Sir *Robert* would approve" (153). Furthermore, in claiming that he writes epistles, which were generally milder and less specific in their attacks than satires, Pope also knows that it would increase his chances of being "dismiss'd" (156). Not only would he escape the laws, but he may never even come under scrutiny in the first place, if he calls his writings epistles.

Perhaps Pope at this time intended this *First Satire of the Second Book of Horace Imitated* to remain a single poem and not to continue with a series. He may not have been keen on continuing to write satires which made explicit attacks on the king and prime minister. Yet even so, his statement "Such as Sir Robert would approve" can hardly be construed as

[89] In view of Pope's acquiescence that he will write the kind of satire "Such as Sir Robert would approve," Thomas R. Edwards claims that the poem ends with Pope's "virtual confession of defeat" (1963, 93). Weinbrot (1969, 1979) expresses a similar view. Others who see Pope as the victor are: Maresca 1966, 37-72; Mack 1969, 66-69 and 177-87; and Reverand 1976, 556. Katherine Mannheimer 2006, 17 also explains that in a legal process the term "proceed" means to enforce the law and thus in the poem Pope establishes two points: that he writes satire and that his satires are legal.

[90] *Ibid*., 366; my italics.

sincere.[91] In referring to "grave Epistles" (151), he may also have had in mind his *Essay on Man*, which he was working on concurrently with the Horatian poems.[92] The epistles comprising *An Essay on Man* were published between 20 February 1733 and 24 January 1734. They were published anonymously and enjoyed great success, even winning acclaim from his enemies who lauded them in their ignorance of who the true author was. Whatever his initial intentions, one thing that is probably true is that the immediate success of *The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace Imitated* encouraged him to write more. The glory it brought him is made manifest in a letter he wrote to Caryll on 8 March 1733:

> You may have seen my last piece of song, which has met with such a flood of favour that my ears need no more flattery for this twelvemonth.[93]

However, as we shall see in the next chapter, over the course of the few months following the publication, he is overwhelmed with parodies, criticisms, and even threats that he indeed should be taken to court.

Both Horace's *Sat.* 2.1 and Pope's *Imitation* deal with their uneasy ambivalence in defining the role and limits of a poet in relation to their respective political authorities. Both poets continue to compose and publish their verses. Although, according to Suetonius, Horace is admonished by Augustus for not addressing his poems to the emperor,[94] he remains aware that he must write poetry which will be deemed "bona" by the "iudice… Caesare" (*Sat.* 2.1.83, 84). Horace largely limits himself to the lesson which he learned in *Sat.* 2.1, that in order to keep himself safe at Rome he must remain in Caesar's favor and that, as such, occasional praise for the emperor is necessary.

In contrast to Horace, Pope's statement at the end of his *Imitation*, "Such as Sir Robert would approve" remains questionable. He does not express any wish to write to be favored by the king and prime minister. He does not think it just that a poet should have such reservations towards the political powers. After all, this is a poet who had refused offers of patronage and actually succeeded in attaining his financial independence solely from the sales of his books. It is also true that he had many aristocratic friends who, indeed, suggested becoming patrons and, when that was turned down, supported him in purchasing subscriptions. It is also possible that Pope did not expect such fierce criticisms of the *Imitation*. However, his

[91] Although McLaverty 2001, 168 takes this as a reference to Fortescue's presentation of Pope's *Dunciad Variorum* to Walpole on 12 March 1729. Fortescue was a friend to both Pope and Walpole. Pope may be attempting to say that the fact that his poem was received by Walpole would mean that he was able to win the minister's acceptance, or approval ("Such as Sir Robert would approve").
[92] See *Corr*., 3:213-14.
[93] *Ibid*., 353.
[94] Suet. *Vit. Hor*.

obstinate refusal to accommodate to the political situation, an accommodation which required writers to pay careful heed to censorship, created a rift between Horace and himself, a fissure which would only deepen as he continued to criticize individuals including political rulers. In that sense, the parting of ways with his favored poet had already begun with his first *Imitation*.

Chapter 7
Politics, Emperor, and King:
The *Epistle to Augustus* and *The First Epistle of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated*

Pope meets Horace again, the Horace of almost two decades later, in the *Epistle to Augustus*.[1] Augustus by then holds the title of *princeps* and also has *imperium proconsulare* and *tribunicia potestas*. Horace realizes the increasing difficulty of poets in keeping themselves separate from politics.[2] However, this first work addressed to the Roman ruler is not a recitation of Augustus' accomplishments or praise in verse, singing of his greatness. That is kept to a minimum (*Ep*. 2.1.1-5). What we have instead is the poet's exploration of the literary history of Rome, the taste of the public, including the factors which led them to develop that particular taste, and the role of the poet in society and history. In his own way he attempts to convey to the emperor his view of the place of the poet in the empire. Pope recognized that the *Epistle to Augustus* was not a mere work of adulation. This chapter will attempt to bring to light the ways in which Horace obliquely criticized the emperor's literary views. It will also discuss how Pope, often with great temerity, responded to the poem by aligning it with the tensions between himself as the poet and the politics of his age.

Changes occurred between the time Horace wrote and published the second book of *Satires* and the composition of the *Epistle to Augustus*. With the exception of *Carm*. 1.2, Horace had only begun to address Augustus in his poetry in the fourth book of the *Odes* published a year before in 13 B.C.E.[3] This was the first open letter to Augustus, which he placed as the first of his second book of *Epistles*. Changes had taken place for Pope too. Albeit elated at the success of his first Horatian *Imitation*, far from convincing and suppressing critics, he received several attacks and threats.[4] The famous *Verses Address'd to the Imitator of the First Satire of the Second Book of Horace* by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu and Lord Hervey likewise followed on 8 March 1733, less than a month after its publication.[5]

[1] The second book of *Satires* was published in 30 B.C.E. and the second book of *Epistles* in 12 B.C.E.
[2] See Chapter 5 on Propertius and Ovid.
[3] See Brink 1982, 536 and Feeney 1993, 54 on *Carm*. 1.2.52. See also Feeney (2009).
[4] Cf. Pope's letter to Swift: "I have met with some complaints, and heard at a distance of some threats" (*Corr*., 3:366). See Weinbrot 1979, 11 and 1982, 233-36 and 339-40.
[5] Cf. Pope's letters to Fortescue in which he calls the *Verses* a "Libell" (8 March 1733; *Corr*., 3:354) and assures his lawyer: "You may be certain I shall never reply to such Libel as Lady Mary's" (18 March 1733; *ibid*., 357); He also writes to Swift in April: "Tell me your opinion as to Lady M-'s or Lord H-'s performance? they are certainly the Top wits of the Court, and you may judge by that single piece what can be done against me" (*ibid*., 366). See McLaverty (1998).

A malignant parody, *The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated in a Dialogue between Mr. Pope and the Ordinary of Newgate*, by a certain Mr. "Guthry," appeared on 2 March, a mere two weeks after the publication of Pope's poem. In reply to Pope's declaration that, though an impertinent satirist, he will remain safe from prosecution and danger, the poem prophesies that the poet will be clubbed and hanged. The *Sequel of Mr. Pope's Law Case: Or, Farther Advice thereon*, under yet another pseudonym Patrick M'Doe-Roach followed on 6 March, again claiming that Pope would eventually face the death penalty.[6] Although Pope never received an official warrant summoning him to the Chancery for the *Imitation*, such were the malign predictions which were made against Pope in the face of law. The political overtones which Horace in the original had carefully refrained from but which Pope the imitator did not hesitate to convey became another point of attack. The fact that he had named Bolingbroke as his ally had its repercussions. He was a statesman "out of Place" (*Hor. Imit. Sat.* 2.1.126) who had become a leading force in the opposition to Walpole. Praise of Bolingbroke was perceived as resistance to Sir Robert. *An Epistle to the Little Satyrist of Twickenham*, published at the end of March, 1733, criticized Pope's political stance. On 16 June 1733, the *Daily Courant*, a Walpolean newspaper, picked up on the name of Bolingbroke and questioned the Lord's patriotism.[7]

I should also mention those who composed replies of praise for Pope. In June 1733, an anonymous work, *The Satirist: in Imitation of the Fourth Satire of the First Book of Horace*, appeared which commended Pope as a satirist. In the same month, Paul Whitehead published his *State Dunces, Inscrib'd to Mr. Pope*. However, Whitehead did not place himself in a safe position in commending Pope.[8] In the midst of culminating attacks on the first Horatian *Imitation*, Pope confessed to Fortescue at the end of a letter of 18 March that "[I] hope I shall have long life, because I am much threaten'd."[9]

[6] See Weinbrot 1979, 8-10 and 14. Weinbrot explains that the former was printed under the title, *A Just Imitation of the First Satire of the Second Book of Horace. In a Dialogue between Mr. Pope and the Ordinary of Newgate. With Achilles Dissected*, with the author as Alexander Burnet. Since it was published by W. Mears but reprinted in the second volume of *Mr Pope's Correspondence* (1735) by Curll, Mr. "Guthry" could be either Burnet or Curll himself. Pope's private reaction to these pieces, the *Sequel* and the *Ordinary of Newgate*, is revealed in a letter written to Fortescue on 8 March: "There has been another thing wherein Pigott is abused as my Learned Council, written by some Irish attorney; & Curll has printed a Parody on my own words" (*Corr*., 3:354-55).
[7] See Weinbrot 1979, 6.
[8] Cf. Weinbrot: "The *Daily Courant*'s attack on Pope… also was an attack on Paul Whitehead… It seems reasonable to assume that threatened punishment of Whitehead was a hint to Pope as the teacher of satiric murder" (1979, 8). See also his comment, based on the correspondence between Pope and Fortescue during this time that Fortescue "may have intervened on his [Pope's] behalf with Walpole" (ibid., 14).
[9] *Corr*., 3:357.

Pope was not subject to official censorship for the first *Imitation*, but, for all his audacity, he was not completely immune to fear. He continued however to develop the Horatian poems into a series, steadily publishing *The Second Satire of the Second Book of Horace, Paraphrased* (July 1734), *Sober Advice from Horace* (December 1734), *The First Ode of the Fourth Book of Horace* (March 1737), and *The Second Epistle of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated* (April 1737). Criticism likewise never abated. Running parallel to his publications, the steady flow of attacks continued. On political lines there were *The State Juggler: Or, Sir Politick Ribband* (1733) and *The False Patriot: An Epistle to Mr. Pope* (1734), both of which were anonymous. Similarly, *The Muse in Distress: A Poem Occasion'd by the Present State of Poetry* was anonymous. Published on 3 November 1733, the author dedicated the work to a Walpole loyalist, Sir William Yonge. He attempted to demonstrate Pope's false beliefs and warned that his assumed safety would not last. Some verses were written as explicit replies to a specific Horatian poem, as in Thomas Bentley's *Letter to Mr. Pope, Occasioned by Sober Advice from Horace, & c.* (4 March 1735) and the anonymous *An Epistle to Alexander Pope, Esq; Occasion'd by some of his Late Writings*, (4 February 1735), which criticized Pope's inefficacy in attempting to follow Horace as a model as well as his objectionable political allegiance with Bolingbroke.[10]

Like Fortescue in *The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace Imitated*, his friends expressed concern about his defiant style and the law throughout this period. Lord Bathurst wrote to Swift shortly after the publication of the first Horatian *Imitation* in February 1733: "It is time for [Pope] to retire, for he has made the town too hot to hold him."[11] In a letter to Arbuthnot, dated July 26, 1734, Pope attempts to reassure his elderly friend:

> As to your kind concern for my Safety, I can guess what occasions it at this time. Some Characters I have drawn are such, that if there be any who deserve 'em, 'tis evidently a service to mankind to point those men out: yet such as if all the world gave them, none I think will own they take to themselves. But if they should, those of whom all the world think in such a manner, must be men I cannot fear. Such in particular as have the meanness to do mischiefs in the dark, have seldom the courage to justify them in the face of day; the talents that make a Cheat or a Whisperer, are not the same that qualify a man for an Insulter; and as to private villany, it is not so safe to join in an Assassination, as in a Libel. I will consult my safety so far as I think becomes a prudent man; but not so far as to omit any thing which I think becomes an honest one. As to personal attacks beyond the law, every man is liable to them: as for danger within the law, I am not guilty enough to fear any.[12]

Even when at the receiving end of such attacks, Pope has not changed his attitude and beliefs. He does not see the naming of individuals to be a vile act. He believes that he is doing "a service to mankind" to expose them. He even thinks that the "Characters" which he created

[10] For attacks on Pope, throughout his career, see Guerinot (1969). See also Weinbrot (1979, 1982).
[11] Swift 1963-65, 4:131-32.
[12] *Corr*. 3:419-20.

under fictitious names will not be correctly identified. It is still acceptable if they do find out, since he is only representing the voices of the public ("all the world think in such a manner") and states that he simply feels no fear ("I cannot fear"). Still, he assures Arbuthnot: "I will consult my safety so far as I think becomes a prudent man." However, the statement is followed by a condition: "but not so far as to omit any thing which I think becomes an honest one." In the face of uncovering the truth, he declares that honesty will take precedence over prudence. Therefore, though cautious not to jeopardize his safety, he is ever prepared to discard discreetness or hesitation when pointing out vice which he notices in certain individuals.

Finally, he conveys his thoughts on his safety before the law. Pope's exposure of vice in his poetry has been perceived as personal attacks and individuals have felt offended. He in turn has received attacks in the form of poems, letters of reply, and pamphlets. Despite his confession of feeling "threaten'd" by some of the contents of attack after the first Horatian *Imitation*,[13] he says that he still remains within the bounds of the law and feels safe in that regard: "as for danger within the law, I am not guilty enough to fear any." This certainly changes after the publication of the *Imitation* of the *Epistle to Augustus*. It becomes impossible for Pope not to recognize the significance of the difference between Horace's relationship to the emperor and his relationship to the king. In the next two chapters I focus on Horace's *Epistle to Augustus* and Pope's *The First Epistle of the Second Book of Horace Imitated*, with a few references to their other poems as I deem relevant to the discussion.

I. Augustus in Eighteenth-Century England: "*Against the Emperor himself*"[14]

First published on May 25, 1737, *The First Epistle of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated* was composed in 1736. In the spring of that year, Pope reported to Fortescue that he "began an Imitation of the finest in Horace… which I propose to finish… this autumn," and by the end of the year he sent a portion of it to Swift who, in February 1737, replied in thanks to the tribute paid to him in the poem.[15] As the first work which Horace explicitly addressed to the new emperor and patron Augustus, my concern is with the tone in which Horace writes as well as the topics which he decided to incorporate in the letter. However, before we enter into an analysis of the epistle and Pope's *Imitation*, it is necessary to understand how Augustus

[13] *Ibid*., 357.
[14] Advertisement to *The First Epistle of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated* (*TE*, 4:191).
[15] *Corr*., 4, 33; for Swift, *ibid*., 56.

was viewed in Pope's eighteenth-century England. From there, beginning with the Advertisement to the *Epistle*, we shall examine Pope's views on Augustus and his opinion on Horace, which has remained largely unchanged since the first *Imitation* in 1733.

Modern scholars are divided on eighteenth-century views on the Roman emperor Augustus. Howard Weinbrot, in his thoroughly researched *Augustus Caesar in 'Augustan' England: The Decline of a Cultural Norm* (1978), produces voluminous evidence to demonstrate that Augustus was seen as a cruel and oppressive tyrant in eighteenth-century England. He claims that the English population was influenced by Tacitus' *Annales* and saw that the ambitions of the young revolutionary leader took its toll on the Roman public in the form of blood-stained proscriptions. Weinbrot shows that Augustus' moral conduct, including the irony of his own seductions, namely of Livia, and the enforcement of the marriage laws in 18 B.C.E., was seen as being far from consistent and exemplary. After the absolute empire was firmly established, Augustus maneuvered the impressions of his tyrannical rule in such a way that the blame would fall on his successors such as Tiberius and Nero whereas he was the one who had created such an autocratic empire. In contrast to this, Howard Erskine-Hill in *The Augustan Idea in English Literature* (1983) argues that views towards Augustus were not as one-sided and offered a wider perspective on how the Roman emperor was perceived. As Niall Rudd states, there were many factors at play in the actions and character of Augustus:

> When Octavian entered on his inheritance, took Caesar's name, and vowed vengeance on Brutus and Cassius, he was acting *both* from filial piety *and* from personal ambition. The two motives reinforced each other. When he bribed the soldiers, outmanoeuvred Antony, and exploited Cicero, he was acknowledging the realities of revolutionary politics *as well as* satisfying his lust for power.[16]

Like Rudd, modern scholars largely agree that Augustan England recognized both Augustus' contributions to peace as well as his despotism which curtailed freedom.[17] The civil wars and the founding of the empire entailed a complex interweaving of ambition and circumstance, and it is impossible to hold a simplistic view as to whether to label Augustus a tyrant or not.

It was recognized too that the social unrest and degeneration of the Republic had reached a point where Rome required the emergence of an absolute ruler to restore peace and unify the people.[18] Oliver Goldsmith in *The History of Rome from the Foundation of the City*

[16] Rudd 1994, 63.
[17] See Kelsall: "the virtues and vices of Augustanism were matters of active debate" (1976, 119); and Fuchs: "Politicians, historians, and poets all had little difficulty imagining the Augustan Age and Augustus's career as compounded of qualities both good and bad" (1989, 30). Similar views have been presented by Watt (1966) and Erskine-Hill (1967).
[18] On this, even Tacitus agreed that Augustus did win the people's support and did so through peaceful means (*Ann*. 1.2).

of Rome to the Destruction of the Western Empire (2 vols., London, 1827), François Catrou and Pierre Rouillé in *The Roman History, with Notes Historical, Geographical, and Critical* (trans. by R. Bundy, 6 vols., London, 1728-1737), and Charles Rollin and Jean Baptiste Louis Crévier in *The Roman History from the Foundation of Rome to the Battle of Actium* (trans. anon., 16 vols., London, 1739-1747) all conceded that especially after Sulla Rome needed a powerful leader who would take control, at the expense of the people's liberty, to suppress the chaos, and restore order and peace.[19] Some of Pope's close friends including Swift and Bolingbroke certainly focused on Augustus as a tyrant, but even Bolingbroke admitted that there were some exemplary aspects of the emperor not to be neglected.[20] One final point to make is that, as Fuchs has shown, Augustus was not frequently used by the opposition faction as the chief target of comparison to a villainous ruler. Presenting copious evidence from the opposition journal the *Craftsman*, he demonstrates, moreover, that Augustus was more often compared to Walpole than to George II.[21]

In a letter to Dr. Arbuthnot dated July 26, 1734, Pope revealed his opinion on Augustus as a patron of the literary arts:

> It is certain, much freer Satyrists than I have enjoy'd the encouragement and protection of the Princes under whom they lived. Augustus and Mecoenas made Horace their companion, tho' he had been in arms on the side of Brutus; and allow me to remark it was out of the suff'ring Party too, that they favour'd and distinguish'd Virgil.[22] …I would only have observ'd, that it was under the greatest Princes and best Ministers, that moral Satyrists were most encouraged; and that then Poets exercised the same jurisdiction over the Follies, as Historians did over the Vices of men. It may also be worth considering, whether Augustus himself makes the greater figure, in the writings of the former, or of the latter? and whether Nero and Domitian do not appear as ridiculous for their false Taste and Affectation, in Persius and Juvenal, as odious for their bad Government in Tacitus and Suetonius? In the first of these reigns it was, that Horace was protected and caress'd: and in the latter that Lucan was put to death, and Juvenal banish'd.[23]

---

[19] Goldsmith, 1:290; Catrou and Rouillé, 5: 458; and Rollin and Crévier, 10: 247-48. See also the contemporary view by Rudd: "had [Augustus] obeyed his mother and stepfather and avoided public life (Appian 3.2.10), would the [republic] have survived? There can be only one answer. For all its achievements in earlier centuries, the senatorial aristocracy had shown itself incapable of holding together a large heterogeneous empire. The old class loyalties were too narrow and rigid. Nor could the state withstand the recurrent rivalries of ambitious generals. Eventually things reached a point where, it seems, there had to be a single authority" (1994, 64).

[20] Swift 1967, 111; Bolingbroke 1968, 1:310.

[21] See Fuchs 1989, 33-38 and 112-13; while admitting that Pope seems to favor the comparison of Augustus to George II, he reminds us that this was not common practice as many opposition journalists knew that the king "resembled Augustus in neither character nor career" (ibid., 35). Augustus was also compared to Oliver Cromwell by Thomas Gordon and Knightley Chetwood, and Conyers Middleton described him as another Catiline (Kelsall 1976, 118). See Weinbrot (1978) for Thomas Gordon's views expressed in his translation of Tacitus (1728-1731). See also the comparison drawn by Lord Hervey in his *Memoirs of the Reign of George II*: "Not that there was any similitude between the two princes who presided in the Roman and English Augustan ages besides their names, for George Augustus neither loved learning nor encouraged men of letters, nor were there any Maecenases about him. There was another very material difference too between these two Augustuses. For as personal courage was the only quality necessary to form a great prince which the one was suspected to want, so I fear it was the only one the other was ever thought to possess" (cited from *TE*, 4:191n.).

[22] See Syme: "Livy, Virgil and Horace of all Augustan writers stand closest to the government" (1939, 318).

[23] *Corr*., 3:420.

Pope is neither under the patronage or "protection" of George II or the royals. He suffers from constant attack. But he states that "much freer Satyrists," those who wrote more bluntly and honestly, received "encouragement and protection of the Princes." He cites Horace as such a free satirist who was valued by "Princes" of his time, Augustus and Maecenas. Furthermore, Pope states that the two patrons made the poet their "companion." It seems as if Pope did not consider Horace a mere tool for propaganda nor a submissive client reduced to meeting any and all requests of his patrons. "Companion" denotes friendship; it is as if Augustus and Maecenas treated Horace as their equal. Pope also praises the patrons' attitude in showing clemency for Horace who had, after all, once "been in arms on the side of Brutus." On this, Pope gives Virgil as another example of a poet who came "out of the suff'ring Party." He then proceeds to say that "moral Satyrists were most encouraged" by "the greatest Princes and best Ministers." He is not commending Horace and other poets here but Augustus and Maecenas as "the greatest Princes and best Ministers" who understood and cultivated the talents of gifted poets. Thus Pope is contemplating not the poets but those who supported them.

The question then leads to "whether Augustus… makes the greater figure" when compared to later arbitrary rulers such as Nero (37–68 C.E., reigned 54-68) and Domitian (51-96 C.E., reigned 81-96). It was not uncommon in Pope's days to find the two emperors paired together as symbols of autocratic rule.[24] In comparing the reigns of Augustus to those of Nero and Domitian, Pope admits that it was in Augustus' reign that "Horace was protected and caress'd." In contrast to the earlier depiction as "companion," the term "caress'd" hints at a strict hierarchy. It is as if the emperor is keeping a pet, well taken care of, but at the same time tamed and controlled. But at least great talents were not "put to death" like Lucan or "banish'd" like Juvenal.[25] Despite the slightly contemptuous "caress'd," and in spite of the fact that his mere act of comparison of Augustus to later infamous emperors signals his doubt about Augustus' own despotic rule, one point which Pope stresses is that Augustus did the right thing in recognizing and promoting the literary geniuses of his empire. He at least was

[24] Weinbrot (1978) provides many examples, including Paul Whitehead's *The State of Rome, under Nero and Domitian…by Messrs. Juvenal and Persius* (1739) (Weinbrot 1978, 178) and Humphry Oldcastle's comment in the *Craftsman*, no. 220, 19 September 1730 (ibid., 114). For the assessment of Nero as a tyrant in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Italy by Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527) and Trajano Boccalini (1556-1613), see ibid., 41; by Ludovico Ariosto, ibid., 66; in England by Robert Stapylton in 1647, ibid., 157-58; and by Anthony Ashley Cooper in 1711, ibid., 159. For Domitian by Edward Gibbon in 1763 on Juvenal's praise of him in his fourth satire, see ibid., 164-65; Gifford in 1802 that Juvenal saw Domitian to be a despot, ibid., 170.

[25] For Lucan and Nero, see Tacitus' *Annals*, 15.49 and Statius's ode to Lucan in which he mentions that the poet depicted Nero in an unfavorable light (*Silvae*, 2.7). Juvenal may have been exiled, but this remains uncertain; cf. Anderson: "the evidence is ambiguous" (1982, 8).

not someone without literary taste and he was clever enough to keep the best talents under his rule.[26]

Statements which further clarify Pope's interpretations on how Horace viewed Augustus are presented in the Advertisement of *The First Epistle of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated*. The first sentence resembles the beginning of the Advertisement to the first *Imitation* in 1733:

The Reflections of Horace, *and the Judgments past in his Epistle to* Augustus, *seem'd so seasonable to the present Times, that I could not help applying them to the use of my own Country.*

This is comparable to what he wrote for *The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace Imitated*:

An Answer from Horace *was both more full, and of more Dignity, than any I cou'd have made in my own person.*[27]

This says something about Pope's views towards Horace that, four years after the commencement of his Horatian series, he still regards Horace as a viable model. While Horace's *Sat*. 2.1 and Pope's *Imitation* are private conversations with trusted lawyers on the subject of criticism and the law, in the *Imitation* of the *Epistle to Augustus*, Pope's sharing of views is expanded to his thoughts on "*the present Times*" and his "*Country*."

Pope's ironic tone begins immediately after this. He describes what Horace, the "*Author*," did in his epistle:

The Author thought them considerable enough to address them to His Prince; whom he paints with all the great and good Qualities of a Monarch, upon whom the Romans *depended for the Encrease of an* Absolute Empire. *But to make the Poem entirely English, I was willing to add one or two of those which contribute to the Happiness of a* Free People, *and are more consistent with the Welfare of* our Neighbours.[28]

Pope says of Horace's manner of describing Augustus that the poet "*paints* [him] *with all the great and good Qualities of a Monarch*." Rudd has pointed out that Horace's "portrait [of Augustus] is idealized," and "some highly unpleasant warts have been removed."[29] Pope, however, understood the poet's limits. He knew that Horace could not have stretched his liberty to openly criticize his great patron. But the fact that the poet could not overtly list what he observed to be the faults of the emperor does not mean that Horace was a simple-minded

[26] On this I agree with Rudd who states of Pope's *Imitation* of the *Epistle to Augustus* that Pope "has left Horace's favourable portrait of Augustus unaltered, but has set beside it a caricature of George II" (1994, 71).
[27] *TE*, 4:191, 3.
[28] *Ibid*., 191.
[29] Rudd 1994, 69.

flatterer.[30] In reality, Augustus was a "*Monarch, upon whom the* Romans *depended for the Encrease of an* Absolute Empire." If we take note that the subject of this sentence is "Romans," we are able to understand that Pope puts the blame neither on the "*Monarch*" nor Horace. While it is doubtful, in the face of proscriptions and other self-serving measures of the Roman leaders, how much the people could have resisted the rise of absolute rule, it is nevertheless they who allowed their new ruler the "*Encrease of an* Absolute Empire."

The second sentence in the opening paragraph of the Advertisement thus reveals Pope's interpretation of Horace's *Epistle to Augustus*: Horace the author depicts Augustus in a positive light, and the Roman people, far from being able to resist the increasingly oppressive rule, somewhat blindly followed him.[31] After explaining what Horace did in his *Epistle*, Pope reveals his intentions of what he will do in his *Imitation*. He transforms the setting to make his *Imitation* "*entirely English*." In contrast to Horace who could not take as much liberty, he explains that he "*was willing to add one or two of those which contribute to the Happiness of a* Free People." Pope wishes to be more assertive than his predecessor in advocating measures to increase contentment for his English people, who should be a "Free People." In addition to England, he says that he has also taken care to attend to the "*Welfare of* our Neighbours." This refers most certainly to the situation in Ireland which he describes in *Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.1.221-28, which is also a compliment paid to Swift, a self-imposed exile who had established Ireland as his permanent home. Horace had limited liberty, but we are to assume that by his discretion he was able to ensure his safety. For Pope, on the other hand, the addition of "*one or two*" extra statements was to cost him.

In the next paragraph of the Advertisement Pope proceeds to correct what he perceives to be common misinterpretations which even the educated and "*learned World*" have assumed for so long:

This Epistle will show the learned World to have fallen into two mistakes; one, that Augustus was a Patron of Poets in general; *whereas he not only prohibited all but the Best Writers to name him, but recommended that Care even to the Civil Magistrate:* Admonebat Praetores, ne paterentur Nomen suum obsolefieri, *&c. The other, that this Piece was only a* general Discourse of Poetry; *whereas it was an* Apology for the Poets, *in order to render* Augustus *more their Patron.* Horace *here pleads the Cause of his Contemporaries.*[32]

[30] See Rudd: "it is wrong to think of him [Horace] primarily as a 'court poet'" (1994, 66); Bowditch: "in complying with a patron, Horace was certainly no slave" (2001, 1); La Penna: "[Horace] was polite, but by no means servile" (2009, 392).
[31] See Fuchs' view that Pope employed Augustus as a "positive norm" in the *Imitation* of the *Epistle to Augustus* (1989, 33).
[32] *TE*, 4:191.

Pope observes "*two mistakes*." The first is that Augustus was a "Patron of Poets in general." The mistake lies in the belief that the emperor endorsed any and many poets ("in general"). Using Suetonius' account as supporting evidence, Pope explains that Augustus was much more selective.[33] Only the "*Best Writers*" were allowed to mention him and the emperor enlisted the aid of the "*Civil Magistrate*" to ensure this. The second misconception concerns Horace's purpose in composing an open letter to the emperor. It was not, Pope argues, a "general Discourse on Poetry." It is worth noting here that in both of the "*mistakes*" which Pope points out, he employs the term "general." He does not approve of how the "*learned World*" engages in a cursory reading and suggests shallow interpretations. Conversely, it demonstrates how deep an interest Pope took in the works of Horace and with how much attention and concentration he read between the lines. His second point, then, is that Horace's letter was not a "general Discourse" but an "Apology," a defense: "Horace *here pleads the Cause of his Contemporaries*." According to Pope Horace's intent was not to make generalizations concerning poetry. Pope believes that Horace had a clear, specific message for the emperor.

Horace, however, knew better than to be too direct. Pope continues in the Advertisement:

> [Horace *here pleads the Cause of his Contemporaries,*] *first against the Taste of the Town, whose humour it was to magnify the Authors of the preceding Age; secondly against the Court and Nobility, who encouraged only the Writers for the Theatre; and lastly against the Emperor himself, who had conceived them of little use to the Government. He shews (by a view of the Progress of Learning, and the Change of Taste among the* Romans) *that the Introduction of the Polite Arts of* Greece *had given the Writers of his Time great advantages over their Predecessors, that their* Morals *were much improved, and the Licence of those ancient Poets restrained: that* Satire *and* Comedy *were become more just and useful; that whatever extravagancies were left on the Stage, were owing to the Ill Taste of the Nobility; that Poets, under due Regulations, were in many respects useful to the* State; *and concludes, that it was upon them the Emperor himself must depend, for his Fame with Posterity.*[34]

According to Pope, Horace's plea is directed "*first against the Taste of the Town*" and "*secondly against the Court and Nobility*." Then, Pope says, Horace finally makes his thrust at his grand addressee: "*lastly against the Emperor himself*." Despite Suetonius' comment about Augustus' selectiveness, Pope claims that Horace felt that the emperor "*conceived them* [poets] *of little use to the Government*," and, using the occasion of being given no other option but to write an epistle to Augutus, he was determined to show that poets "*were in many respects useful to the* State." To prove his point, Pope explains, Horace embarks on a long exposition tracing the history of Roman poets and literature, of their "*Progress of Learning*"

[33] Suet. *Aug*. 89.
[34] *TE*, 4:191-92.

and "*Change of Taste*" spanning across several centuries: "*that the Introduction of the Polite Arts of* Greece *had given the Writers of his Time great advantages over their Predecessors, that their* Morals *were much improved, and the Licence of those ancient Poets restrained: that* Satire *and* Comedy *were become more just and useful; that whatever extravagancies were left on the Stage, were owing to the Ill Taste of the Nobility*." Once again, just as he had avoided placing blame on either Augustus or Horace by explicitly mentioning "Romans" in the first paragraph of the Advertisement, Pope here states that the improvements that have been left incomplete were "*owing to the Ill Taste of the Nobility*," not of the emperor or of Horace and his fellow poets. This is another of Pope's hints at the evasive manner Horace resorted to in order to guard his safety.

The primary goal for Horace, which differs sharply from Pope's, was "*to render* Augustus *more their Patron*." However, what they share is the fact that "*it was upon them* [poets] *the Emperor himself must depend, for his Fame with Posterity*." While Pope is not appealing for patronage from his king, he is critical of George II's famed predilection for opera as well as his utter contempt of poetry. Pope believes that Horace tried to communicate the same warning, that political rulers better not overlook the power of the poets, for it is they who can bestow lasting fame in history.

The final paragraph of the Advertisement, though brief, provides us with further clues to Pope's views of Horace:

We may farther learn from this Epistle, that Horace *made his Court to this Great Prince, by writing with a decent Freedom toward him, with a just Contempt of his low Flatterers, and with a manly Regard to his own Character.*[35]

Pope passes one principal comment about Horace on the composition of his letter to Augustus: "Horace *made his Court to this Great Prince*." At first glance this may be construed as one of Pope's affirmations that Horace indulged in blandishments so as to "*render* Augustus *more their* [poets'] *Patron*." But I take it rather in the sense that Pope recognized that Horace paid his due respects to his great patron. While excessive flattery may not be necessary, one is nevertheless expected to demonstrate civility to the patron who supports one so that one can devote oneself to the practice of one's art. Horace simply and correctly performed his duty as a client.

Pope then makes three additional observations on Horace's manner of composing his epistle. The first is that he wrote with "*a decent Freedom toward him* [Augustus]." Pope does

[35] *Ibid*., 192.

not consider Horace's work as one long letter of adulation.[36] Pope believes that his freedom was "*decent*," modest but good and proper. He acknowledges that Horace exercised some freedom. Liberty was curbed, of course, but he stretched it to the fullest extent within the acceptable boundaries. He had the good sense to exhibit some decency since he was, after all, making a statement "*against the Emperor himself*."

Secondly, Pope tells us, Horace wrote with "*a just Contempt of his low Flatterers*." We do not ultimately know if Suetonius' statement about Augustus' selectiveness represented a prevalent notion in Horace's time, or, for that matter, if Suetonius is accurate at all. What we can gather from this phrase, though, is that Pope believes that Horace, in exhibiting contempt for "*Flatterers*," at least did not attempt to become one himself. He wished to maintain his dignity.

This relates to the third and final observation which Pope makes, that Horace wrote with "*a manly Regard to his own Character*." The composition of the *Epistle to Augustus* marks an important point in Horace's career because it is a work in which the poet was finally compelled to write an epistle to his patron and emperor which he had avoided for as long as he could. Yet he approached this task and his "*Great Prince*" with confidence. He exercised a certain amount of "*Freedom*," never debased himself to the level of "*low Flatterers*," and, though maintaining in what Frank Stack calls a "polite but cautious attitude to Augustus" through "carefully controlled poetic language,"[37] he stayed true to "*his own Character*." While Pope has no hope nor any desire to win the favor of the Court, to write "*with a decent Freedom toward him* [as in the exercise of good judgment], *with a just Contempt of his low Flatterers, and with a manly Regard to his own Character*" were attitudes which he admired in Horace and wished to adopt for himself.

II. The Beginning: Address to Augustus

Horace opens his *Epistle* with a eulogy to Augustus:[38]

Cum tot sustineas et tanta negotia solus,
res Italas armis tuteris, moribus ornes,
legibus emendes, in publica commoda peccem,
si longo sermone morer tua tempora, Caesar. (*Ep*. 2.1.1-4)

[36] See Stack 1985, 154.
[37] Ibid., 151.
[38] See Brink 1982, 39 for Horace's tendency to use "Caesar" instead of "Augustus" and for the unusual position of the addressee, not at the beginning but at the end of the sentence.

Since you manage so many affairs of so much importance all alone,
you protect our Italian state with arms, you enhance us with morals,
you improve us with laws, I should sin against public good,
if I were to waste your time with a tiresome discourse, Caesar.

The first lines are like a panegyric on a small scale. As long as Horace is composing an epistle to Augustus himself, it may well be appropriate to begin with a commendatory address. In the narrow space of four lines, Horace acknowledges that Augustus bears many tasks and responsibilities: he must attend to a large number of political affairs ("tot sustineas et tanta negotia"); on the military side, he must make sure that the Italian wealth and state remain protected ("res Italas armis tuteris"); within the state, he takes charge of moral reform, such as by the introduction of the *lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* and the *lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis* ("moribus ornes"); and, on matters on which he detects the need for correction, he enforces with laws ("legibus emendes").[39] However, even in such an opening, Horace has not forgotten that Augustus is an absolute ruler. This is made quite clear in the very first line: "solus." At first sight it may seem as if Horace is concerned that so many weighty responsibilities fall on the emperor alone, as if he must be wearied by the substantial number of important decisions to be made. However, if we were to approach his list of duties from a different angle, it turns into an ironic statement that Augustus alone holds the power to control the empire. He is the sole figure who can dictate affairs of the state on all levels: political ("negotia"), military ("armis"), ethical ("moribus"), and legal ("legibus").[40]

Although Horace, with "solus," hints at the presence of a dictator, a state that is quite different from the Republican configuration of senate and consuls, on the surface at least he presents the picture of an emperor who is hard at work to ensure the safety and well-being of his people. Pope correctly captures Horace's style in stating in the Advertisement: "[Horace] *paints* [Augustus] *with all the great and good Qualities of a Monarch, upon whom the* Romans *depended for the Encrease of an* Absolute Empire." Nevertheless, in order to further highlight the superiority of Augustus' special status, Horace contrasts it to his own station. In an attitude of extreme humility, Horace states: "in publica commoda peccem, | si longo sermone morer tua tempora." This hesitation itself is ironic in that, though in a guise of servile modesty, Horace does present him with a long discourse. With its 270 lines, the *Epistle to Augustus* is one of Horace's longest individual poems, exceeded only by the 326 lines of *Sat*.

[39] Cf. Rudd: "While *mos* is sometimes thought of as a traditional, unwritten, code of behavior as distinct from *lex*, here the two concepts are combined" (1989, 75).
[40] See Feeney 2009, 362-65 and Kelsall 1976, 120.

2.3 and the 476 lines of the *Ars Poetica*.[41] Whether it will be judged worthy of his time is dependent solely on Caesar, but despite all the reservations he does knowingly decide to take up Caesar's "tempora." Moreover, he states that if his "longo sermone" was to prove useless to Augustus, he would be committing an offense against public interest ("in publica commoda peccem"). In his meek tone he admits his powerlessness, his lack of capacity compared to his Caesar who manages all affairs of the state. Compared to the *princeps* who provides such "publica commoda," all that Horace can do as a poet is to ask for Caesar's time to read a long discourse, and even then, should it fail to be deemed useful by Caesar, he not only would have failed to serve any public good ("publica commoda") but, in taking up his time, he would also have hampered Caesar from further enhancing "publica commoda." There is an underlying hint of irony in Horace's humble approach in the opening of this epistle, but the effects are subtle and we must still keep in mind that his primary intention was to acknowledge Augustus's efforts, certainly not to incense him.

Pope opens his *Imitation* with a speech filled with irony:

WHILE YOU, great Patron of Mankind, sustain
The balanc'd World, and open all the Main;
Your Country, chief, in Arms abroad defend,
At home, with Morals, Arts, and Laws amend;
How shall the Muse, from such a Monarch, steal (5)
An hour, and not defraud the Publick Weal? (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.1-6)

Pope does not attempt to conceal his ironic tone. He had used the same address, "Patron of Mankind," when referring to Marcus Aurelius in the *Temple of Fame* (line 167), but the application here to George II is not meant to be sincere. Rudd sees in the phrase, "The balanc'd World," the "image of Atlas with the globe on his shoulders."[42] Such a heavy burden the king bears, we are led to think, but Pope's irony returns in the next phrase that the king in fact "open[s] all the Main." Contrary to its aim of free trade, the act was actually serving no benefit for English trade, as the unattended sea routes only served to welcome Spanish pirates.[43]

[41] See Brink 1982, 38.
[42] Rudd 1994, 72; he supposes that "balanc'd World" was taken from Lyttleton's poem, "To Mr. Glover on his Poem of Leonidas. Written in the Year 1734," which referred to the English patriot Sidney Godolphin. According to Mrs. Charles Caesar, Lord Oxford was impeached and sent to the Tower "for words reflecting on the Earl of Godolphin" (cited from Erskine-Hill 1982, 437). Weinbrot 1978, 196-97 and 244 agrees with the possibility. Kelsall 1976, 122 suggests another possibility, Addison's *Letter from Italy* (1701), an adaptation of Virgil's praise of Rome in book 6 of the *Aeneid*.
[43] See *TE*, 4:xxxv-xxxvi; Erskine-Hill 1983, 332.

The expression of a "balanc'd World" is also significant in that Pope may have envisioned a balance of power among European nations.[44] In *Windsor-Forest*, he had happily anticipated the conclusion of the War of the Spanish Succession with the Treaty of Utrecht. Horace later in the *Epistle* compares his emperor to Alexander the Great (*Ep*. 2.1.232). Part of the analogy which Horace tries to draw may have been the expansion of the empire by Augustus as Alexander once did in his territorial conquests. However, what Pope wishes for England is not a conqueror eager for war and subjugation but a leader who can sustain peace for his nation as well as for the "*Welfare of* our Neighbours." However, he knows that the king is not in sole control of the administration. It appears a little strange in the following line that he addresses George II as "chief." Pope's *Imitation* of the *Epistle* is addressed to the king and not to Walpole,[45] but Walpole in reality acted as right-hand man to the king and exercised strong influence on decisions of policy. Pope's use of "chief" to address the king thus carries a tone of condescension. Pope swiftly returns to his address to the king. Playing on the "armis" (*Ep*. 2.1.2) from Horace's original which described Augustus' foreign policy of protection from invaders, Pope takes "Arms" in English not in the militaristic sense but literally the arms of a person. Pope had begun composition of this poem in the autumn of 1736. It must have been fresh in his mind that a few months earlier on 22 May, George II had left England to pay a visit to Hanover, in the arms of his new mistress Madam von Walmoden.[46] Such were the affairs which the king attended to abroad.

"At home," Pope continues, the king was supposedly concerned with reform in "Morals, Arts, and Laws." The addition of "Arts," not in Horace's original, is a jibe at the king who was a famous fan of opera but whose scorn of the literary arts was equally well-known. Pope is of course not commending George II's interest in music but expressing his contempt at the king's neglect of poetry. In contrast to Horace who composed his *Epistle* to plead reform of literary taste so as to increase appreciation for poetry, Pope does not expect that with this *Imitation* his dull king will come to recognize the beauty and significance of poetry for England, not to mention the great poetic talents of the nation.[47]

[44] See Kelsall 1976, 121-22.
[45] See Fuchs 1989, 149-50, note 21.
[46] Stack 1985, 158 interprets Pope as converting "peccem" as sin in terms of seduction, that the poetic Muse then would indeed be "defraud[ing] the Publick Weal" to "steal | An hour" with the king. This is not the only instance of Pope's jibe at the misconduct of royals. See *Hor. Imit. Sat*. 1.2.81-86 for his ridicule of Charles II and his mistress.
[47] See Kelsall: "Horace was reticent because there were more important things than poetry requiring the attention of the *princeps* carrying everything alone, and the poet accordingly subordinated his claims" (1976, 122). On

Finally, in a tone of ironic modesty, he asks if he dare "steal" any time "from such a Monarch." It is ironic because Pope poses as the one who steals, as if about to engage in some wrongdoing by presenting this epistle, whereas he is doing the opposite by pointing out vices to be corrected in the nation. "From such a Monarch" does not signify a king worthy of praise. Instead of "such a 'laudable' Monarch," Pope intends to convey the opposite meaning of "such a 'disdainful' Monarch," one who leaves the sea open to foreign pirates while he enjoys a visit to his homeland on the Continent with his mistress and shows no intellectual desire for literature. Pope feigns fear that he may "defraud the Publick Weal" in asking "such a Monarch" to pay attention to what he has to say. This also carries the contrary meaning, as Pope is the one who suggests good for the "Publick Weal." It is thus not the poet but the "Monarch" who has been "defraud[ing] the Publick Weal" and betraying his people by indulging in private joys and neglecting his duties to his nation.

After paying due deference to his patron and emperor for all his effort in providing peace and protection for his people, Horace mentions the exceptional position of Augustus:

Romulus et Liber pater et cum Castore Pollux,
post ingentia facta deorum in templa recepti,
dum terras hominumque colunt genus, aspera bella
componunt, agros assignant, oppida condunt,
ploravere suis non respondere favorem
speratum meritis. diram qui contudit Hydram (10)
notaque fatali portenta labore subegit,
comperit invidiam supremo fine domari.
urit enim fulgore suo qui praegravat artis
infra se positas: exstinctus amabitur idem. (*Ep*. 2.1.5-14)

Romulus, father Liber, and Pollux with Castor,
received in the temples of the gods after heroic deeds,
while they protected the lands and the species of men,
subdued fierce wars, allotted fields, and founded towns,
deplored that the hoped for appreciation did not match their merits.
He, who crushed the dreaded Hydra
and conquered the notorious monsters in fatal battle,
discovered that envy is quenched ultimately at death.
For he who outweighs talents ranked below himself burns with his own splendor;
he will likewise be loved once perished.

Romulus, Dionysius ("Liber pater"),[48] the Dioscuri Castor and Pollux, and Hercules (not mentioned by name, 10-12) all joined the ranks of divinity ("deorum in templa recepti"). Except for Romulus the mythical founder of Rome, Dionysius, Castor and Pollux, and

Pope, see Fuchs' comment that his irony is a sign of "his surer knowledge of how little he can do about the people and forces he fears and hates" (1989, 113).

[48] Although Dionysius was born an Olympian deity, by his divinity Horace may be referring to his Bacchanalia, which became widely diffused in Italy in the second century B.C.E. Though once prohibited by the Roman Senate in 186 B.C.E., it may have been revoked under Julius Caesar and the Bacchic cult retained its popularity in the Imperial Age.

Hercules are Greek in origin,[49] but in Horace's Rome they were all worshipped as gods.[50] Setting aside Hercules for a moment, the picture which Horace paints of the deified mythological heroes is rather dismal. For all their grand feats ("ingentia facta"),[51] that is, the protection they provided for their people and land ("terras hominumque colunt genus"), by suppressing wars ("aspera bella | componunt"), allotting farmland ("agros assignant"),[52] and founding of cities ("oppida condunt"), they felt that they did not receive as much glory as they deserved ("suis non respondere favorem | speratum meritis"). They deplored the ingratitude of the people in their lack of sufficient recognition ("ploravere").[53]

We now turn to Hercules. He, along with the Dioscuri brothers, had a desire to be immortalized. However, he realized that envy ("invidiam"), that ambition to outshine ("praegravat") others, even after so many feats, did not diminish. It was upon his death, by ordering his servants to set fire to him on the funeral pyre on Mount Oeta, that he joined the ranks of the gods. Horace here is speaking of the deification of heroes as it relates to Augustus, as we shall see very shortly. However, "invidiam" does not apply solely to conquerors. For anyone possessing talent ("artis"), there is the desire to be recognized ("favorem | speratum"). Quite apart from the topic of deification, this applies to Horace's pleading to Augustus, on behalf of himself and contemporary poets, that their literary creations be properly acknowledged in their lifetime, not after they have become past and history.

To replace Horace's mythological figures, Pope gives historical figures from his native England:

Edward and Henry, now the Boast of Fame,
And virtuous Alfred, a more sacred Name,
After a Life of gen'rous Toils endur'd,
The Gaul subdu'd, or Property secur'd, (10)
Ambition humbled, mighty Cities storm'd,
Or Laws establish'd, and the World reform'd;
Clos'd their long Glories with a sigh, to find
Th' unwilling Gratitude of base mankind!
All human Virtue to its latest breath (15)
Finds Envy never conquer'd, but by Death. (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.1.7-16)

The counterparts which Pope introduces are English kings Edward III (1312-1377, king 1327-1377), Henry V (1386-1422, king 1413-1422), and Alfred the Great (849-899, king of Wessex 871-899). Unlike Horace who draws from mythological divinities, these are real historical

[49] See Brink 1982, 41 for other instances of juxtaposition of Greek and Roman heroes prior to Horace.
[50] See ibid., 40.
[51] See ibid., 42-43 for "facta" as a term ordinarily found in epic.
[52] See ibid., 43 for the idea that this may be true of Augustus too.
[53] See Rudd 1989, 76 for the possibility that Horace may have invented the reaction of the people.

figures.[54] "Gaul subdu'd," "Property secur'd," "Ambition humbled," "mighty Cities storm'd," "Laws establish'd," and "the World reform'd" apply to the kings who made many conquests abroad and reformed the legal system and state affairs within England.

Edward III led a successful military campaign in Scotland and acquired a large amount of land. On the Continent he captured the French king, John II, and by the treaty of Brétigny he gained full sovereignty over French lands. Although the French were to regain most of their property in 1375, Edward III had earlier sought to fortify England in preparation for war by increasing efficiency and solidarity within the nation. It was he who introduced the duke as a new title for those closely related to the king. It was not only in matters of land that he had "Gaul subdu'd," as he essayed to eliminate the use of French in England by ordering that the law courts and Parliament use English. Finally, he was also noted for his legal reform, particularly for the Treason Act of 1351 and further extensions of the Justices of the Peace.

Henry V also led campaigns against France. After suppressing the Welsh revolt of Owan Glyndwr, he sailed to France and captured Rouen and Paris ("mighty Cities storm'd").

Alfred belonged to the pre-Medieval era, and he was known for defending southern England against Viking raiders from Denmark, in the aftermaths of which he built fortifications along the coast that still remain to this day. At home, he was engaged with military reform, particularly with the navy, urban development, tax and legal reform, and the enhancement of literacy in English. These were some of the mighty deeds accomplished by George II's predecessors. It should be noted, however, that comparison to Edward, Henry, and Alfred was not Pope's invention. The three figures were frequently used by the Opposition not only as heroic conquerors but perhaps more importantly, as symbols of English liberty.[55]

Pope, remaining largely faithful to Horace's original, provides a clever parallel. In their reign they enjoyed "long Glories." Edward III, especially, was crowned king of England at only age fourteen and his rule spanned over half a century. However, just as Horace's mention of the people's ingratitude towards the mythological heroes may have been an invention, the assertion that the English kings "Clos'd their long Glories with a sigh," in disappointment, is not quite true. Edward III was a king who enjoyed unprecedented support from his people in his lifetime, and none of his five adult sons revolted in opposition against him, which is a rare occurrence where contentions over succession are not uncommon. Henry

[54] See Kelsall 1976, 122 on the "sacredness" of Alfred and other kings.
[55] See Stack 1985, 159, and Levine 1967, 427-51. Contemporary examples include the *Craftsman*, no. 377 (September 22, 1733) and James Thomson's *Ode to the Prince of Wales* (1737).

V died unexpectedly at the age of thirty-five near Paris, but his body was brought back to England and was properly buried in Westminster Abbey. Alfred was known for seeking judicial fairness and for his pursuit of wisdom through education and religion.

Thus we can assume that Pope's cry, "Th' unwilling Gratitude of base mankind!," is an ironic statement. In Horace, it is Hercules, one of the heroes, who recognizes the inextinguishable envy ("invidiam") inside him. In Pope, however, it is not one of the kings but "All human Virtue" which "Finds Envy never conquer'd, but by Death." Seeing that the main discussion of the poem lies in the criticism of the people as well as the king, I take this to be a subtle forewarning. What Pope is really trying to point out is not the "base mankind" among the English people not of the past but of the present and that "Envy" was not burning inside the ancient kings but in the current king.

Horace contrasts Romulus, Dionysius, Castor and Pollux, and Hercules with his own emperor Augustus:

praesenti tibi maturos largimur honores
iurandasque tuum per numen ponimus aras,
nil oriturum alias, nil ortum tale fatentes. (*Ep*. 2.1.15-17)

On you we confer honors betimes,
and we set up altars on which oaths may be sworn by your divinity,
acknowledging that nothing shall arise at any other time, nothing so great has risen.

Augustus was not officially deified until after his death in 14 C.E. However, this is not empty flattery either, as Augustus was worshipped as a god, especially in Egypt and in the Greek cultures in Asia Minor.[56] Temples dedicated to the *princeps* were built in Rome as well.[57] Horace is highlighting the *princeps*' positive aspects, and he is not inventing fiction either. These are his observations of Rome and the milieu in which he lived.

In the English version, Pope expands on the reverence expressed by Horace towards Augustus:

To Thee, the World its present homage pays,
The Harvest early, but mature the Praise:
Great Friend of LIBERTY! in *Kings* a Name (25)
Above all Greek, above all Roman Fame:
Whose Word is Truth, as sacred and rever'd,
As Heav'n's own Oracles from Altars heard.
Wonder of Kings! like whom, to mortal eyes
None e'er has risen, and none e'er shall rise. (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.23-30)

[56] See Rudd 1994, 64-65 for the emperor's cult.
[57] Cf. Rudd: "[Augustus] refused to be worshipped as a god in Rome in his own lifetime" (ibid., 64).

Pope points out that it is wrong that any "Praise" should be given for one the fruits of whose policies have not been proven ("The Harvest early"). In "Great Friend of LIBERTY" Pope of course means the opposite. It is an overt attack on George II, and it is an addition that does not figure in Horace's original. Horace would, or could, never have addressed such an openly ironic comment to Augustus. Weinbrot suggests that Pope, by placing his king "Above all Greek, above all Roman Fame," means not that George II is better than them in goodness and efficiency as a ruler but that he has surpassed them in the degree of his tyranny.[58] George II believes that his "Word is Truth," but they are based on "Oracles from Altars heard." Instead of thinking of state affairs himself, he plays a passive role in hearing information fed to him by his advisers, which he believes to be the "Truth."[59] Finally, completely upturning Horace's commendation of Augustus, Pope characterizes his king as such a tyrant that, "None e'er has risen, and none e'er shall rise."

III. Past and Present: Artistic Tastes

Horace is very tactful in structuring his *Epistle to Augustus*. He opens with some commendatory lines to his addressee. Having established Augustus' greatness as emperor (1-5), he continues with more praise. He mentions that Augustus has attained status comparable to a divinity (15-17), thus further highlighting the emperor's grandeur. However, the comparison with heroic predecessors serves also to contrast the past and the present. The topic of deification thus provides a smooth transition to what Horace really wants to communicate to his patron, which concerns the appreciation of the old and new in literary arts.[60] Horace speaks of his observation of the Roman people:

sed tuus hoc populus sapiens et iustus in uno,
te nostris ducibus, te Grais anteferendo,
cetera nequaquam simili ratione modoque
aestimat et, nisi quae terris semota suisque
temporibus defuncta videt, fastidit et odit. (*Ep*. 2.1.18-22)

But your people, wise and just in this one way,
in placing you above our leaders and those of the Greeks,
values no other with a similar reason and method,
they despise and detest all except those
that are distant from their own lands and long gone from their times.

[58] Weinbrot 1978, 198.
[59] See Mack 1969, 145-46 on the "Oracles" as the voice of Walpole. See Weinbrot 1978, 199-200 for the negative connotations of oracles in Pope's era.
[60] This has been pointed out by Brink (1982), Stack (1985), Fuchs (1989), Rudd (2004), and Feeney (2009).

Horace assures that the people are wise and just ("sapiens et iustus") in honoring Augustus as being greater than any predecessor ("te nostris ducibus, te Grais anteferendo"). However, this is the only thing in which the people's judgment is correct ("hoc… in uno"). The people exercise good judgment in revering their current leader over ancient ones, but they do not apply the same reasoning and method ("simili ratione modoque") for all other matters ("cetera nequaquam").

This is problematic for Horace who wishes that the people would apply the same sound judgment not only to political leaders but to writers. The way he sees the situation at present is that the Roman people only respect Greek works ("terris semota") or native ones which are centuries old ("suisque | temporibus defuncta"). He tells Augustus that the people feel revulsion for contemporary writers. "Fastidit" and "odit" are strong words which signify hatred. [61] It is a feeling stronger than ignorance or indifference. Horace feels that contemporary writers, including himself, deserve more respect from the current Roman populace. This is the cause which he pleads to the emperor. The Roman people are, after all, "your" people ("tuus… populus"), Horace urges. In employing the possessive determiner "tuus," Horace places the responsibility on Augustus. It is his people and he must take the responsibility to correct their erroneous judgment. However, this is not to say that Horace is enraged against the *princeps* nor that he is pointing the finger in blame. Horace explains carefully in this *Epistle* the situation as it stands in Rome, because, although he must be careful of the tone and manner in which he presents his argument, he has faith in Augustus that he will listen and will have the capacity to make fitting amends in due time.

Pope is much more forceful in his criticism of the English people:

Just in one instance, be it yet confest
Your People, Sir, are partial in the rest.
Foes to all living worth except your own,
And Advocates for Folly dead and gone. (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.1.31-34)

Pope's ironic statements continue, as there is no believing that he deems the English people "just" in upholding their king. Using the force of Horace's "fastidit" and "odit," Pope calls his people "Foes." There is more vigor in Pope, even a true sense of hatred, since, for him the English people are not only those who pay undue respect to ancient works but also those who have pestered and attacked him throughout his career. Such malicious members of the English society are "Foes" to him personally. Furthermore, he continues that the people are "Advocates for Folly dead and gone." It is hardly likely that by "Folly" Pope denounces all

[61] Stack refers to these verbs as "excessive" (1985, 157).

the works of his literary predecessors. Rather, it adds to his depiction of the blindness of the people. They are a crazed mass who would enthusiastically "Advocate" even "Folly."

Unlike Horace, Pope does not believe that George II will fully understand his criticism of the king's tastes or of the public, nor does he expect the king to correct himself and the people towards a wider and wiser appreciation of the literary arts. The contemporary England which Pope paints, king and people included, is a corrupt world that sees no possible hope of remedy.

After having presented his case, Horace proceeds in the next lines (*Ep*. 2.1.23-34) to explain to Augustus the situation which he perceives. He describes the people as being: "sic fautor veterum" ("follower of the ancients to such a degree," 23). Such adherence to the ancients, though, is a problem because ancient writers had a tendency to be loquacious in their writings. Yet literature has evolved since and his opinion is: "non est quod multa loquamur" ("there is no reason why we should speak in so many words," 30). This falls in line with his earlier criticism of Lucilius from *Sat*. 1.4 and *Sat*. 1.10. It is not speed but care, not verbosity but concision that is vital to the beauty of poetry. He reiterates his conviction of quality over quantity. Furthermore, Horace argues against the common belief that ancient works are deemed to be superior poetry simply on the grounds that they are centuries-old, and he questions at what point in time any poet would be classified among the ranks of the venerable (*Ep*. 2.1.34-49).

Horace cites some examples:

Ennius, et sapiens et fortis et alter Homerus,
ut critici dicunt, leviter curare videtur
quo promissa cadant et somnia Pythagorea.
Naevius in manibus non est et mentibus haeret
paene recens? adeo sanctum est vetus omne poema.
ambigitur quotiens, uter utro sit prior, aufert (55)
Pacuvius docti famam senis, Accius alti,
dicitur Afrani toga convenisse Menandro,
Plautus ad exemplar Siculi properare Epicharmi,
vincere Caecilius gravitate, Terentius arte.
hos ediscit et hos arto stipata theatro (60)
spectat Roma potens; habet hos numeratque poetas
ad nostrum tempus Livi scriptoris ab aevo. (*Ep*. 2.1.50-62)

Ennius, wise and mighty and the other Homer,
as the critics uphold, seems to care little
about where go his predictions and Pythagorean dreams.
Does not Naevius remain in our hands and stick to our minds almost as if a newcomer?
To such an extent is every ancient poem sacred.
Whenever the subject is discussed, which may be better than the other,
Pacuvius obtains renown as the learned old one, Accius as lofty,
the toga of Afranius is said to have been befitting for Menander,
that Plautus prepared with speed before his model the Sicilian Epicharmus,

that Caecilius won for his seriousness, Terence for his art.
Powerful Rome learns these authors thoroughly and watches them, packed in a narrow theater;
she retains these and counts poets from the time of the writer Livius to our era.

Horace divides by genre. Epic comes first as the style of high poetry. Ennius (239-169 B.C.E.) for his *Annals* and Naevius (*c*. 270- *c*. 200 B.C.E.) for his *Bellum Punicum* were the foremost in cultivating this field in Latin literature. He then smoothly glides into drama. Pacuvius (*c*. 220– *c*. 131/132 B.C.E.) and Accius (170- *c*. 85 B.C.E.) wrote tragedy, and Afranius (1st century B.C.E.), Plautus (*c*. 254-184 B.C.E.), Caecilius (*c*. 225-168 B.C.E.), and Terence (195/185–159 B.C.E.) were comic playwrights. Horace makes a barely perceptible yet calculated transition, as drama is a topic which he intends to discuss in depth later on in the poem.

Horace juxtaposes these figures with Greek models far more ancient than the ancient Roman writers. Ennius is linked to Homer ("alter Homerus"[62]), in accordance with the dream in which Homer told him that his epic soul was transmigrated into Ennius'. Afranius wrote *togatae*, based on Italian themes and characters ("Afrani toga"), but Horace reminds us that they in fact were similar in form to Menander's comedies ("dicitur… convenisse Menandro"). Plautus had as his model the comic writer Epicharmus (*c*. 540- *c*. 450), who composed his works in haste ("ad exemplar Siculi properare Epicharmi"). This hints again at Horace's criticism of the ancients that speed does not make for excellence. The juxtaposition with Greek writers serves to demonstrate how Roman literature is still dependent on the old; the Roman people, in clinging so persistently to ancient Greek and Roman writing, fail to appreciate new developments brought by contemporary writers of Latin. They are still what are taught and what people see at the theatre ("hos ediscit et hos arto stipata theatro | spectat"). Even Livius Andronicus (*c*. 284-204 B.C.E.) is still alive in the minds of the Romans to this day ("habet hos numeratque poetas | ad nostrum tempus Livi scriptoris ab aevo").[63]

Pope begins by recalling major past writers from his native England:

Shakespear, (whom you and ev'ry Play-house bill
Style the divine, the matchless, what you will) (70)
For gain, not glory, wing'd his roving flight,
And grew Immortal in his own despight.
Ben, old and poor, as little seem'd to heed
The Life to come, in ev'ry Poet's Creed.
Who now reads Cowley? if he pleases yet, (75)
His moral pleases, not his pointed wit;
Forgot his Epic, nay Pindaric Art,
But still I love the language of his Heart.

[62] See Jerome's comment found in Warmington 1967, 130.
[63] Cf. La Penna: "we should note here that already attention has turned chiefly to the theatre" (2009, 387).

"Yet surely, surely, these were famous men!
"What Boy but hears the sayings of old Ben? (80)
"In all debates where Criticks bear a part,
"Not one but nods, and talks of Johnson's Art,
"Of Shakespear's Nature, and of Cowley's Wit;
"How Beaumont's Judgment check'd what Fletcher writ;
"How Shadwell hasty, Wycherly was slow; (85)
"But, for the Passions, Southern sure and Rowe.
"These, only these, support the crouded stage,
"From eldest Heywood down to Cibber's age." (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.1.69-88)

Pope points out that Shakespeare wrote "For gain" and with no other particular aim ("wing'd his roving flight").[64] His works were for immediate "gain" and not for "glory" in posterity. Similarly, Ben Jonson "as little seem'd to heed | The Life to come."[65] However, it was rather only Shakespeare who "grew Immortal in his own despight."[66] We should keep in mind, however, that these do not necessarily reflect Pope's personal views towards these playwrights.[67] Pope was fond of Abraham Cowley since his youth,[68] but, with the rules of versification which came to be valued in the years after the Revolution, by the turn of the century his popularity had waned: "Who now reads Cowley?" The free style of his *Pindarique Odes* was no longer recognized ("Forgot his… Pindaric Art"). His "wit" was criticized, and his "Epic" too.[69]

The next paragraph contains a mixture of judgments by critics and the people, some of which are accurate and others which are not. The statements are put in quotation marks in the poem to clarify that these are what Pope hears but does not necessarily agree with. Francis Beaumont (1584-1616) and John Fletcher (1579-1625), both noted playwrights, collaborated on many theater productions. However, in Pope's time, although attribution of authorship of each part had been complicated by the fact that Philip Massinger later revised many of the Beaumont-Fletcher plays, it was generally believed that it was Beaumont who wrote the bulk of the plays and that his opinions ("Judgment") were superior to those of Fletcher's. Thomas

[64] Cf. Pope's Preface to Shakespeare: "One cannot… wonder, if *Shakespear* having at first appearance no other aim in his writings than to procure a subsistance, directed his endeavours solely to hit the taste and humour that then prevailed" (*Prose Works*, 2:15).
[65] Cf. Pope's Preface to Shakespeare: "Because *Johnson* did not write extempore, he was reproached with being a year about every piece" (*ibid*., 19).
[66] For the concept of immortality, see *TE*, 4:199n. Cf. also Pope's Preface to Shakespeare: "(notwithstanding his defects) he is justly and universally elevated above all other Dramatic Writers" (*Prose Works*, 2:13), but Pope believed that Shakespeare did not care for immortality (see *ibid*., 16).
[67] Cf. Pope's Preface to Shakespeare: "It is ever the nature of Parties to be in extremes; and nothing is so probable, as that because *Ben Johnson* had much the most learning, it was said on the one hand that *Shakespear* had none at all; and because *Shakespear* had much the most wit and fancy, it was retorted on the other, that *Johnson* wanted both. Because *Shakespear* borrowed nothing, it was said that *Ben Johnson* borrowed every thing" (*ibid*., 18-19).
[68] Cf. "Cowley is a fine poet, in spite of all his faults" (Spence 1966, 1:189).
[69] See *TE*, 4:200n.

Shadwell (*c*. 1642-1692) may have been "hasty" in that for a good part of his career he managed to produce plays almost annually, but Pope's statement is purposely false. Pope, who had in his earlier years edited Wycherley's works, knew that he was far from being a slow writer.[70] Yet the next line in the couplet shows that the tragedians whom he admired are also recognized by the public. Thomas Southerne (1660-1746) was a friend of Pope's, and the poet even wrote some lines for him on his birthday in 1742. The dramatist earned his reputation from tragedies such as *The Fatal Marriage* (1694) and *Oroonoko* (1696). Rowe was another tragic stage writer whose talents Pope recognized.[71] Regarding his predecessors, especially Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, and Dryden, Pope knew that their authority and grandeur were incontestable. Although all receive some criticism for their style in this poem, he himself had read and admired their works since youth.[72]

Pope, on the other hand, criticizes those who support only the theater, ranging from "eldest" John Heywood from the sixteenth century to his personal foe Colley Cibber, who was appointed Poet Laureate in 1730, an honorary position which Pope felt the comic writer did not deserve. Underlying Pope's enmity for Cibber, which began some two decades earlier in 1717, is the criticism of George II for his penchant for drama as well as his keeping a minister like Walpole who would appoint such a dramatist as Poet Laureate. Rudd suggests that Pope's criticism of Cibber, along with Theobald, Settle, and Rich, was based on his low opinion of the pantomime as well as the opera which they promoted on the contemporary stage. For Pope, who attempted to practice moral writing, the pantomime was a pointless entertainment that did not foster intellectual development.[73]

Horace too finds contemporary judgment at times erroneous:

> Interdum vulgus rectum videt, est ubi peccat.
> si veteres ita miratur laudatque poetas
> ut nihil anteferat, nihil illis comparet, errat: (65)
> si quaedam nimis antique, si pleraque dure
> dicere credit eos, ignave multa fatetur,
> et sapit et mecum facit et Iove iudicat aequo. (*Ep*. 2.1.63-68)

> Occasionally the masses see what is right, but there are times when they are wrong.
> if they so admire and praise ancient poets,
> in such a way that they rank none above them, none to compare with those writers, they are mistaken.
> If they think that the authors speak too much in what one might call in the manner of olden times,
> and that the greater part of it is rough, if they profess that much of it was written lazily,
> they have taste, they are with me, and they judge in line with Jove.

[70] See *ibid*., 201n.
[71] For his works and friendship with Pope, see Chapter 3.
[72] Cf. Rudd: "Horace projects an attitude of superiority [over his predecessors]. Pope is somewhat more circumspect" (1994, 83).
[73] Ibid., 86.

Horace presents two views towards the ancients. The first is held by the public that, in his judgment, is incorrect ("errat"). They are those who uphold and laud the ancient writers to such an extent that none may be ranked above them nor stands comparison (64-65). Horace's criticism of the ancients remain consistent, that they are too verbose ("nimis"), crude ("dure"), and careless ("ignave") in their compositions.[74] Those who see those aspects share his taste ("sapit") and, moreover, have accurate judgment in that it is the truth, equal to Jove's ("Iove iudicat aequo"). Horace reiterates this view time and again in this epistle to Augustus, because he wants the emperor to understand what needs to be emended in contemporary Roman society with regards to literature. He considers it part of the emperor's responsibility, along with his efforts to correct morals and to reform by law ("moribus ornes, | legibus emendes"), that he steer the public towards a more sensible judgment in literature which certainly includes increased appreciation for the refined literary arts and poets of their own age.

Pope's criticism of the public regarding literature is as follows:

All this may be; the People's Voice is odd,
It is, and it is not, the voice of God. (90)
To Gammer Gurton if it give the bays,
And yet deny the Careless Husband praise,
Or say our fathers never broke a rule;
Why then I say, the Publick is a fool. (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.89-94)

Pope concedes that reception and criticism vary and truth is difficult to determine ("All this may be"). In contrast to Horace who confidently asserts that his judgment on the ancients is equal to Jove's and is thus correct ("Iove iudicat aequo"), Pope at first wavers in his judgment. Overall, he finds that "the People's Voice is odd," but "it is, and it is not, the voice of God." This recalls Pope's conclusion to the first *Epistle* of his *Essay on Man*:

And, spite of Pride, in erring Reason's spite,
One truth is clear, "Whatever IS, is RIGHT." (*Essay on Man*, 1.293-94)

While the first poem of the *Essay on Man* was published on February 20, 1733, before the publication of *The First Epistle of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated*, Pope was working concurrently on the four parts of the *Essay on Man* and the Horatian *Imitations* during the early 1730s. It is conceivable that some of his ideas may overlap across the two series. In the first part of the *Essay on Man* Pope takes a Christian approach to explain that we are not all-knowing. We are subject to blindness and ignorance and we are vulnerable to pride and misunderstanding. He reaches the conclusion at the end of the poem in stating his faith in

[74] Cf. Brink: "[Horace] dismisses archaic verse because it does not make what in his own view appears as an artistic unity; he regards it as incoherent, imperfect, poetry" (1982, 470).

God's system and creations and thus that: "Whatever IS, is RIGHT." Pope thus demonstrates his humility that he may not always be correct in his judgment. Although he disagrees with the "People's Voice," what he is hearing may be the "voice of God" and it may be what "is RIGHT."

Following this, however, he analyzes further the "People's Voice." However, this analysis itself can hardly be construed as sincere. *Gammer Gurton* was in Pope's time believed to be the earliest comedy written in English.[75] He would find the voice of the people "odd," if such an ancient work was to be admired in his day ("if it give the bays"). So far so good. The next line in the couplet is rather ironic. The English people's judgment would be "odd" if they were to commend *Gammer Gurton* and "yet deny the Careless Husband praise," a recent comedy from 1704. This is the point which Horace in the original criticizes, that the contemporary public upholds the old over the new. However, in Pope this is an ironic statement since *The Careless Husband* was the most successful play by Cibber, Pope's long-time enemy.[76]

Pope makes one final point concerning contemporary standards. As I have discussed in Chapter 3, adherence to the rules of poetry became increasingly valued since the late seventeenth century, but it also curbed imaginative freedom. If the current public was to admire ancient writers so much, they may as well "say our fathers never broke a rule," as if such poetic regulations were practiced by far-gone predecessors as well. But this is not the case, as poets such as Cowley, who took liberties in his translations and imitations, were not appreciated in Pope's time. It is thus that Pope finds that "the People's Voice is odd." Their judgments, what they revere or denounce, are an assortment of prejudices which is made on no reasonable grounds and exhibits no coherence or consistency. Therefore Pope reaches the conclusion: "the Publick is a fool."

After mounting criticisms on the style of the ancients, Horace inserts a note of clarification: "Non equidem insector delendave carmina Livi | esse reor" ("I of course do not attack the poems of Livius Andronicus, nor do I think that they should be destroyed") (69-70). As Jacob Fuchs has pointed out, Horace's "real enemy is popular bias," not ancient writers or their works.[77] Horace summarizes:

indignor quidquam reprehendi, non quia crasse

[75] Cf. Butt: "Before the discovery of *Ralph Roister Doister* about the year 1818, this [*Gammer Gurton*] was the earliest example of English comedy" (*TE*, 4:202n.).
[76] Even Cibber himself was counfounded by this line; see *ibid*., 202n.
[77] Fuchs 1989, 115.

compositum illepideve putetur, sed quia nuper. (*Ep*. 2.1.76-77)

I am indignant at whatever is condemned,
not because it may be thought that it was composed crudely and inelegantly, but because it was composed recently.

After some seventy-five lines of carefully composed explanation, he allows himself to reveal his wrath ("indignor").[78] He deems it just if a living poet's composition is censored because it has no artistic value, but not simply for it being new and contemporary.[79]

Pope provides a fairly literal rendering of these lines:

I lose my patience, and I own it too,
When works are censur'd, not as bad, but new. (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.115-16)

Reprehendere, to censor or condemn, carries a different weight for Pope, who had neither the protection of the king as his patron and for whom the possibilities of being taken to Chancery were more than slight, but he remains faithful to Horace's original contrast of the old and new. Whereas Horace has embarked on some ninety lines in explaining the current situation in Rome and thus pleads to the emperor for change, Pope's only mention of George II in relation to literature is a pejorative depiction that emphasizes the king's concealed disinterest: "th' affected fool | At Court, who hates whate'er he read at School" (105-6). The poets' outlooks towards their respective political leaders diverge.

[78] In addition to "indignor," the verbs "impugnat" and "odit" (cf. line 22) further attest to the magnitude of his rage: "nostra sed impugnat, nos nostraque lividus odit" ("But [the contemporary Roman] impugns our poems, and he spitefully hates us and our poems") (89). Cf. Brink on lines 76-89: "Emotions, and nothing but emotions are now seen to be involved" (1982, 470); Klingner: "His attitude borders on rage" (2009, 342).

[79] Pope captures the essence of Horace's argument in his comparison with coins: "Authors, like Coins, grow dear as they grow old; | It is the rust we value, not the gold" (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.35-36; *TE*, 4, 197). Horace wants his audience to pass judgment according to the quality of his work ("gold"), and not by the criteria of new or old ("rust").

Chapter 8

Politics Continued: The Rift Between Horace and Pope

While Horace attempts to instruct the emperor, in the belief that the new Roman ruler will encourage the promotion of proper artistic taste in the empire, Pope anticipates no such prospect for the king and the English people. In continuation of the previous chapter, this chapter will focus on the subject of politics, as it relates to the different attitudes which Horace and Pope exhibit towards their leaders.

IV. Society and the Arts: "Utilis urbi"[1]

In his discussion of the old and new, Horace now turns his attention to Greek models, on which so many early Roman works were based or from which they were adapted. This adds a new dimension to the poem, as the juxtaposition of old and new now becomes Greece and Rome:

Ut primum positis nugari Graecia bellis
coepit et in vitium Fortuna labier aequa,
nunc athletarum studiis, nunc arsit equorum, (95)
marmoris aut eboris fabros aut aeris amavit,
suspendit picta vultum mentemque tabella,
nunc tibicinibus, nunc est gavisa tragoedis;
sub nutrice puella velut si luderet infans,
quod cupide petiit, mature plena reliquit. (100)
[quid placet aut odio est quod non mutabile credas?]
hoc paces habuere bonae ventique secundi. (*Ep*. 2.1.93-102)

As soon as Greece laid aside her wars she began to recount nonsense
and favorable fortune slipped away into vice.
She was ablaze, now in the spirit of the athletes, now of horses,
she loved the artisans of marble or ivory or bronze,
she hung her face and mind on painted pictures,
she rejoiced, now at flutists, now at tragic actors.
as if an infant girl playing at the nurse's feet,
what she sought with desire, when fulfilled, she abandoned quickly.
How does she please or feel an aversion, what would you believe is not fickle?
They had so much of good peace and a favorable wind.

Horace first recounts the situation in fifth-century Greece, when various arts flourished. Laying aside weapons and terrors after the Persian Wars, the people showed passion ("studiis") for athletic games and chariot races (95), sculptors and painters (96-97), musicians

[1] *Ep*. 2.1.124.

and tragic actors (98). Their fickle curiosity is even compared to a baby girl at play ("puella… infans"). The metaphor depicting a domestic scene, "sub nutrice puella velut si luderet infans," serves to contrast their current peace with wartime battles. Peace provided a favorable situation for developments in entertainment and art; like a passing breeze they playfully chased one passion after another ("paces… bonae ventique secundi").

The description of culture and society in Horace turns into political criticism in Pope:

In Days of Ease, when now the weary Sword
Was sheath'd, and *Luxury* with *Charles* restor'd; (140)
In every Taste of foreign Courts improv'd,
"All, by the King's Example, liv'd and lov'd."
Then Peers grew proud in Horsemanship t' excell,
New-market's Glory rose, as Britain's fell;
The Soldier breath'd the Gallantries of France, (145)
And ev'ry flow'ry Courtier writ Romance.
Then Marble soften'd into life grew warm,
And yielding Metal flow'd to human form:
Lely on animated Canvas stole
The sleepy Eye, that spoke the melting soul. (150)
No wonder then, when all was Love and Sport,
The willing Muses were debauch'd at Court;
On each enervate string they taught the Note
To pant, or tremble thro' an Eunuch's throat.
But Britain, changeful as a Child at play, (155)
Now calls in Princes, and now turns away.
Now Whig, now Tory, what we lov'd we hate;
Now all for Pleasure, now for Church and State;
Now for Prerogative, and now for Laws;
Effects unhappy! from a Noble Cause. (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.139-60)

Pope describes England in peace after the civil war ("*Charles* restor'd"). "Days of Ease" followed the conclusion of the war ("now the weary Sword | Was sheath'd"), and the English people were finally allowed some time and energy to indulge in "*Luxury*."[2] The quote, "'All, by the King's Example, liv'd and lov'd'" (142), is a line taken from Lord Lansdowne's *The Progress of Beauty*; he too was suspected of being a Jacobite and was imprisoned in the Tower from 1715 to 1717.[3] In alignment with Horace's description of the Greek enthusiasm for horse races (*Ep*. 2.1.95), Pope cites "New-market" (144), where racing began during the time of James I and gained wider attraction with the support of Charles II. Thus Pope writes that "New-market's Glory rose" (144), but his verdict is grim: "New-market's Glory rose, as Britain's [Glory] fell" (144). Although not in the realm of literary arts, Pope questions the taste of England's royal family.

[2] Erskine-Hill observes that in lines 147ff. Pope describes the reign of Charles II as a "sort of Renaissance," comparable to a description of the Renaissance found earlier in his *Essay on Criticism* (1983, 328). Rudd sees in line 147 an echo of Juvenal (1.83) (1994, 170).
[3] *TE*, 4:206n. and ibid., 361.

In the field of literature, he mentions works on horsemanship written by the Duke of Newcastle (143).[4] This illustrates British interest in French literature, especially romances which were translated into English (146). The "Taste of foreign Courts" (141), however, did not come exclusively from the French. Sir Peter Lely (1618-1680) was a Dutch portrait-painter ("on animated Canvas") who had relocated to England in 1640, where his reputation flourished after the Restoration (149). Yet amidst the zeal for "Love and Sport" (151), Pope deplores that poetry was left behind: "The willing Muses were debauch'd at Court" (152). There were Muses who were "willing" to contribute their poetic art, but they were corrupted by the Court. Poetry received no special recognition.

The first opera to be performed in England was "The Siege of Rhodes" (1656) by Sir William Davenant. The talent of the "willing Muses" for verse had no outlet but to teach "the Note | To pant, or tremble thro' an Eunuch's throat" (153-54). In describing the arrival of opera shortly before the Restoration and its surge thereafter in Charles II's reign, he says that the "Muses" were "debauch'd," which suggests sexual corruption. The verb "To pant" and the reference to the singers as "Eunuch[s]" further heighten the sexual innuendos. These expressions underline Pope's repulsion towards the opera, as well as the fact that it was the most favored entertainment of George II.[5]

Following Horace's metaphor, Pope too points out that Britain was as "changeful as a Child at play" (155). Pope then however deviates from the original which concentrates on the blooming of the arts and entertainment and introduces politics. Playing on "nunc… nunc" from Horace (*Ep*. 2.1.95, 98), he deplores the inconstancy of English politics since the Restoration (156-59) which "Now calls in Princes, and now turns away." Britain witnessed successive reigns, all of them short-lived. Charles II was restored in 1660, but the Stuart line was shunned in 1688 when James II was dethroned in favor of William of Orange, a foreigner. Queen Anne ascended to the throne upon his death in 1702, but, by the Act of Settlement of 1701, she became the last member of the House of Stuart to rule England. Following her

[4] I.e., Duke of Newcastle's *Methode et Invention Nouvelle de Dresser les Chevaux* (1658) and *A New Method and Extraordinary Invention to Dress Horses* (1667).

[5] See, for instance, Pope's conversion of the tear-inducing tragedies of Pupius to a box in the opera alongside George II, in his answer as to what purpose one should store and spend their wealth. Horace's original reads: "isne tibi melius suadet, qui 'rem facias, rem, | si possis, recte, si non, quocumque modo, rem,' | ut proprius spectes lacrimosa poemata Pupi" ("Is he better who urges you, 'You should make money, money, by rightful means if you could, if not, by whatever method, money,' so that you may observe in your own reserved seat the tearful poetry of Pupius") (*Ep*. 1.1.65-67). Pope's version is: "'If not, by any means get Wealth and Place. | For what? to have a Box where Eunuchs sing, | And foremost in the Circle eye a King'" (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 1.1.104-6).

death in 1714, George I, a German-speaking prince from Hanover, assumed the throne.[6] The "Noble Cause" (160), the liberty for which the English population fought was not attained, as England swayed to and fro in different reigns: "Now all for Pleasure, now for Church and State; | Now for Prerogative, and now for Laws" (158-59). The brief reigns in the late seventeenth century did not allow for stability to be established in the nation.[7] Pope's conclusion to the "Noble Cause" - the liberty, tolerance, and stability which the English people sought - from the civil war is that, unfortunately, it has only seen "Effects unhappy" (160), as the people only became subject to foreign reigns and restrictive legislation following the war.

From the playful caprice of the Greeks, Horace turns to his native Romans who exhibited the opposite character:

Romae dulce diu fuit et sollemne reclusa
mane domo vigilare, clienti promere iura,
cautos nominibus rectis expendere nummos, (105)
maiores audire, minori dicere per quae
crescere res posset, minui damnosa libido.
mutavit mentem populus levis et calet uno
scribendi studio; pueri patresque severi
fronde comas vincti cenant et carmina dictant. (*Ep*. 2.1.103-10)

At Rome it was long a pleasant rite
to awake at dawn with an open house, to draw out the laws for a client,
to pay out to conscientious debtors money under guarantee,
to listen to the elders, to tell the younger,
by means of which one could grow his assets, destructive desire diminished.
The capricious public has changed their minds
and is on fire in one craze to write;
sons and strict fathers dine with leafy crowns bound to their hair and dictate poetry.

Horace explains that the Romans possessed a different nature than their Greek counterparts. The temperament of the people reflected strict routine and righteous conduct. They woke to open their doors at the break of dawn ("dulce… sollemne reclusa | mane domo vigilare"). During the day they set themselves to business; a lawyer explains legal conditions to a client ("clienti promere iura") and a creditor provides loans ("cautos… expendere nummos") to honest debtors who may be trusted not to breach their contract ("nominibus rectis"). The Romans are depicted as serious, hard-working people, and the examples given evoke no

[6] Jacobites even sought to call the exiled son of James II, the Old Pretender, to the throne. See Erskine-Hill, 1983, 329 and Fairer 1989, 1.
[7] Cf. Erskine-Hill: "Charles's reign lacked the controlled strength of an Augustan age, 'George's Age' lacks the stability. George has been warned" (1983, 329).

impression of treachery or counterfeit.[8] At home, their morals are passed down from their ancestors to the young, by which they learn proper ways to maintain their wealth and well-being yet not to yield to disastrous avarice.

The tone changes, however, at line 109. Of late, they have become like the Greeks. As a poet, he points out the recent craze which the Romans have taken up. He evokes a comic scene of sons and fathers wearing wreaths of victory and reciting verses even while they dine (109-10).[9] Horace presents an exaggerated image to illustrate the phenomenon of "uno | scribendi studio" (108-9) among the Romans.[10]

We turn briefly to Pope who has transformed the setting to contemporary England:

Time was, a sober Englishman wou'd knock
His servants up, and rise by five a clock,
Instruct his Family in ev'ry rule,
And send his Wife to Church, his Son to school.
To worship like his Fathers was his care; (165)
To teach their frugal Virtues to his Heir;
To prove, that Luxury could never hold;
And place, on good Security, his Gold.
Now Times are chang'd, and one Poetick Itch
Has seiz'd the Court and City, Poor and Rich: (170)
Sons, Sires, and Grandsires, all will wear the Bays. (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.1.161-71)

The terms "rise by five a clock," "Instruct," "Church," "School," "worship," "teach," and "prove" reflect the sober lifestyle as depicted by Horace's portrait of the Romans. As Fuchs has stated, Pope's description of what once was a typical family of a "sober Englishman" (161) was "based… squarely on Horace's sober old Romans," and it is a "vaguely defined early English period" for which no specific timeframe in history is given.[11] It may well be that Pope did not have a concrete era in mind but that he needed a peaceful and morally righteous past to contrast with the present state of society. As capital of the nation, London in particular

[8] Stack believes that this is to emphasize not that the Romans were an assiduous people but that they were simply "mostly interested in money" (1985, 170).
[9] See Feeney 2009, 365-66 and La Penna 2009, 390-91 for the "invidia" of a father towards his son, as related to the obstinacy of the old in refusing to accept new styles. In the conflict of father and son (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.125-134), Schonhorn (1968, 436-42) and Stack (1985, 166) argue that Pope may have been referring to George II and his son, the Prince of Wales.
[10] Cf. Feeney's statement on Horace's comparison between the Greeks and Romans: "[Horace] showed poetry in Greece as one manifestation of a general tendency; at Rome, by contrast, poetry is always being, as it were, written against the grain, at odds with the national character, legislated against, misunderstood by the public, the only one of the *artes* to be cultivated" (2009, 385).
[11] Fuchs 1989, 117 and 116. Horace's original similarly gives no specific indication of dates in his literary history; see Feeney 2009, 376.

was somewhat comparable to Rome.[12] Pope's lament over present circumstances will be more manifest in the *Dialogues*, published a year after this *Imitation*.

However, even in such times of peace, Pope tells us that the "sober Englishman" was cautious of the fact that "Luxury could never hold" (167). The equivalent for this in Horace is: "minui damnosa libido" (*Ep*. 2.1.107). For Horace, "damnosa libido" refers to insatiable greed and illicit pleasures.[13] Pope had employed the word "Luxury" earlier in "*Luxury* with *Charles* restor'd" (140), in reference to the entertainment and arts which flourished in the reign of Charles II. Such repetition of identical terms is not found in Horace's Latin. The statement put in the mouth of an anonymous Englishman, that "Luxury could never hold" (167), provides a clue that, amidst the seeming advancement of culture, the "Luxury" was not to develop and last for long. "Luxury" does not refer to avarice and indulgences but freedom. For Pope specifically, it refers to that of speech in his writings, but that freedom of speech was to be severely curtailed (cf. "Now for Prerogative, and now for Laws," 159). Similarly, "place, on good Security, his Gold" (168) may be a general advice for one's handling of assets, but it may refer to the excessive speculation and investments in the South Sea Company.

In contrast to Horace who attempts to demonstrate the native temperament of his people, Pope gives more hints, however subtle, about the degeneration of his society after the Restoration. Surely enough, the peace brought on by the end of the civil war and, with it, the anticipation and hope for liberty in England did not last: "Now Times are chang'd" (169). Following Horace, Pope declares that the whole of England, "Court and City, Poor and Rich: | Sons, Sires, and Grandsires" (170-71), has gone mad with "one Poetick Itch" (169) to scribble verses, but Pope's ideas on poetry and its reception in society remain tightly intertwined with his thoughts on the political situation of his age.[14]

I return now to Horace's idea of "scribendi studio" (109) among contemporary Romans. He elucidates the function of poets in society:

Hic error tamen et levis haec insania quantas
virtutes habeat, sic collige: vatis avarus
non temere est animus; versus amat, hoc studet unum; (120)
detrimenta, fugas servorum, incendia ridet;

[12] Cf. Rudd: "If we compare, say, the London of 1750 with the Rome of 15 BC, we have two imperial capitals with a population of about three-quarters of a million. In each case growth had brought with it slums, overcrowding, filth, fire, and crime" (1994, 61-62).
[13] Cf. Rudd: "Gambling, drink, and sex are all included in *libido*" (1989, 92).
[14] Perhaps Pope views this "Poetick Itch" negatively because he had in mind Poet Laureates who did not deserve such merit, hack writers and others who wrote malicious poems about him, and in general all those who wrote not for their interest in the art of poetry but for remuneration or advancement of their status. Cf. An earlier and positive use of "itch" to describe his interest in writing: "[Homer] was the first author that made me catch the itch of poetry, when I read him in my childhood" (*Corr*., 1:297).

non fraudem socio puerove incogitat ullam
pupillo; vivit siliquis et pane secundo;
militiae quamquam piger et malus, utilis urbi,
si das hoc, parvis quoque rebus magna iuvari. (125)
os tenerum pueri balbumque poeta figurat,
torquet ab obscenis iam nunc sermonibus aurem,
mox etiam pectus praeceptis format amicis,
asperitatis et invidiae corrector et irae;
recte facta refert, orientia tempora notis (130)
instruit exemplis, inopem solatur et aegrum.
castis cum pueris ignara puella mariti
disceret unde preces, vatem ni Musa dedisset?
poscit opem chorus et praesentia numina sentit,
caelestis implorat aquas, docta prece blandus, (135)
avertit morbos, metuenda pericula pellit,
impetrat et pacem et locupletem frugibus annum.
carmine di superi placantur, carmine Manes. (*Ep*. 2.1.118-38)

Nevertheless this error and this slight lunacy
may have some merits, collect them together thus.
The soul of a bard is hardly ever avaricious; he loves verses, he pursues this and this alone;
he laughs at losses, fugitive slaves, fires;
he contrives no offense against an ally or his ward;
he lives on pulse and second-rate bread;
although slow and unfit for the military, he is useful for the state,
if you grant this, that great things can be helped by small things too.
The poet shapes the tender and lisping mouth of the boy,
even now he diverts the ear from improper discourse,
later on yet, he forms the heart with friendly instructions,
reformer of ferocity, envy, and hatred,
he reports good deeds, provides the coming age with notable examples,
and consoles the needy and the depraved.
Whence would the girl not yet married learn the prayers with chaste boys,
if the Muse had not given them a bard?
The chorus calls for guidance and feels the divinities present,
alluringly with their learned prayer appeals to the sky for raindrops,
shuns disease, repels fearful perils,
procures both divine blessing and a year rich in harvest.
The gods in the heavens are appeased by the song, by the song the gods of the underworld.

We might expect Horace, the poet, to chastise the "populus levis" (108) for their scribbling frenzy, but with the conjunction "tamen"(118) he in fact turns in defense of "scribendi studio" (109). The "error" (118) actually has some merits ("quantas… virtutes," 118-19), he explains. He is not referring, however, to the "scribendi studio" of the "populus levis." He uses the craze of the people for writing only as a transition to explain the nature of poets. His true intention is to convey to the emperor the "scribendi studio" of poets, which may border on a mild form of insanity ("levis haec insania," 118). In what C. O. Brink calls a "self-deprecating and humorous" illustration, Horace sets out to describe the mind and life of a poet.[15] A poet is dedicated to his verse. It is his one and only passion (120). There is hardly ever any room in

[15] Brink 1982, 475. Rudd interprets "error" to mean not a mistake but rather an "aberration," as in "mentally abnormal behaviour," referring to the mental condition of poets (1989, 94).

that somewhat peculiar mindset for avarice (119-20). His concentration is devoted so entirely to poetry that he remains indifferent to any emergencies that may be happening around him. In fact, he even laughs at such disasters (121). As for nutrition, he sustains himself on second-rate grains. He is heedless of everything except his verse (122).

After such semi-humorous representations of a poet's peculiarities, which are his own too, Horace assumes a more serious tone. He admits outright that he is useless as a soldier (124).[16] Following the humble confession, he boldly states, in the famous phrase, that he could still be of use to the state: "utilis urbi" (124). Horace addresses Augustus directly in line 125 ("das" in the second singular person) that it is by small things ("parvis… rebus") that great accomplishments are made ("magna iuvari"). While the soldiers are far away on a battlefield, it is the poet at home who educates the young, from infancy, into correct speech (126). Moreover, it is not only enunciation but also content, or proper thought, that the poet instructs ("pectus.. format… | asperitatis et invidiae corrector et irae," 128-29). "Recte facta refert" (130) refers to epic,[17] and lines 130-31 very possibly allude to Virgil's *Aeneid*.[18] Then, as if to compensate for his *recusatio* in not writing epic, he subsequently makes an allusion to his own achievement, *Carmen Saeculare* (132-38), a celebratory poem composed upon Augustus' request for the *Ludi Saeculares* of 17 B.C.E.[19]

Horace begins by explaining the "levis… insania" (118) of a poet and his lifestyle, then explains how he can be of use to society in the education of the young, and finally makes allusions to contemporary works including his own. It is by taking baby steps ("parvis… rebus," 125), such as attending to the education of infants, that great ends are achieved. In these lines addressed to Augustus, Horace guides the emperor to eventually see that the culmination ("magna") is manifest in the productions of contemporary poets whom he has welcomed under his patronage. Horace's tone in lines 124-38 is serious and sincere. There is hardly any irony.[20] At the center of his long epistle Horace has placed his genuine plea to demonstrate that poets indeed can be "utilis urbi."[21]

[16] This may be a covert message to Augustus that he will never fight against him, as he once did long ago on the side of Brutus. Pope was convinced of this: "Horace had not acquitted himself much to his credit in this capacity… in the battle of Philippi… He hopes to be pardoned" (*TE*, 4:211n.). Descriptions of his unpleasant experiences as a soldier are also found in *Carm*. 2.7; the only exception, as mentioned in Chapter 5, is his declaration that he will go back to the battlefield if for Maecenas' sake (*Epod*. 1).
[17] Stack 1985, 173.
[18] Suggested by Fraenkel (1957, 391); among those who agree are Fuchs (1989, 118).
[19] Suet. *Vit. Hor*.
[20] Fuchs 1989, 115 and 117.
[21] Cf. Brink on lines 118-38: "Its central placing in the poem emphasizes the importance H. attached to it" (1982, 475); and Fraenkel who calls lines 132-38 the "crown of his epistle" (1957, 391).

The corresponding lines in Pope expand over fifty lines (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.189-240). At the start Pope seems to faithfully follow the Horatian model (189-93). Horace's "error" (*Ep*. 2.1.118) turns into "mischief" (189), and "levis… insania" (*Ep*. 2.1.118) into "Madmen" (190) and "Folly" (191). He keeps Horace's self-deprecating tone. The term "mischief" and his calling the pen a "Play-thing" (193), as if a trifle toy, recall images of a prankish yet harmless child.[22] However, the political overtones are always present in Pope. Where Horace simply states that the light madness of poets can actually have merits ("quantas | virtutes," *Ep*. 2.1.118-19), Pope says that "These Madmen never hurt the Church or State" (190). There is an implied assertion, that though a Catholic, he has never committed offense to the official "Church" of England. He also affirms that "rarely Av'rice taints the tuneful mind" of a poet (192). For Pope, the vice of avarice is deeply intertwined with politics and society.[23] In addition, he claims that a poet "ne'er rebels, or plots" (194). He may be defending here his innocence against suspicions of being a Jacobite as well as recalling his involvement with the Atterbury trial, when, called to take the witness stand, he genuinely feared exile himself. Overall, his expressions in these lines, "the mischief is not great" (189), "never hurt" (190), "rarely… taints" (192), and "ne'er rebels, or plots" (194), convey a defensive attitude.

Furthermore, Pope claims that it is not poets but "other men" who rebel and plot (194):[24]

Flight of Cashiers, or Mobs, he'll never mind;
And knows no losses while the Muse is kind. (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.195-96)

The "Flight of Cashiers" refers to those who were involved in the South Sea Bubble and who managed to escape with their money. Pope brushes this aside, saying that "he'll never mind" and that he "knows no losses." However, Pope himself was among the many who invested in the South Sea Company and suffered losses when the Bubble burst. Yet he persuades himself that all is fine "while the Muse is kind" and stresses a poet's pacific mode of living. He then provides a cursory summary of the poet's lifestyle (198-200), what he calls the life of a "good man" (198). "Garden" (199), "quiet" (199), and "a perfect Hermit" (200) evoke images of simplicity and serenity. Although close to London, Pope is distant enough to be at one remove from all the commotion in the capital. He is not, nevertheless, a recluse who, content in his own world, remains inactive and inattentive to social matters.

[22] The various uses of Pope's pen and writing as a weapon (cf. *Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.69; *Dia.* 2.212 and 248) will be discussed in the final chapter.
[23] See *Dia*. 1.110 and 162.
[24] Fuchs observes that the Pope's examples of vices in society are "more criminal" and "certainly more violent" than what Horace provides (1989, 118).

One may be tempted to think, as Pope says, "Of little use the Man you may suppose" (201), but in the next lines he embarks on his own rendering of a poet as "utilis urbi:"

Yet let me show, a Poet's of some weight,
And (tho' no Soldier) useful to the State. (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.1.203-4)

The term "weight" suggests importance, but it can also imply a burden. As his statement of "utilis urbi" unfolds Pope's meaning in being "useful to the State" may be a burden for the king and court. The function of a poet, Pope believes, lies in the fact that his poetry "benefits mankind" (191). Poets should not exist for the sole purpose of pleasing and serving the rulers of the state.[25]

First, following the model of Horace, he sets out to explain the use of poetry in a child's education: "What will a Child learn sooner than a song?" (205). However, veering sharply from the Latin original, he uses this as an opportunity to make a jibe at George II and the foreign court:

What better teach a Foreigner the tongue?
What's long or short, each accent where to place,
And speak in publick with some sort of grace. (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.1.206-8)

Pope here speaks of the king ("a Foreigner") and the Hanoverian royals who currently rule England. He also treats George II as if he were no better than a child, which hints not only at his language ability but his intellectual capacity as well.

While Horace continues to explain the merits of the poet to the state, Pope turns this into a criticism of poets who do not serve any good to the nation and its people:

I scarce can think him such a worthless thing,
Unless he praise some monster of a King. (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.1.209-10)

A poet who "praise[s] some monster of a King" is a "worthless thing." As Fuchs argues, this may very possibly point to the dramatist Cibber, appointed Poet Laureate several years earlier.[26] Pope continues to emphasize that the function of a poet is not "To please a lewd, or un-believing Court" (212).[27] As Stack explains, Pope's view is that a poet "must be at every level concerned with the moral and political life of the country, and so must be everywhere in opposition to the King, the Court, the government, and the moneyed interests of the city."[28] For Pope, to be "utilis urbi" does not mean to offer praise to or to flatter undeserving rulers of

[25] Cf. Fuchs: "To be '*utilis urbi*,' it appears, the poet must not cooperate with those in power; to be most virtuous, he must actually oppose them" (ibid.).
[26] Ibid..
[27] Butt notes that the adjective "lewd" is "not unjustly applied to George II's court" (*TE*, 4:212n.).
[28] Stack 1985, 175.

a state. The poet must give priority to the welfare of the people and be useful to the state in such a way that he can "*contribute to the Happiness of a* Free People."[29]

In Pope's *Imitation*, Horace's allusion to Virgil's epic is turned into a tribute to Jonathan Swift (1667-1745):

Let Ireland tell, how Wit upheld her cause,
Her Trade supported, and supply'd her Laws;
And leave on SWIFT this grateful verse ingrav'd,
The Rights a Court attack'd, a Poet sav'd.
Behold the hand that wrought a Nation's cure, (225)
Stretch'd to relieve the Idiot and the Poor,
Proud Vice to brand, or injur'd Worth adorn,
And stretch the Ray to Ages yet unborn. (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.221-28)

As opposed to Horace who praises a poet for writing *for* the state, Pope upholds Swift as a writer who combated *against* a corrupt government. Pope refers to him as "the hand that wrought a Nation's cure." Swift, as an Anglo-Irish,[30] had a lifelong involvement in the politics and economics of both countries. His contributions in Ireland include "Her Trade supported," which refers to his support for Irish trade expressed in *A Proposal for the Universal Use of Irish Manufacture* (1720), a work for which the printer was prosecuted. He "supply'd her Laws" in opposing the debasing of currency.[31] Swift also extended his "hand" for the care of the underrepresented members of society, "the Idiot and the Poor," by establishing a foundation for the mentally ill and a system of loans for the poor.[32] At his death he left over £10,000 for the founding of a hospital. Although neither poet lived to see it open in 1757, Swift had confided his intentions to Pope.[33] Pope expresses his friend's vision that he "stretch the Ray to Ages yet unborn." As Pope depicts it, Swift's contributions to Ireland go beyond his merit as a writer. They stand in stark contrast to some of the rapacious and treacherous Englishmen whom he described earlier (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.195 and 197).

Unlike Horace's allusion to Virgil's panegyric, a work designed to pass on the greatness of the emperor in posterity, Pope sings of one poet, not a political ruler, who has

[29] Advertisement to *The First Epistle of the Second Book of Horace* (*TE*, 4:191).
[30] Angus Ross and David Woolley explain the historical circumstances of Swift's birth in Ireland: "A new Act of Settlement in 1661, which aimed at paying in Irish land some of Charles II's debts to his supporters, was passed by the Protestant Irish Parliament. This threw land titles into new confusion that provided ample pickings for English carpet-bagging lawyers, among whom was Swift's father" (1984, xviii). Swift lived alternately in both Ireland and England until his definitive return to Dublin in 1714. Ross and Woolley propose "three cataclysmic events" in England which affected Ireland in the seventeenth century: the Act of Settlement of 1652 under Cromwell, the new Act indicated above under Charles II, and the Irish civil war, in which James II's and William III's armies clashed in Ireland (ibid., xvii-xviii).
[31] Rudd 1994, 89.
[32] *TE*, 4:214n.
[33] *Ibid*.

made lasting contributions to society. It is by using Swift and his generosity to Ireland as evidence that Pope proves how a poet can be "utilis urbi." Equally with his appraisal of his friend, Pope attempts to convey in this passage an indirect criticism of his own king in England, who can neither identify precious poetic talent nor the virtuosity of poets as instigators of social reform so as to make them "utilis urbi."

In the place of the *Carmen Saeculare*, a song written for a celebratory public occasion, Pope's chorus sings in the "country pews" (233) of an unnamed English town:

Not but there are, who merit other palms;
Hopkins and Sternhold glad the heart with Psalms; (230)
The Boys and Girls whom Charity maintains,
Implore your help in these pathetic strains:
How could Devotion touch the country pews,
Unless the Gods bestow'd a proper Muse?
Verse chears their leisure, Verse assists their work, (235)
Verse prays for Peace, or sings down Pope and Turk.
The silenc'd Preacher yields to potent strain,
And feels that grace his pray'r besought in vain,
The blessing thrills thro' all the lab'ring throng,
And Heav'n is won by violence of Song. (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.1.229-40)

Instead of high-born youth chosen to sing at the Secular Games of Rome ("cum pueris… puella," *Ep*. 2.1.132), Pope describes rustic "Boys and Girls" who sing the Psalms of Hopkins and Sternhold (230) in "country pews."[34] Pope regarded Thomas Sternhold and John Hopkins as "bad Poets," and they were indeed notorious for their unsophisticated verse.[35] Pope's initial commendation of them, "Hopkins and Sternhold glad the heart with Psalms" (230), is insincere, and he later refers to their translation of prayers, the English Psalter of 1562, as "pathetic strains" (232). They are far from Pope's definition of a "proper Muse" ("How could Devotion touch [them], | Unless the Gods bestow'd a proper Muse?," 233-34). The "Boys and Girls," the youth of England turn to the Muse and "Implore your help" (232). There are "Verse [that] chears their leisure" (235), "Verse [that] assists their work" (235), and "Verse [that] prays for Peace" (236). Pope thus recognizes that there are gifted poets with good intentions in his age. However, there are also a group of poets who "sings down Pope and Turk" (236).[36] "Pope" in this line refers, not to the poet but, to the Bishop of Rome and the leader of the Catholic Church. Pope accentuates the malevolence of these poets and claims in his version that the preacher is "silenc'd" (237) by their "potent strain" (237). There exists

[34] Fuchs 1989, 121.
[35] In Pope's letter to Swift: "My name is as bad an one as yours, and hated by all bad Poets from Hopkins and Sternhold to Gildon and Cibber" (*Corr*., 2:334). See also Mack 1985, 298 for Pope on Sternhold.
[36] See *Corr*., 2:334 for the association with "Turk."

verse in England that is anti-Christian. With no proper religious worship, the English people are lost and lean toward violence instead of peace.

Instead of a generation of youth who can look towards a future free of disease and perils and filled with peace and good harvest (*Ep*. 2.1.136-37),[37] the English preacher in Pope's version powerlessly senses "his pray'r besought *in vain*."[38] The chorus reaches out to the divinities and "Heav'n is won" (240). Only, it is not won by the song itself ("carmine," *Ep*. 2.1.138), but the sheer "violence" of their song (240). Whereas Brink has claimed the significance of Horace's plea of "utilis urbi" at the center of the poem, Fuchs offers his opinion as to what is placed at the center of Pope's version: "at the very center of his poem, in the twelve lines directly following the passage on Swift, Pope pictures metaphorically the results of England's failure to achieve, on this lofty level, a grand synthesis of art and virtue."[39] In the image of the rustic chorus, Pope describes a nation that is lacking in the perception of good art. Moreover, the nation constitutes a "lab'ring throng," a wretched people in reduced circumstances for whom morals and virtue are not in their scope and who can only have recourse in violence. This points to a degenerate society, not one unified by a ruler who provides his people with peace, stability, and the arts. Pope laments the current national identity of England.

On the subject of literature, Horace begins to trace the literary history of Rome.[40] As he described in lines 103 to 107, the Romans followed a strict and virtuous lifestyle. This is echoed in line 139: "agricolae prisci, fortes parvoque beati" ("ancient peasants, sturdy and content with little"). They rewarded themselves with entertainment each year after harvest (140). The drama that was staged in Fescinnine verse at the harvest festivals was the earliest form of the performing arts.[41] Following a brief, and by now familiar, criticism of the rusticity of the verse (146), Horace describes how this Fescennine license eventually spun out of control:

libertasque recurrentis accepta per annos
lusit amabiliter, donec iam saevus apertam
in rabiem coepit verti iocus et per honestas

[37] Cf. Syme on Rome: "With peace and prosperity polite arts returned to favour" (1939, 375).
[38] My italics.
[39] Fuchs 1989, 119.
[40] Brink 1982, 476 warns us against the accuracy of Horace's account. See also Stack, who calls it "allegorical rather than historical" (1985, 179). Goldberg claims: "drama did not dominate the theaters of first-century Rome to anything like the extent they dominate Horace's thoughts" (2005, 180). Lowrie explains: "The picture he presents is idealized" (2005, 414). Feeney in fact claims that Horace "derides the comparison of Roman authors with Greek" and that the poet is convinced "that the historical patterns of Rome and Greece are distinct and cannot be compared to each other without absurd distortion" (2002, 178 and 179).
[41] See Rudd 1989, 98-99 for its etymology.

ire domos impune minax. doluere cruento (150)
dente lacessiti; fuit intactis quoque cura
condicione super communi. quin etiam lex
poenaque lata, malo quae nollet carmine quemquam
describi. vertere modum formidine fustis
ad bene dicendum delectandumque redacti. (*Ep*. 2.1.147-55)

And freedom, welcomed through the returning years, amused delightfully,
until jest, now cruel, began to change into open rage and,
threatening and with impunity, to permeate honest hearths.
Exasperated by the blood-thirsty fang, they grieved;
the uninjured too felt concern about the public situation;
so that the law even created a full penalty,
which prohibited anyone to be portrayed in harmful verse:
they altered their style, by dread of beating by a club,
they were led back to saying and charming well.

"Libertas," which here signifies verbal freedom, was once a source of joyous entertainment ("lusit amabiliter").[42] However, the "iocus," a term which is often used favorably in Horace,[43] evolved into expressions of harmful savagery. It reached a point where the Fescennine license could no longer be left "impune," and it was deemed that a law was necessary to curb its licentiousness (151-54). Unlike the death penalty which was prescribed in the Twelve Tables, Horace comments that the punishment which the playwrights came to fear was beating ("formidine fustis").[44] With the introduction of a law and a penalty, the poets learned to write in a language that was appropriate for festive amusement ("bene dicendum delectandumque").

Horace does not approve of "libertas" as a license for uninhibited abuse. His diction in describing its abuse, "saevus," "rabiem," "minax," and "cruento | dente" convey his disgust and disapproval. He affirms that intervention by "lex" and "poena" is at times useful even in the realm of literary aesthetics.[45] As an epistle that is personally addressed to Augustus, it signals, one may infer, the poet's assent, on the political level, to the emperor's moral reforms and laws ("moribus ornes, | legibus emendes," 2-3).

In contrast to the Greek frivolity described earlier (93-102), Horace now states that it was Greece who brought her arts ("artis," 156) to uncultivated Italy ("agresti Latio," 157). He claims that it was thanks to Greek influence that the native Saturnian meter went out of fashion. Horace finds Saturnian verse uncouth ("horridus," 157) and even labels it a serious venom ("grave virus," 158). He regrets that the rustic strain still remains to his day ("hodieque manent vestigial ruris," 160). In lines 161-167, he dwells on the development of tragedy in the

[42] Ibid., 99.
[43] See, for example, *Ep*. 1.6.65-66.
[44] See Cic. *De Rep*. 4.12 and Chapter 6. Rudd 1989, 100 claims that it could also mean to be beaten to death.
[45] Cf. Stack who argues that one can see in this passage Horace's "recognition of native energy… and at the same time his sense that restraint upon that vigour was to some extent necessary and desirable" (1985, 179).

theater. While acknowledging that the Romans possessed innate talent for the genre ("spirat tragicum satis") ("it had sufficient tragic inspiration") (166), he criticizes their verbosity: "metuitque lituram" ("he feared to remove," 167). As for comedy (168-76), citing Plautus as an example, he shows that the playwrights were only interested in monetary profit and paid no heed to the fact that the genre in fact requires more work: "habet Comoedia tanto | plus oneris" ("Comedy carries so much greater a burden," 169-70). As stated before in the case of Lucilius and others, refinement of language ("munditiae," 159) is what Horace advocates, and his criticism of old literature remains the same: roughness in verse, verbosity in tragedy, and careless work in comedy.[46] Having traced the literary history of Rome, Horace sets the scene for his message to Augustus concerning contemporary poetry.

Following Horace, Pope paints an image of his "rural Ancestors" in *Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.241-248. The annual harvest was followed by a period of beatitude, as Pope's expressions suggest: "Indulg'd," "feasts," "off'rings," "thankful strain," "joy," "laugh," "jest," "Smooth'd ev'ry brow," and "open'd ev'ry soul." There is no explicit mention of drama, but Pope is in line with Horace in recounting the restrictions imposed on the freedom of speech in literature. In the olden days, "pleasing Licence grew" (249) and "Taunts alternate innocently flew" (250). But times have changed:

But Times corrupt, and Nature, ill-inclin'd,
Produc'd the point that left a sting behind;
Till friend with friend, and families at strife,
Triumphant Malice rag'd thro' private life.
Who felt the wrong, or fear'd it, took th' alarm, (255)
Appeal'd to Law, and Justice lent her arm.
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 forbore the vice. (260)
Hence Satire rose, that just the medium hit,
And heals with Morals what it hurts with Wit. (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.251-62)

With the conjunction "But," the tone changes and the language stands in stark contrast to the earlier descriptions of happiness: "corrupt," "ill-inclin'd," "strife," "Malice," "rag'd," "wrong," "fear'd," and "alarm." Laws against libel were put into effect (256-57).[47] Horace's "bene dicendum delectandumque" (*Ep*. 2.1.155) turns into the expression: "The Poets learn'd to please, and not to wound."

[46] Cf. Rudd: "The *munditiae* are the new forms and standards derived from Greece by Ennius and his successors. Their effect, however, was not complete" (1989, 101).
[47] See *Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.147-48, in Chapter 6.

Unlike Horace, Pope offers two possibilities of writing. The first is obvious: "Most warp'd to Flatt'ry's side." He refers to court poets who took the safe route of "Flatt'ry" towards their patrons and men of power in their society. Pope was not one of them, and he describes the alternative path which he has chosen: to write satire. Horace, as a client under the emperor's patronage, did not have this option and it is thus not mentioned in the Latin original. Pope embarks on a defense of his position as a satiric poet. While most poets turned to "Flatt'ry," a minority ("some," 259) "Preserv'd the freedom" (260) of the times when the "pleasing Licence grew" (249) and "Taunts alternate innocently flew" (250). At the same time, they condemned vice (260). Satire became a perfect vehicle ("just the medium hit," 261) for poets in their writing "to please, and not to wound" (258). Truth, in pointing out vice, can sting ("it hurts with Wit," 262), but the purpose of satire is not "to wound." It is to correct vices by imparting moral wisdom ("heals with Morals," 262).

Finally, Pope's views on French influence (263-95), a counterpart to Horace's description of importations from Greek culture (*Ep*. 2.1.156-76), have been discussed in Chapter 4. Horace's "munditiae" (*Ep*. 2.1.159) are smartly converted to "refinements" (265). He names the native poets Waller and Dryden (267) and exalts Shakespeare and Otway (277) as England's proud tragedians. Although, following Horace, he expresses mild criticism towards his predecessors for their lack of polish and concision (278-81), he revered the four writers which he mentions. In comedy, Pope proceeds from those whom he admires to ones whom he detests. William Congreve (1670-1729) (287) had become a friend of Pope's as early as 1706 and it was to him that Pope dedicated his *Iliad* in 1720. While there is criticism of George Farquhar (1677-1707) (288) and Sir John Vanbrugh (1664-1726) (289), neither was a personal ally nor foe to Pope. Following the writers about whom Pope was neutral, Aphra Behn (1640-1689) (290-91) is quite fiercely denounced for staging obscenities.[48] However, the ultimate jibe is reserved for Cibber (292-93). All serve the equivalent of Plautus in Horace, as their primary goal was monetary gain (294). From poets and tragedians from the previous centuries, Pope moves into more recent times by mentioning contemporary playwrights of comedy. Like Horace, Pope has now prepared the way for his final attack on the English audience, poets, and, most of all, on the king.

[48] See Rudd 1994, 88 for Chaucer, Skelton, and Behn - all writers criticized by Pope in the poem - and their connections to their respective kings and courts.

V. Poetry and the Theater: "*Praise undeserv'd is scandal in disguise*"[49]

After a long discourse ("longo sermone," 4) on the theory, history, and criticism of Roman literature, Horace at last embarks on the situation at present and the message which he wishes to communicate to Augustus. Continuing with the topic of drama, he now focuses not on the playwrights but on the audience.[50] Instead of criticizing the emperor outright, he first describes the Roman public at large in order to present the problem which he observes. The criticism extends to Augustus as well, but Horace only dares to do this indirectly via the criticism of the Roman people. He employed the same tactic in his criticism of the appreciation of the old over the new, where he referred to "tuus… populus" (18) and "volgus" (63) as the culprits of blindness to true literary value. This time the subject is "plebecula" (186):

saepe etiam audacem fugat hoc terretque poetam,
quod numero plures, virtute et honore minores,
indocti stolidique et depugnare parati
si discordet eques, media inter carmina poscunt
aut ursum aut pugiles; his nam plebecula gaudet. (*Ep*. 2.1.182-86)

It often terrifies even the daring poet and puts him to flight,
because, though superior in number, they are inferior in virtue and rank,
unlearned and stupid and prepared to fight hard,
if a knight disagrees with them, they demand a bear or boxers
in the middle of a play; for in these the common people rejoice.

Horace cannot stand the rough and ignorant crowd who merely jeer and cheer at the farce that is presented on the stage. The "plebecula" constitute a majority of the theater audience ("numero plures"). However, in Horace's opinion, they are a mass of uneducated fools ("indocti stolidique") who are easily swayed to violence ("depugnare parati"). In addition to a bear and boxers ("aut ursum aut pugiles"), Horace mentions a cross-breed of a panther and a camel (195)[51] and a white elephant (196). Sometimes it is a zoo, at other times there are war scenes with cavalry, footmen, fallen kings with hands tied behind them, chariots, and ships (189-93).

[49] *Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.413.
[50] See *AP*, 153-57. Cf. Brink's comment on Horace's estimation of the performing arts: "However set on gaining glory, he [the playwright] depends on the audience" (1982, 479) and Mayer 1995: 291-94.
[51] I.e., a giraffe; see Rudd 1989, 109.

However, amidst this rough crowd we find a spectator of equestrian rank ("eques").[52] While presumably a minority, the nobility are among the audience who enjoy the crude entertainment:

verum equitis quoque iam migravit ab aure voluptas
omnis ad incertos oculos et gaudia vana. (*Ep*. 2.1.187-88)

Why even all the pleasure of the equestrian order has also moved
from the ear to vague sights and shallow joys.

Of late the aristocratic ranks are no better in their appreciation of the arts than the common people who are "indocti stolidique." There is a silent criticism of Augustus as, according to Suetonius, the emperor had a predilection for stage performances, and especially those which featured the appearance of animals.[53] Horace begins by openly criticizing the common people ("plebecula") and then expresses surprise and disappointment that the tastelessness has recently permeated the nobility ("equites") as well. Yet Horace here ends his ascent in the description of the audience in terms of social hierarchy, leaving a blank on his judgment on the tastes of the ultimate ruler. In these performances, what counts for the audience is the circus which they see ("oculos") and not what they hear ("aure"). The audience lends no ear to what the playwrights have written in their scripts for the actors to speak.[54] Horace attempts to show that there is no literary value in these plays if it is only visible excess that is esteemed by the spectators. It is the people ("populum," 197), then, who watch the plays ("spectaret," 197) which have become a spectacle to watch ("nimio spectacula plura," 198).

Pope provides an equally colorful description of the English audience:

There still remains to mortify a Wit,
The many-headed Monster of the Pit: (305)
A sense-less, worth-less, and unhonour'd crowd;
Who to disturb their betters mighty proud,
Clatt'ring their sticks, before ten lines are spoke,
Call for the Farce, the Bear, or the Black-joke.
What dear delight to Britons Farce affords! (310)
Ever the taste of Mobs, but now of Lords. (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.1.304-11)

Like Horace, he calls the spectators an "unhonour'd crowd" that is "sense-less" and "worth-less." Pope had firsthand experience of producing a play when he co-wrote *Three Hours After Marriage* with Gay and Arbuthnot in 1717. Sherburn describes the performances:

[52] See Suet. *Aug*. 44.2 for the possibility that equestrian bachelors were for a period of time barred by legislation from attending the *ludi*. See Rawson 1991, 525-56 and Schnurr 1992, 159 for the possible dates when the legislation was in effect. Cf. also *Sat*. 2.6.48.
[53] Suet. *Aug*. 43-45 and 89. See Augustus' *Res Gestae*, 22-23 and Suet. *Aug*. 43, for the emperor's funding of the theater, gladiatorial games, and other public entertainment.
[54] Cf. *Ep*. 2.1.206.

Beginning 16 January, the play had an unusual run of seven consecutive nights in spite of a strong attempt to 'damn' it at its first performance. Two or three of the performances were riotous, and it was asserted at the time that only presents to the actors kept the play going, though the theatre, according to all reports, was crowded.[55]

The play was ultimately successful, but it is easy to imagine that the behavior of the audience reflects what Pope calls some two decades later in this poem an "unhonour'd crowd" who have "the taste of Mobs." Echoing Horace (*Ep*. 2.1.187-88), Pope states that the spectators' concentration shifts "From heads to ears, and now from ears to eyes" (313). It is no wonder that Pope accurately reproduces Horace's exclamation: "The people, sure, the people are the sight!" (323).

The "sight" is the chief attraction of the theater, but equally impressive is the noise that is generated: "Clatt'ring their sticks" (308), "all its throats" (326), "Thunder of the Pit" (327), "Loud as the Wolves" (328), "roarings" (329), "the shout" (330), and "long-applauding note" (330). With this he contrasts the silence of the actor and, by extension, the absence of poetry: "The Play stands still" (214) because the actor has spoken "Not a syllable" (335). A comic image of the situation is given:

Ah luckless Poet! stretch thy lungs and roar,
That Bear or Elephant shall heed thee more. (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.324-25)

The art of poetry has no place in the theater.

The most important aspect of these lines in Pope is the political overtones they carry. The "taste of Mobs" are "now of Lords" too (311). Like Horace's Augustus, Pope's king, George II, liked the theater, especially the opera. Pope compares the audience to the "many-headed Monster of the Pit" (305), referring to the Lernean Hydra. The monster is a recurring image in Pope's *Imitation*. At the beginning of the poem, "Envy" (16) which Hercules recognized his inability to extinguish is referred to as a "Monster" (18). In line 210, Pope speaks of poets who write praise for the powerful as those who flatter "some monster of a King." Pope's monsters are associated with power. The monster of envy (16, 18) is a burden that all heroes and kings share. The "monster" in line 210 is explicitly associated with the king. The "many-headed Monster" of the theater audience has as its origin the "Monster," King George II. Pope makes the criticism that the king is not acting as an exemplary model in cultivating the taste of his people. Far from correcting and educating the people, George II neglects his duties and indulges in his preferred form of entertainment. His people follow suit, and thus "some monster of a King" becomes a "many-headed Monster."

[55] Sherburn 1934, 195.

Furthermore, Pope transforms Horace's depiction of kings with hands bound (*Ep*. 2.1.191) to: "Old Edward's Armour beams on Cibber's breast!" (319). Pope describes the staging of Shakespeare's *Henry VIII* in late 1727. Various playhouses sought to stage the piece on the occasion of George II's coronation which took place on 11 October 1727. Cibber, who played Wolsey, wore "Old Edward's Armour" which had been borrowed from the Tower.[56] The armor of the medieval hero, whom he names in the list of kings earlier (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.7), has become a mere prop for the stage. Such is the respect shown for one of the mightiest kings in their national history.

What drives both poets to scorn the theater audience is not only that they are a rude, obstreperous crowd who delight in "Clatt'ring their sticks" and making unnecessary noise, but chiefly that they do not appreciate the content of what is being presented. They are more interested in the appearance of bears and the circus-like spectacle than they are in the speeches of the actors, the unfolding of the plot, and the poetry of the language. Such is the audience, and the playwright is no better since he is only interested in monetary gain.[57] Horace seeks to differentiate himself from playwrights who provide a crass form of entertainment solely for profit and pleads his cause as a writer of poetry for reading.[58] Thus he attempts to coax Augustus to turn his attention from vulgar spectacles to more refined poetry:

verum age, et his qui se lectori credere malunt
quam spectatoris fastidia ferre superbi. (*Ep*. 2.1.214-15)

Come now, and with these too who prefer to entrust themselves to the reader
than to bear with the fastidiousness of the disdainful audience.

Matters are complicated, however, because it is not only that the emperor simply had a personal preference for the theater. Augustus had other motives as well.

As Antonio La Penna has shown, the theater was a form of entertainment which all members of Roman society could attend: aristocrats, the middle classes, and the plebs.[59] The inclusion of the lower classes was important for Augustus, as La Penna explains:

Augustus cares about presenting himself as the protector and benefactor of the plebs. One recalls the rioting of the plebs during the famine of 23 BCE. Augustus quelled the violence by assuming for himself the care of the grain supply.[60]

[56] For details on this, see *TE*, 4:222n.
[57] See Rudd 1989, 105 for money earned by playwrights at the *ludi* and Plautus' fortune.
[58] Cf. *Ep*. 2.1.199-200.
[59] La Penna 2009, 393-97. Cf. Bowditch: "the spending of… vast amounts of money on public games, dinners, or distributions to the *plebs* was expected of the powerful and, ideally, was supposed to be voluntary and free of self-interest" (2001, 43).
[60] La Penna 2009, 394n.

To counter unemployment of the plebs in the capital, Augustus arranged for the distribution of free grains from the provinces. To provide for their leisure time, he supported the theater in Rome. Augustus' support for the theater accounted for his literary politics, as an attempt to maintain peace and order in the empire. Augustan poetry, one that relies on a "lectori" (*Ep*. 2.1.214) which Horace promotes, was too restrictive. It was a learned and cultured literature that excluded all but the elite. The success of Augustus' policy, however, was ultimately very limited.[61] The promotion of an all-inclusive entertainment in itself did not address the more serious social and economic issues. It was a temporary diversion which, in the end, functioned as a façade to conceal and forget yet did not better the lives of all classes. Augustus' scheme to unite the people through a common form of entertainment was a failure.

Horace, for his part, has his argument to make. Commenting on his description of the theatrical audience, Denis Feeney points out that the poet "certainly does not regard the public as educable."[62] Earlier in the poem, Horace derides the scribbling craze of contemporary Rome (*Ep*. 2.1.117). The "indocti" of *Ep*. 2.1.117 reappear in his depiction of the theater masses in *Ep*. 2.1.184. He had similarly condemned the uneducated theater public in the description of Scipio and Laelius: "a volgo et scaena… remorant" ("had withdrawn from the masses and the stage") (*Sat*. 2.1.71). He declared a similar expression of disgust towards the *vulgus* in *Carm*. 3.1.1: "Odi profanum vulgus" ("I dislike the ignorant masses"). With the words "Verum age" (*Ep*. 2.1.214), Horace attempts to veer the emperor's attention away from the stage and to show that the playwrights who cater to the unmannered throng are not "utilis urbi."

Pope echoes Horace's opinion that poetry to be read is to be preferred over poetry to be performed:

Think of those Authors, Sir, who would rely
More on a Reader's sense, than Gazer's eye. (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.350-51)

Both poets would rather write for a reader who has "sense" enough to be touched by their writing and to appreciate their meaning, rather than compose a script for a "Gazer" whose interest only lies in feeding their eyes with bizarre spectacles on the stage. One may also recall from Chapter 4 that as poet-editor Pope was interested in editing Shakespeare's

[61] Goldberg states that the success of *Thyestes* was an exception yet that "Revivals of it are not attested: Quintilian… probably knew it as a text" (2005, 180). Bowditch 2001, 94 suggests that *Thyestes* was most probably commissioned by Augustus (Octavian), either for the *ludi*, in celebration of the victory at Actium, or upon the deciation of the Temple to Apollo in 28 B.C.E. La Penna 2009, 395 cites Varius' *Thyestes* and Ovid's *Medea* as the only theatrical successes, both of them short-lived.
[62] Feeney 2009, 381. Feeney (2009) originally appeared in 2002 in: *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace*, edited by T. Woodman and D. Feeney, 172-87. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

dramatic pieces not so much as scripts to be performed before a riotous crowd but as texts which could be refined or rephrased.

The next concern of both Horace and Pope, as advocates of poetry for reading, is with libraries where such texts could be found and safely stored.[63] Like his display of humility in the beginning of the *Epistle* (2.1.3-4), Horace takes on a polite attitude: "Curam redde brevem" ("Give a moment's attention") (216). He makes a request in a conditional form, to Augustus: "si munus Apolline dignum | vis complere libris" ("if you wish to fill the gift of Apollo worthy of books") (216-17). Nevertheless, "age" (214) and "redde" (216) are in the imperative, and it is clear that after his criticism of the Roman taste for theater he returns to addressing the *princeps* personally. Up until then, Augustus occupied the role of a spectator and, possibly, a reader in Horace's literary discourse. With the mention of the library and books, Horace places him in a position of power. Augustus is no longer a part of the general audience, at the receiving end of works to be performed or read. Horace knows that Augustus, as patron of the literary arts, holds the power to promote and diffuse literature to his people. That is why the poet must plead his cause directly to Augustus.[64]

In lines 216-217 Horace refers to the library at the Temple of Palatine Apollo which housed two sections, one for Latin works and the other for Greek.[65] Julius Caesar was the first statesman to introduce the idea of a public library.[66] C. Asinius Pollio, patron of Virgil and Horace, followed through with the scheme after the death of Caesar and in 39 B.C.E. the first public library in Rome appeared.[67] However, in addition to Caesar's project which Varro was put in charge of, Rome had models in the conception of a library, that of Alexandria and that of the Attalid kings of Pergamum.[68] However, there was a fundamental difference between Greek and Roman libraries. The Hellenistic institutions had as their goal to gather all written material. The library at Alexandria had over five hundred thousand rolls, and that of Pergamum showed similar enthusiasm for continual addition to their collection. The lists of ten orators and ten lyric poets[69] were only a part of the librarians' system of organization by genre and author. Roman libraries were conceptually different in that they involved selection

[63] For libraries in ancient Rome, see Casson (2002) and Corbier (2006).
[64] See Fraenkel 1957, 394-95.
[65] For the portico with the Danaid sculptures, see Suet. *Aug*. 29.3. See also Galinsky 1996, 213-24. Cf. Horsfall 1993, 58-67, Goldberg 2005, 190-203, and Corbier 2006, 173-74..
[66] Suet. *Iul*. 44.
[67] The temple was dedicated to Apollo in October 28 B.C.E. See Suet. *Aug*. 29.5 and Plin. *Nat*. 35.10 for testimony of Pollio's involvement with the building of the library.
[68] Horsfall 1993, 58.
[69] Cf. *Carm*. 1.1.35-36.

from the beginning. Entry of books in the libraries was not automatic. Citing the Palatine library which eventually became known for its abundance of books on law and oratory, Sander Goldberg notes that the selection process is difficult to determine as choice is subjective.[70] Some of the librarians were associated with Augustus, Maecenas, and Atticus, to whom Augustus consulted on his library project.[71] It is almost inconceivable that these "gatekeepers" did not reflect their will and directions.[72] That a poet's work was included in a library collection thus meant that its merit was recognized by the state and received, as it were, an official stamp of approval. In hopes of "permanent classification," authors vied for space in the libraries for their works.[73] Horace was no exception, as the selection process at libraries implied a type of canonization.[74] The criteria did not rest solely on the merit of the poet's work. One needed to be connected with a patron of prominence. This confirms Pope's interpretation that the original *Epistle to Augustus* was composed "*in order to render* Augustus *more their* [contemporary poets'] *Patron.*"[75]

Pope finds an equivalent in the recently established Merlin's Cave:

How shall we fill a Library with Wit,
When Merlin's Cave is half unfurnish'd yet? (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.354-55)

Merlin's Cave was the name of a house in the Royal Gardens at Richmond that stored a choice collection of literary works. The mention of this Cave is evidently an attack directed against George II, which Pope plays with on several levels. The magician and prophet Merlin,[76] associated with King Arthur in legend, was referred to by poets including Theobald and Dryden to represent George II as the new Arthur of England. The authors were contributing to political propaganda to promote the Hanoverian line.[77] Thus Merlin, we may suppose, does not hold a positive connotation for Pope. Moreover, though named after such a figure, Merlin's Cave was far from a grand library building. It was a house with a thatched roof and its literary collection was small.[78] It did not stand comparison with the Greek and

[70] Goldberg 2005, 194.
[71] Palatine librarian C. Iulius Hyginus was Augustus' freedman (Suet. *Gram*. 20.1-2); C. Melissus, librarian to the *porticus Octaviae* collection, was Maecenas' freedman (ibid., 21.3); and another Palatine librarian Pomponius Macer was possibly a freedman of Atticus (Suet. *Iul*. 56.7).
[72] Goldberg 2005, 203.
[73] Horsfall 1993, 61.
[74] Goldberg 2005, 196-203 shows, with the example of Ovid, that the library did not necessarily ensure survival or immortality of a work and had more to do with status.
[75] Advertisement to *The First Epistle of the Second Book of Horace* (*TE*, 4:191).
[76] Cf. *Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.132. See *ibid*., 206n for details on the work translated from the Welsh by Geoffrey of Monmouth.
[77] Schonhorn 1980, 555 and Rudd 1994, 73.
[78] See *TE*, 4:224-25n. and Rudd 1994, 73 for descriptions of the building.

Roman libraries. It is not only the building that is at fault, but Pope again hints at George II's lack of appreciation for the literary arts. Even the idea of a library, which materialized as Merlin's Cave, was suggested not by the king himself but by his wife Queen Caroline.

Moreover, according to Pope, the library is "half unfurnish'd." We may compare this to an image in his *Imitation* of the *Second Epistle of the Second Book*, published one month prior to that of the *Epistle to Augustus* on 27 April 1737. Where Horace describes the Palatine Library, which had "vacuam Romanis vatibus aedem" ("space available for Roman bards," *Ep*. 2.2.94),[79] Pope takes the literal meaning of "vacuam," empty, instead of "open to" or "available for," and transforms this into the following:

Lord! how we strut thro' *Merlin*'s Cave, to see
No Poets there, but *Stephen*, you, and me. (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.2.139-40)

There are "No Poets there," meaning no books written by poets, and therefore the library remains "half unfurnish'd." Stephen Duck (1705-1756) was a pensioned librarian appointed by the Queen.[80] It is a joke that the only three people present in the Cave would be the keeper, the king, and Pope, as we know that the "Lord" and "you," meaning George II, is one of the most unlikely people Pope would expect to find in the library. The singular "me" stands in contrast to Horace who writes the letter to Augustus not only for himself but also for his contemporaries.[81] Pope feels that he has no fellow poets who stand for the same cause. This feeling of isolation will be made more manifest in the *Dialogues*, the conclusion to his Horatian poems.

Horace continues in his attempt to persuade Augustus of the merits of refined poetry. He turns to a humble reflection on the conduct of poets:

multa quidem nobis facimus mala saepe poetae
(ut vineta egomet caedam mea), cum tibi librum (220)
sollicito damus aut fesso; cum laedimur, unum
si quis amicorum est ausus reprehendere versum;
cum loca iam recitata revolvimus irrevocati;
cum lamentamur non apparere labores
nostros et tenui deducta poemata filo; (225)
cum speramus eo rem venturam ut, simul atque
carmina rescieris nos fingere, commodus ultro
arcessas et egere vetes et scribere cogas. (*Ep*. 2.1.219-28)

It is true we poets often inflict much ill on ourselves

[79] See Horsfall (1993) on the dearth of Latin literature as opposed to the Greek in the Roman libraries, Greek literature having existed for seven centuries to Latin's two in the age of Augustus.
[80] It appears that Pope did not think too highly of Duck, though he describes him to Gay as: "he is a harmless man, and therefore I am glad" (*Corr*., 3:143).
[81] Pope recognized this too; see his Advertisement: "[Horace's epistle] *was an* Apology for the Poets, ...Horace *here pleads the Cause of his Contemporaries*" (*TE*, 4:191).

(such that I personally hack at my own vines),
when we present to you a book when you are anxious or wearied;
when we feel hurt, if one of our friends has dared to criticize a single verse;
when we, unasked, read again passages already recited;
when we lament that our efforts and poems, spun out by a delicate thread, remain unnoticed;
when we hope that the matter shall come to that end, that,
as soon as you will have learned that we are composing songs,
you, fittingly and of your own accord, may summon us,
forbid that we be impoverished, and conduct us to write.

Just as he described earlier the "levis… insania" (118) and his own unstoppable urge to write (111-13), which culminated in the fourth book of *Odes*, he returns to the comic and unassuming depiction of the nature of poets. The repetition of "cum" suggests the poets' volatile temperament as they are constantly preoccupied with their compositions as well as the reception of their works. They can be a nagging, needy sort of people, and Horace somewhat apologetically mentions that Augustus must have been harried by them numerous times. "Cum tibi librum | sollicito damus aut fesso" (220-21) recalls *Ep*. 1.13.1-5 in which Horace instructs his messenger Vinius Asina to deliver his volumes, presumably the first three books of the *Odes*, but tells him to pay heed not to disturb the emperor if he seems to be in a bad mood. The occurrence of "si" which happens three times in a single line (*Ep*. 1.13.3) is comparable to the iteration of "cum" in the above passage of *Ep*. 2.1. Horace attempts to demonstrate that while he does seek Augustus' attention and approval, he does not mean to be impolite in his eagerness to send him newly crafted verses. It would be ideal, Horace says, if, instead of the poet beseeching Augustus, the emperor would be enticed to invite the poet upon hearing of a new work in progress (226-27).

He expresses his wish that Augustus will not allow worthy poets to remain in poverty and that he will actually command that they produce verse (227-28). This is again Horace's attempt, in Pope's words, "*to render* Augustus *more their Patron*." Horace does this intelligently by placing himself in the inferior position of one with an attitude to be chastised and one in need of support through patronage, and at the same time by upholding Augustus as the one who has the capacity to provide for a proper living for poets ("egere vetes," 228) as well as the power to issue orders ("cogas," 228).

Pope adds more twists in the equivalent lines (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.356-75). Making an ironic transformation of Horace's humble approach to Augustus, he addresses George II personally:

My Liege! why Writers little claim your thought,
I guess. (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.356-57)

It is clear to Pope that writers do not impress the king. In a demonstration of feigned sympathetic understanding, he acts as if the poets are indeed to blame. After all, he says, poets are, "Of all mankind, the creatures most absurd" (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.359). He provides a similar list of the frantic responses which poets are apt to fall into when it comes to matters of poetry (360-66).

However, Pope adds a twist to Horace's description of the destitution which poets experience when a composition, the culmination of hard work, goes unnoticed (*Ep*. 2.1.219-28). Pope says that poets "lament, [when] the Wit's too fine | For vulgar eyes" (366-367). The readers are in fact the ones to be condemned, not the poets. It is not out of self-pity that the poets "lament." Rather, they deplore the lack of proper education and receptivity to literary arts among the audience. One may assume that George II is not an exception to those "vulgar eyes" who shun a "Wit" that is "too fine."

Pope continues in his description of poets as "the creatures most absurd" and explains what many contemporary writers resort to:

But most, when straining with too weak a wing,
We needs will write Epistles to the King;
And from the moment we oblige the town, (370)
Expect a Place, or Pension from the Crown;
Or dubb'd Historians by express command,
T' enroll your triumphs o'er the seas and land;
Be call'd to Court, to plan some work divine,
As once for LOUIS, Boileau and Racine. (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.368-75)

The questions of flattery and patronage come into view. Pope claims that this is what "most" writers do. As a professionally independent poet, he excludes himself from that majority. Yet in the next line he includes himself in the plural pronoun "We," because he nevertheless belongs to the league of poets. When poets are agonized because they cannot find poetic inspiration ("when straining with too weak a wing"), they resort to composing "Epistles to the King." They do so also in hopes of securing a living ("Expect a Place, or Pension from the Crown") as well as recognition ("dubb'd Historians"[82]). They anticipate being commissioned to produce work that is "divine," as in a work that will be rendered immortal by posterity. It is what happened for such talents as Boileau and Racine under Louis XIV (375). On the surface Pope attempts to illustrate the greedy and selfish aspirations of these writers. What pomposity to assume that they can produce a work that is "divine," he seems to exclaim. In reality, of course, Pope is attacking George II for his lack of judgment in the arts. English poets today do not have a king like Louis XIV who can recognize proper talent. Even if there are writers as

[82] I.e., historiographer royal.

gifted as Boileau and Racine, they will not be accorded a pension by which they may be able to engender a "divine" work.[83] The current situation in England works neither for the benefit of the poets nor for the king, and the king is to blame.

Horace reveals a different view of his emperor with regards to artistic judgment by comparing him to Alexander:

gratus Alexandro, regi magno, fuit ille
Choerilus, incultis qui versibus et male natis
rettulit acceptos, regale nomisma, Philippos.
sed veluti tractata notam labemque remittunt (235)
atramenta, fere scriptores carmine foedo
splendida facta linunt. idem rex ille, poema
qui tam ridiculum tam care prodigus emit,
edicto vetuit ne quis se praeter Apellen
pingeret aut alius Lysippo duceret aera (240)
fortis Alexandri vultum simulantia. (*Ep*. 2.1.232-41)

Pleasing to the great king Alexander was
that Choerilus, who, for his uncultivated and ill-made verses,
brought back Philippic coins, a royal issue, as remuneration.
But, as when ink is handled writers produce the usual stain,
they nearly smear illustrious deeds by a foul poem.
That same king, the wasteful one
who pays so lavishly for so silly a poem,
forbade by an edict that nobody other than Apelles should paint him,
or no other save Lysippus should shape bronze
imitating the countenance of mighty Alexander.

Just as in the beginning of the *Epistle* when he is compared to Romulus, Dionysius, the Dioscuri brothers, and Hercules (5-14), Augustus is again placed alongside a grand ruler in history, Alexander the Great. Legend has it that, like Augustus, Alexander exhibited superb taste in the fine arts and forbade that all but the most gifted artists portray him.[84] He used his judgment well in having Apelles paint him and Lysippus fashion his sculptures (239-41), but he erred in one respect: poetry.[85] It was foolish of him to pay such handsome compensation to Choerilus, an epic poet of Iasos in Caria, who, according to Horace, did not deserve such distinction (237-38).[86] By comparing Augustus to Alexander the Great, Horace ranks his ruler

[83] The current Poet Laureate in Pope's time was Cibber, appointed by Walpole. See Pope's direct criticism of George II in not nominating the right minister to appoint a deserving poet:

Or chuse at least some Minister of Grace,
Fit to bestow the Laureat's weighty place. (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.378-79)

[84] See Brink 1982, 239n. and 483.

[85] Goldberg points out that Horace's passage on Alexander was "calculated to recall" Cicero's letter to Lucius Lucceius (*Ad Fam*. 5.12) in which he mentions Apelles and Lysippus in his attempt to coax him to write a history of his consulship (2005, 184); see also his references.

[86] Cf. *AP* 357.

above the Greek king who contributed to the expansion of territory on a scale previously unheard of.[87]

Pope finds the equivalent of Alexander the Great in more recent English history: Charles I and William III (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.380-89; *TE*, 4, 227-29). Like Alexander, the English kings knew good art in painting and sculpture ("well in paint and stone they judg'd of merit," [384]). They commissioned the most highly reputed artists from Europe to paint their portraits and produce sculptures. Bernini, an architect, made a bust of Charles I in Rome, from the portraits of the king by Vandyke (380-81).[88] Sir Godfrey Kneller was of German birth and settled in England under the patronage of Charles II and later monarchs. He painted an equestrian portrait of William III in 1701 (382-83).[89] What was missing was a poet who could immortalize the kings in verse. Dryden was appointed Poet Laureate and historiographer royal under Charles II, but he was forced to abandon his public offices upon the accession of the Protestant William III in 1688, and he left no grand panegyric. In recent history there had been no poet who composed any discernible work of commemorative verse in which the kings and their deeds could be remembered by posterity. Gradually Pope moves to the present to determine whether the current king would handle the situation better than his predecessors.

Unlike Alexander who, for all his refined artistic judgment, showed such poor taste in poetry, Horace assures his emperor and addressee that he has proper judgment in the literary arts.[90] The proof is that he welcomed Virgil and Varius:

> At neque dedecorant tua de se iudicia atque
> munera, quae multa dantis cum laude tulerunt,
> dilecti tibi Vergilius Variusque poetae. (*Ep*. 2.1.245-47)
>
> But your beloved poets Virgil and Varius
> dishonor not your judgment of them,
> nor your gifts, which they displayed with much praise of the giver.

Virgil and Varius were also personal friends to Horace. It was through their introduction that he met Maecenas (*Sat*. 1.6.55). Augustus had done well in choosing two of the most gifted epic poets to celebrate his age. However, both poets were already dead when Horace published this poem in about 12 B.C.E. Virgil, Tibullus, and possibly Varius all died in the

[87] See Feeney 2009, 384-85 for the idea that, as Roman art imported much from the Greek culture, the Greeks may still be superior in the visual arts but the literary arts may be the one field in which the Romans could excel.
[88] *TE*, 4:226-27n.
[89] Kneller was Pope's neighbor in the vicinities of Twickenham. He did not hold the portrait painter in high esteem; see *ibid*., 227n. and 367.
[90] For Horace's comparison of Alexander to the dullness of the Boeotians (241-44), see Feeney 2009, 383, in which he argues that Alexander lacked judgment in *contemporary* poetry; he approved of Pindar and spared his descendants and his house when Thebes was pillaged in 335 B.C.E.

year 19 B.C.E.[91] The question then remains whether Horace, as one of his client poets still living, will write of the emperor's glorious deeds.

In Pope, the three lines of *Ep*. 2.1.245-47 in his parallel text are bracketed and they are not in italics. Customarily, Pope printed the original Latin in italics, and un-italicized words, usually only two or three words at a time, are there for emphasis. Moreover, for his English *Imitation* on the facing page there is a blank space. The space omitted is apparently for the Latin lines omitted. The silence speaks for itself.[92] The emphasis here is that because George II does not have any discernment in the literary arts, there are no great poets who have flourished under his patronage. The king has not done anything better than his predecessors.

Towards the end of the *Epistle,* Horace addresses Augustus directly about his *recusatio*.[93] He assures Augustus that it is not personal preference for "sermones" (250). He lists and thereby acknowledges some of the emperor's feats, such as the end to wars and the successful diplomatic negotiations with the Parthians (252-56).[94] He even accentuates them by explicitly stating that they occurred under Augustus' leadership: "te principe" (256). Yet he remains equally straightforward in refusing to write of glorious exploits ("res componere gestas," 251).[95] Again, Horace has recourse to his supposed lack of talent:[96]

si quantum cuperem possem quoque. sed neque parvum
carmen maiestas recipit tua nec meus audet
rem temptare pudor quam vires ferre recusent. (*Ep*. 2.1.257-59)

If only I was also able as much as I wish.
But neither does your majesty accept a puny song nor does my modesty dare
to attempt a theme which my strengths would refuse to undertake.

Horace says that he is aware of Augustus' contempt for verses of poor quality (257-58). The emperor has good judgment, but he is also a strict judge. The same familiar diction of humility is present here as we have seen in Horace's works since *Sat*. 1.10 and beyond. He describes his caution in saying that he does not dare ("audet," 258) to undertake anything beyond his own talent. In *Sat*. 1.10.48, he stated that Lucilius was the inventor of, and superior to him in, satire and that he would not dare ("ausim") to assume the crown from his

[91] See Brink 1982, 559.
[92] See Weinbrot 1978, 208-9, and Stack who states that the blank "says better than words all that needs to be said" (1985, 193).
[93] See Brink 1982, 257-59n. and 485 for his preference to call this not *recusatio* but an *apologia*.
[94] See Goldberg 2005, 186.
[95] Cf. Pope's statement in the Advertisement that Horace wrote "*with a decent Freedom*" (*TE*, 4:192). Fraenkel observes that "in the opinion of judicious men no one was better qualified to undertake that task than Horace himself" (1957, 397), but see also Brink 1982, 484-5, who contends this idea.
[96] Cf. *AP*, 38-40. See also Chapter 5.

great predecessor. Likewise, "pudor" (259) was one of the reasons which he described to Agrippa (*Carm.* 1.6.9) in his claim that Varius would be better fit to write of his deeds.

Pope's rendering of Horace's *recusatio* is filled with irony:

> Oh! could I mount on the Maeonian wing,
> Your Arms, your Actions, your Repose to sing! (395)
> What seas you travers'd! and what fields you fought!
> Your Country's Peace, how oft, how dearly bought!
> How barb'rous rage subsided at your word,
> And Nations wonder'd while they dropp'd the sword! (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.1.394-99)

Pope expresses a feigned desire to become like Homer ("Maeonian wing") and to sing of the king's exploits.[97] His diction recalls earlier accusations which he made against George II. "Arms," "Repose," and "seas you travers'd" remind us of the voyage to his native Germany in the company of his mistress. Attempts to establish the "Country's Peace" were far from being a success.[98] "How barb'rous rage subsided at your *word*" reminds us of Pope's mockery of the king's limited abilities in the English language.[99]

In subsequent lines, Horace's "neque parvum | carmen maiestas recipit tua" (257-58) becomes: "But Verse alas! your Majesty disdains" (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.1.404). It is not even the quality of his poetry. The very act of writing verses for the king is pointless since George II does not read them. Echoing Horace's method of *recusatio*, Pope confesses: "I'm not us'd to Panegyric strains" (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.1.405). However, as Fuchs has dryly noted, that since Pope "has no requests from George to sing, he is not really declining anything here."[100] Yet, assuming the attitude of a poet with good intentions who is misunderstood, he deplores that "when I aim at praise, they say I bite" (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.1.409). It is true that he is not in favor at the court and that he has received malicious criticism throughout his career, but the statement is ironic because it is not his goal to praise. His ultimatum is: "'Praise undeserv'd is scandal in disguise'" (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.1.413). Flattery is out of the question for him. Pope's king does not merit praise. Outwardly, it would seem the right thing to do to show pride for one's country by commending its leaders, but, seeing the current state of England, such an act would only be a "scandal in disguise" that would do nothing but jeopardize the welfare of the nation and the "*Happiness of a* Free People."[101]

---

[97] Cf. Kelsall: "[Pope] suggests, among alternative possibilities, that if the king were great, Pope might be an English Homer. Horace is too modest for this" (1976, 123).
[98] Cf. Butt: "Walpole's pacific policy, reluctantly adopted by George II, was becoming increasingly unpopular. *Dearly* is especially ironical" (*TE*, 4:228n.).
[99] My italics.
[100] Fuchs 1989, 122.
[101] Advertisement (*TE*, 4:191).

As scholars have pointed out, Horace knows well how to say things with a smile:[102]

... ac neque ficto
in peius vultu proponi cereus usquam (265)
nec prave factis decorari versibus opto,
ne rubeam pingui donatus munere et una
cum scriptore meo, capsa porrectus operta,
deferar in vicum vendentem tus et odores
et piper et quidquid chartis amicitur ineptis. (*Ep*. 2.1.264-70)

And I desire neither
to be displayed ever with my features distortedly shaped in wax
nor to be glorified in ill-concocted verse,
lest I should blush at the crass gift presented,
and together with my writer, spread out in a closed box,
that I should be carried away onto a street that sells
incense and perfume and pepper and whatever is wrapped in sheets of papyrus malapropos.

Horace puts himself in the shoes of Augustus and expresses his understanding that if he were the emperor, he would be embarrassed ("rubeam")[103] to have himself represented in ugly wax figures or to receive poorly composed verses ("prave factis… versibus") which are good only to be used as wrapping paper for sundry goods. Despite the differences in status and position, Horace offers empathy and associates himself with Augustus.[104] As a poet, he would not like to write dull verses not worthy to be kept and read, and as an emperor and patron Augustus would not be pleased to have such verses addressed to him. Each has something to offer the other. The emperor provides protection for the poet through the system of patronage. The poet can devote himself to his literary gift to write poetry of high caliber which will be respected in the ages to come and by which posterity can recognize a ruler who encouraged artistic development for his own nation. If not by commendatory verses about the emperor and his feats, he will still have been "utilis urbi" by promoting talent well suited to undertake the task. It is an amicable, reciprocal relationship that ensures the survival, in the present and in posterity, of both poet and emperor.

Pope unfortunately cannot find any mutual benefit in the relationship with his king. With no sense of irony, he bluntly states:

Well may he blush, who gives it, or receives;
And when I flatter, let my dirty leaves (415)
(Like Journals, Odes, and such forgotten things
As Eusden, Philips, Settle, writ of Kings)
Cloath spice, line trunks, or flutt'ring in a row,

[102] Cf. Klingner: "[Horace] takes pains not to end on a difficult or pretentious note" (2009, 354).
[103] Cf. Rudd: "One might leave open the possibility of a more violent reaction by translating 'flush'. This would allow for mortification and anger, even if the notion of apoplexy is thought too extreme" (1989, 121). Pope uses the traditional rendering of "blush" (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.414).
[104] Cf. Stack: "Horace ends by identifying himself with Augustus" (1985, 197); Fuchs: "Horace implies a parallel between the emperor… and himself" (1989, 123).

Befringe the rails of Bedlam and Sohoe. (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.414-19)

Pope is vehemently against flattery, whether it be the poet who flatters or an undeserving patron who receives it (414). Horace in *Ep*. 2.1.264-70 disapproves of flattery but he believes that good poetry should be recognized and trusts that Augustus has proper literary taste to do so. For Pope, who has no faith in his king, anything written for or about George II is sheer flattery. There is no place for praise. Like his enmity towards Cibber, he names another Poet Laureate, Laurence Eusden, who replaced Nicholas Rowe after his death in 1718. Ambrose Philips once addressed an ode to Walpole in 1724. Elkanah Settle composed birthday odes for George I and the Prince of Wales in 1717.[105] Pope claims that, despite being written for the powerful on grand occasions, they become easily "forgotten things." If he were ever to put himself to such type of writing, they would be "dirty leaves" deserving to be used as wrapping paper because there is no merit in them as poetry. It is fitting that such papers float in Bedlam and Soho, unappealing districts of the capital. Pope, whose tone had remained temperate throughout the poem, allows bitter and sincere resentment to pour forth at the end.

In the *Imitation* of Horace's *Epistle to Augustus*, Pope intends to draw contrasts between Horace's Augustus and his George II in order to demonstrate the dullness of his own king concerning both politics and literature. However, the role of the poet in connection to the powerful could not be neglected, and Pope finds that his relationship with George II differs vastly from that between Horace and Augustus. Fuchs tells us that the *Epistle to Augustus* is "Horace's noblest description of the poet working *for* power," but Erskine-Hill says that "in Pope's Epistle the false ruler is at the beginning and end."[106] Horace is careful to practice discretion before the emperor, but it is not solely fear or seething anger boiling beneath that show of modesty.

There is also a sense of companionship. Around the time the *Epistle* was published in 12 B.C.E., Augustus was fifty years old and Horace fifty-two. They belonged to the same generation. They were both social climbers who, by this time, had attained firm status in their respective occupations. As noted, several years earlier in 19 B.C.E., Horace had lost his closest fellow poets, Virgil, Tibullus, and Varius.[107] In the spring of 12 B.C.E., Augustus had lost one of his most prized allies, the navy commander, Agrippa. I have mentioned that there is a tone of irony, a covert indication of an autocratic ruler, in Horace's very first line which

[105] For Eusden, see *TE*, 4:357; for Philips, *ibid*., 375-76; for Settle, *ibid*., 383.
[106] Fuchs 1989, 113; Erskine-Hill 1983, 334.
[107] There were still Propertius and Ovid, both younger than Horace, but they are never mentioned in Horace's poetry.

addresses Augustus as carrying the burden of the empire "solus" (1). While the view that it is a marker of an absolute ruler certainly dominates in Pope, Horace may also offer sincerity and sympathy in view of the emperor's isolation.[108] Drawing on the reflections of Theocritus, Simonides, and Pindar on the relationship between poet and patron, Denis Feeney describes Horace and Augustus: "The boat will carry poet and patron down the river of time together, as objects of reverence, envy, or ridicule."[109] There is a sense of togetherness which is on one level linked to the business-like arrangement of poet and patron. However, on another, and perhaps more deeper level, there are common points to be seen in the two figures who are approximately of the same age, who did not come from the most promising origins, who participated in war, and succeeded in attaining renown. What they share at present is their ambition that their glory be celebrated in posterity. Poet and patron can work together to achieve this.

Pope is also isolated, but in a very different way from Horace. He is also in middle age and he too lost important family members and friends in the early 1730s. He still has many very loyal aristocratic friends, but his tension with the political leaders would never work in his favor. Aside from the usual band of nonpolitical critics, his *Imitation* of the *Epistle to Augustus* raised some eyebrows among the authorities. Pope was used to fending off attacks from Lady Mary and Lord Hervey and other hostile writers, but in the face of law he would have virtually no option but to comply. The *Imitation* was published anonymously, but it was not difficult to identify Pope as the author.[110] He brought himself dangerously close to pursuit by the Privy Council for his lines on Swift and Ireland.[111] While in *The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace* Pope puts in the mouth of Fortescue a recitation of early English laws on libel (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.145-48), libel laws and cruel punishments were not history in Pope's time.[112] It was in fact the contrary. There were few cases of defamation in the early stages of the establishment of the laws, but a broader interpretation which was introduced under Charles II actually increased the number of libel cases.[113] In response to Pope's *Imitation* of the *Epistle to Augustus*, the *Daily Gazetteer* published a series of accusations in

[108] Cf. Feeney: "the poet was just as isolated, the sole survivor of his generation" (2009, 364).
[109] Ibid., 382-83; see also his references.
[110] See Foxon 1991, 140.
[111] Mack 1985, 683, and *TE*, 4:xxxvii-xxxviii. Ben Jonson was called by the Privy Council in 1603 for his depiction of corrupt politics in the Roman empire in *Sejanus*.
[112] For libel and defamatory words in Pope and the eighteenth century, see Kropf 1974, 153-68; Halsband 1975, 473-74; Reynolds 1975, 475-77.
[113] Kropf 1974, 156. See also his explanation that the eighteenth century was a "particularly litigious age," the reason being that "An increasingly large number of criminal actions were brought against printers by the government in an attempt to control the rapidly expanding press" (ibid., 153).

the summer of 1737, one of which insisted that the Roman Twelve Tables should be restored.[114]

The end is near; with the possible exception of the incomplete *1740* the exact date of composition of which remains unknown, Pope concludes his Horatian *Imitations* with the two *Dialogues* in the following year. However, we must not assume that differences between Pope and Horace came to dominate. There remained many identifiable aspects between the two poets: their status as an outsider, retirement on a rural property, and thoughts on aging and mortality. The next chapter will be devoted to discussions of the similarities which Pope finds and the hints which he seeks in Horace's works as he begins in middle age to contemplate his own mortality.

[114] To indicate that Pope deserved the death penalty. See Weinbrot 1979, 10.

Chapter 9

The Similarities: "non qualis sum eram"[1]

Pope's consciousness turns to Horace when Pope reaches middle age. And politics was not the only factor.[2] There were more personal considerations. This chapter will explore the reasons which steered Pope towards Horace, not in his youth, but in the 1730s when Pope was in his forties. Horace had completed his two books of *Satires* in 35 B.C.E. and 30 B.C.E. respectively while he was in his thirties, but he composed the two books of *Epistles* between 20 B.C.E. and 13 B.C.E., when he was in middle age just like Pope. Age matters, not in the sense of the juxtaposition of exact age but in the measure of where Pope and Horace stood in their lives. I shall argue that Pope reflects on his public accomplishments and private losses in the Horatian *Imitations*.

Throughout their adult lives, the two poets expressed a love of the countryside in their poetry. As they age, retirement in the country becomes increasingly appealing. That Pope was in middle age when he composed the *Imitations* is also important insofar as this was when he witnessed the deaths of some of his friends and, most importantly, of his mother in 1733. He becomes conscious of his own mortality. He has lost both parents, and he has no spouse or offspring. Pope turns to Horace's poetry as he contemplates how to spend his old age. Horace does not speak of any living kin, and he never married either. The ancient poet also confessed his waning motivation to write. Like Horace, Pope too feels that it may be time to pass the baton to the younger generation.

I. The Countryside Retreat: "Good air, solitary groves, and sparing diet"[3]

Passages indicating Horace's affection for the countryside are scattered throughout his poetry. It is almost impossible not to notice his affinity and his longing, when in Rome, for rural retreat on his Sabine farm and other property which he owned in the country. He speaks of the estate near Tibur (modern Tivoli), a fashionable resort for the Roman aristocracy:

Tibur Argeo positum colono
sit meae sedes utinam senectae. (*Carm.* 2.6.5-6)

[1] *Carm*. 4.1.3.
[2] Although regarding *Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.2, several passages of which I cite in this chapter (122-24; 131-48; 161-80), covert political statements have been found by some scholars; see for example Aden 1969, 27-46.
[3] *Corr*., 2:110.

Would that Tibur, founded by an Argive settler,
be the residence of my old age.

At this time Horace has reached about halfway in his career. He has published two books of *Satires* and the *Epodes*. The two books of *Epistles* and his last book of *Odes* are to follow in the next decade. He has befriended and been patronized by Maecenas. He has lived through the transition of the consolidation of political power in Rome, which means that he has also had to extend his client-patron relationship to the new ruler Augustus. To a large extent it seems that he has been able to do this smoothly and safely. In the midst of such changes and continued accomplishments, when contemplating his own retirement in the future, Horace prefers the country to the busy city of Rome. *Carm*. 2.6 is addressed to Septimius, who will be setting off to fight in the Cantabrian wars. Horace himself was once a soldier, but at his age he is no longer fit for military life and he confesses that he does not miss the life on the sea and battlefields (*Carm*. 2.6.7-8). He expresses his desire that he may make Tibur, a property he acquired in addition to his Sabine farm,[4] his place of retirement in old age (6).

However, Horace was after all a poet who courted the powerful. Not only did he have obligations which compelled him to be in Rome for a certain amount of time in the year, but he was a welcome member of elite Roman society. This is a major difference between Horace and Pope, but first we will take a look at Horace's lifestyle and thoughts which wavered between Rome and the country. As much as Horace's fondness for the countryside is genuine, the poet admits that he sometimes feels equal fondness for Rome:

Romae Tibur amem ventosus, Tibure Romam. (*Ep*. 1.8.12)

Like the wind, at Rome I love Tibur, at Tibur, Rome.

Horace flatly confesses his caprice that when in Rome, he misses his rural estate, and when in the country, he misses the city. His fickleness may seem like a pendulum swinging to and fro, but the poet compares himself to the wind: "ventosus." He changes his mind as if he is the wind, but, even in this state of constant indecision, there is lightness and ease. Horace knows that he is free to stop by or to breeze past like the wind, as he is always welcome in both worlds. He is not confined to one or the other.

In *Ep*. 1.10 he claims that it is in the country that he lives and reigns ("vivo et regno," 8). That is where he feels alive and in control of his life. The epistle is addressed to Aristius Fuscus, a dramatist and a long-time literary friend who appears in as early as the first book of

[4] Suet. *Vit. Hor*., with Rudd 1994, 166.

Horace's *Satires* (*Sat*. 1.9.61; 1.10.83).[5] In the opening of the epistle Horace makes the contrast that Fuscus is a lover of the city ("Urbis amatorem," 1) whereas Horace is one of the lovers of the country ("ruris amatores," 2). He even asks the city-dweller: "novistine locum potiorem rure beato?" ("Have you known a place more preferable to the blissful country?") (14). If Horace was to take a stand between life in the city and life in the country, he seems firm in his defense of the rural life.

He draws much the same contrast in the epistle addressed to his *vilicus* (1), a former slave of his who has been promoted to manager of the Sabine estate:

rure ego viventem, tu dicis in urbe beatum:
cui placet alterius, sua nimirum est odio sors.
stultus uterque locum immeritum causatur inique:
in culpa est animus, qui se non effugit umquam.

Tu mediastinus tacita prece rura petebas;
nunc urbem et ludos et balnea vilicus optas: (15)
me constare mihi scis et discedere tristem,
quandocumque trahunt invisa negotia Romam. (*Ep*. 1.14.10-17)

I say that the man living in the countryside is happy, you say the one in the city.
He to whom another's lot is pleasing, no doubt his own lot lies in dissatisfaction.
Each, foolish, unfairly gives as excuse the undeserving place:
the soul is at fault, which never escapes himself.

You, as a servant, were seeking the countryside in silent prayer,
now an estate manager you wish for the city and games and baths:
you know that I am consistent with myself and depart in sadness
whenever the detested business transactions drag me to Rome.

Horace believes that the man who lives in the country is happy, but the estate manager, according to Horace, claims that the good life lies in the city (10). This reminds us of Horace's observation, from the very beginning of his poetry and career, that nobody is content with what he has:

Qui fit, Maecenas, ut nemo, quam sibi sortem
seu ratio dederit seu fors obiecerit, illa
contentus vivat, laudet diversa sequentis?
'o fortunati mercatores!' gravis annis
miles ait, multo iam fractus membra labore. (5)
contra mercator navem iactantibus Austris
'militia est potior. quid enim? concurritur: horae
memento cita mors venit aut victoria laeta.'
agricolam laudat iuris legumque peritus,
sub galli cantum consultor ubi ostia pulsat. (10)
ille, datis vadibus qui rure extractus in urbem est,
solos felicis viventis clamat in urbe. (*Sat*. 1.1.1-12)

How does it happen, Maecenas, that nobody lives content with his own lot,

[5] In *Sat*. 1.9.61, Horace describes Fuscus as "mihi carus" ("dear to me"). Fuscus is also the addressee of Horace's *Carm*. 1.22.

whether chance has given him or fate has subjected him to,
that he looks up to those leading other lives?
"O lucky merchants!" says the soldier,
now exhausted in the limbs with much strife through hard years.
On the other hand is the merchant, when the south winds hurl at his ship,
"The army is better. And why? They clash:
in an hour's time comes instant death or joyful victory."
The one skilled in the court and laws looks up to the peasant,
when just before the crowing rooster a client pounds on his door.
He who has been given the means and has been dragged to the city from the country
cries that only those living in the city are happy.

This is the familiar account of the soldier who envies the merchant and vice versa (4-8), the lawyer who thinks that the farmer has an easier life (9-10), and the rustic man who is belated to go to the city for an appointment with a lawyer (11-12).[6] In the case of his former slave, Horace further lectures him that it is the state of mind that determines happiness, not location. One may think that one might be happy elsewhere, or in another occupation, but that will not change as long as one does not change one's mindset (*Ep*. 1.14.13).[7] Horace reminds the manager that when he was a slave, supposedly in the city, he prayed to be in the country (14). However, now that his duties bind him to the country, he longs for the urban life (15).

As for himself, Horace insists that his love of the rural life remains constant: "me constare mihi" (16). However, the statement of consistency in this poem wholly contradicts the wind-like fickleness he admitted in *Ep*. 1.8.12. He recounts his trips to Rome as if they are nothing but drudgery. He says that it makes him *tristis* (16) every time he receives news that he must depart for Rome. He describes his duties in Rome as *invisa negotia* ("odious affairs," 17) as if they are nothing but a source of trouble. In Horace's words they *trahunt* ("drag," 17) him to the capital, as if by force and against his will. Moreover, we are to assume that such odious times occur regularly, if not frequently ("quandocumque," 17). Nevertheless, there is a hint of exaggeration which warns us that we must not take his statement entirely at face value. His *negotia* in the capital mostly likely involved Maecenas and Augustus, and as such it is hardly conceivable that Horace would make outright, or sincere, complaints. I take this to be another instance of Horace's posturing. It is again a manifestation, made public through his poetry, of how good his patron-client relationships were so as to allow himself to be jokingly playful with his superiors. It is as if he is pouting in feigned anger. It is all a part of the jest.

[6] The farmer will be in the city only temporarily to take care of legal matters; see Gowers 2012, 65.
[7] Cf. Ofellus' teaching, as told by Horace: "non in caro nidore voluptas | summa, sed in te ipso est" ("The best pleasure lies not in expensive savor but in you") (*Sat*. 2.2.19-20), which Pope renders in his *Imitation*: "The pleasure lies in *you*, and not the meat" (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.2.16).

Horace refers again to his deep affection towards the rural life which he refers to again in the next epistle:

rure meo possum quidvis perferre patique. (*Ep*. 1.15.17)

On my country farm I can endure and put up with anything.

Country life may be hard if one is a farmer, but Horace is a landowner with his own servants. It is no wonder that Horace loves the country, but at the same time he also knows that he has a place in the city too, as he is an accepted member of the elite circle.

In another instance in which Horace describes rural retreat and depicts the life of another, Ofellus, Pope relates the life as his own.[8] In *Sat*. 2.2, Horace claims that what he writes in this poem are the precepts of Ofellus, an old neighbor of his who has been reduced to a tenant farmer (*Sat*. 2.2.2-3). Horace is a landowner; Pope is not. Pope is not a farmer, but he feels that he is closer to Ofellus in that they are both tenants. Pope substitutes Hugh Bethel,[9] his long-time friend, for the character of Ofellus (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.2.9-10), but towards the end of the poem he states his intention:

His equal mind I copy what I can,
And as I love, would imitate the Man. (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.2.131-32)

Pope himself becomes Ofellus at the end of the *Imitation* (133-63).[10] He looks back on his own life from his present rural home at Twickenham:

In *South-sea* days not happier, when surmis'd
The Lord of thousands, than if now *Excis'd*;
In Forest planted by a Father's hand, (135)
Than in five acres now of rented land.
Content with little, I can piddle here
On Broccoli and mutton, round the year;
But ancient friends, (tho' poor, or out of play)
That touch my Bell, I cannot turn away. (140)
'Tis true, no Turbots dignify my boards,
But gudgeons, flounders, what my Thames affords.
To Hounslow-heath I point, and Bansted-down,
Thence comes your mutton, and these chicks my own:
From yon old wallnut-tree a show'r shall fall; (145)
And grapes, long-lingring on my only wall,
And figs, from standard and Espalier join:
The dev'l is in you if you cannot dine. (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.2.133-48)

The South Sea Bubble broke in 1720. Pope was not left ruined, but he also lost money as he too was a stockholder. He compares this to the present in 1733. Walpole's Excise Bill was

[8] See also Chapter 2 and 6 for discussions on Ofellus.
[9] For Pope and Bethel, see Aden 1969, 33-36 and Erskine-Hill 1975, 309-17.
[10] McLaverty 2001, 164-65 calls these examples, of positioning himself as Lucilius and Ofellus, a sign of Pope's egoism.

designed to levy a commodity tax on consumers. Due to strong public opposition, the Bill was withdrawn, but Pope declares that it would make no difference to his happiness if he lost in the South Sea speculation then or if he were obliged to pay a new commodity tax now. He asserts that wealth does not equal happiness, as he claims that he is certainly "not happier" ("In *South-sea* days not happier… than if now *Excis'd*," 133-34). On the same level of comparison, he states that he is not happier when he lived in Windsor Forest, from about 1700 to 1718, than at Twickenham where he has since moved ("not happier… | In Forest planted by a Father's hand, | Than in five acres now of rented land," 133, 135-36). Stability, control of one's own life despite changing circumstances, and a sense of self-sufficiency are what Pope mirrors with Ofellus.

Unlike Horace who was presented with the Sabine estate and possibly owned other property, life in the country for Pope was more complicated. His family's move from their London home on Lombard Street to Hammersmith, then out of London to Binfield and to Chiswick, was not due to increased wealth or desire to live in more luxurious houses. Pope is settled on "five acres now," but he does not own them. The Twickenham estate is "rented land" from Thomas Vernon. It then makes sense that Pope assumes the position of Ofellus. In *Sat*. 2.2 Horace, the poet, preaches the wise words and ways of Ofellus, and in the *Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.2 Pope, the poet, introduces "Bethel's Sermon" (9), which the poet deems "strong in sense, and wise" (10). Although Horace once experienced the affliction of losing some of his property after Brutus' defeat, he is still a landowner. For Pope, it is Hugh Bethel who is the landowner and the poet himself who lives on rented property. Thus the juxtaposition of Ofellus and Pope works here in their shared status as renters and not property holders.

However, we must keep in mind that it is the simple life in the country, regardless of status, which both Horace and Pope admired. Horace often uses descriptions of food to illustrate this point.[11] Pope too claims that he can be "Content with little" (137) for his meals on the Twickenham estate. According to Horace, Ofellus also proudly lived on simple food:

Quo magis his credas, puer hunc ego parvus Ofellum
integris opibus novi non latius usum
quam nunc accisis. videas metato in agello
cum pecore et gnatis fortem mercede colonum, (115)
'non ego' narrantem 'temere edi luce profesta
quidquam praeter holus fumosae cum pede pernae.
at mihi seu longum post tempus venerat hospes
sive operum vacuo gratus conviva per imbrem

[11] For Horace's expressions in his poetry upholding simple living and food at his home, see for example *Sat*. 2.6, *Ep*. 1.1, 1.5, 1.14, 1.16, and 1.18.

vicinus, bene erat non piscibus urbe petitis, (120)
sed pullo atque haedo; tum pensilis uva secundas
et nux ornabat mensas cum duplice ficu. (*Sat*. 2.2.112-22)

Just so that you may have more confidence in these words,
when I was a little boy myself I knew this Ofellus
to make full use of his honest means no more extensively than now,
when it is all but ruined.
You may see him with his cattle and his sons,
a robust tenant farmer on his little field, now confiscated,
recounting, "I hardly ate anything on a working day other than vegetables with a leg of smoked ham."
But when I was free from work, whether a friend of mine came after a long absence,
or a neighbor on a rainy day, he was a welcome guest.
We ate well, not with fish fetched from town but a pullet and a kid,
then grapes on vines and nuts with sliced figs adorned the dessert plate.

Horace explains that Ofellus, once a landowner, has been reduced to a tenant farmer. A typical dinner for this peasant consisted first and foremost of vegetables "holus" (117), coupled with some conserved meat ("fumosae cum pede pernae," 117). At a feast with a friend or a neighbor he would serve a fresh pullet or a young goat ("pullo atque haedo," 121), presumably from his farm. According to Horace, Ofellus made a point that fish from the city market was not his choice: "non piscibus urbe petitis" (120). The insistence on "urbe" demonstrates contempt for the urban life, in which produce must first be transported from a distant river or farm and thus was not a fresh catch or freshly picked. Dessert was nothing exotic or luxurious but local fruit: "pensilis uva" (121), "nux" (122), and "duplice ficu" (122).

Like Ofellus, Pope too was in many ways self-sufficient, growing his own broccoli and other produce in his garden at Twickenham.[12] Throughout the year he ate "Broccoli and mutton" (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.2.138).[13] He claims that even when he has guests, he serves no fancy "Turbots" that could "dignify [his] boards" (141) but fish caught from nearby Thames ("gudgeons, flounders, what my Thames affords," 142). The mutton that he does serve comes from neighboring towns: "Hounslow-heath" and "Bansted-down" (143). If he serves a hen, it was from his farm ("these chicks my own," 144). Closely following Horace's original, Pope states that he offers nuts, grapes, and figs picked from his trees and vines ("From yon old wallnut-tree," 145; "grapes, long-lingring on my only wall," 146; and "figs, from standard and Espalier join," 147). The repetition of the possessive adjective "my" shows the pride which Pope takes in the rural surroundings that can provide the sustenance which he needs: "*my*

[12] In *Ep*. 2.2.167-69, Horace criticizes those who own extensive farmland and yet purchase greens and logs which they could supply from their own land. In his *Imitation*, Pope reflects Horace's manner of emphasis, "emptor" (167), "emptum" (168), and "emptis" (168), by repeating lines which begin with "Buy" (see *Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.2.242-43). We shall see shortly that despite this argument by Horace, and supported by Pope, neither actually worked in the fields to produce these items.
[13] Pope grew broccoli and fenochio in his garden; see *Corr*., 2:192.

Thames" (142); "these chicks *my* own" (144); "*my* only wall" (146).[14] Like Horace's Ofellus, he hints that he does not order "Turbots" from the city when fish just as good, if not better, can be found in the river flowing by his Twickenham grounds. Pope does not consume luxurious extravagancies from the city but thrives on local simple food. He wrote to Francis Atterbury:

> The situation here is pleasant, and the view rural enough, to humour the most retir'd, and agree with the most contemplative. Good air, solitary groves, and sparing diet…[15]

It is a modest life.

Although I have stated that Pope was largely, and proudly, self-sufficient thanks to the produce from his garden, it should perhaps be clarified that this does not mean that Pope himself worked in the fields.[16] Pope's recognition of this fact is demonstrated in his parallel Latin text in which he has clearly eliminated certain words from Horace's original:

Quo magis hoc credas, puer hunc ego parvus Ofellum
Integris *opibus novi non latius usum*, (95)
Quam nunc accisis. *Videas*, metato *in agello*,
Non ego, *narrantem*, *temere edi luce profesta*
Quidquam praeter olus, *fumosae cum pede pernae*.

At mihi seu longum post tempus *venerat hospes*,
Sive operum vacuo, &*c.* – *bene erit*, *non* piscibus
urbe petitis, (100)
Sed pullo *atque* haedo; *tum*-
-pensilis uva *secundas*
Et nux *ornabit mensas*, *cum* duplice ficu. (Pope's Latin parallel text, 94-102)[17]

Pope has changed the Latin original in two places. He has silently trimmed the line "cum pecore et gnatis fortem mercede colonum" from Horace's original (*Sat*. 2.2.115), and he has replaced the original "gratus conviva per imbrem | vicinus" (*Sat*. 2.2.119-20) with "*&c.*" (Pope's Latin, 99). The reason is simple. It is because the phrases which have been discarded account for differences between Pope and Ofellus.

The parallel Latin text is presented in italics. However, for words which Pope wished to emphasize he left them un-italicized, and the emphasis lies in the similarities which are to be found between Pope and Ofellus. They are: "Ofellum | Integris" (Pope's Latin, 94-95); "accisis" (96); "metato" (96); "longum post tempus" (99); "operum vacuo" (100); and the foods which Pope has rendered faithfully and which I have discussed above to demonstrate their shared manner of simple dining: "[h]olus" (98); "piscibus" (100); "pullo" (101); "haedo"

[14] My italics. See Stack 1985, 72.
[15] *Corr*., 2:109-10.
[16] See Fuchs 1989, 79-81.
[17] *TE*, 4, 64-66.

(101); "pensilis uva" (101); "nux" (102); and "duplice ficu" (102). "Integris" (95), in "Ofellum | Integris," and "accisis" (96) are adjectives that modify "opibus" (95). "Opibus" signifies means, resources, or wealth, and as we know, Ofellus' land which he once owned was subsequently lost to the war veteran Umbrenus (*Sat*. 2.2.133). Thus his means have been ruined ("accisis" from the Latin verb "accido") (96). Nevertheless, whatever means Ofellus has at present, his leased farmland which he tills, he has managed to keep "Integris" (95), meaning intact, healthy, and honest, or blameless. Likewise, Pope lays emphasis on "metato" from "metato in agello" (96). Ofellus lives on a farm that has been measured off, or confiscated and no longer his own. This life as a former landowner who has been reduced to a tenant certainly struck a chord with Pope, whose family had to sell their property due to religious persecution and who eventually settled on a leased estate at Twickenham.

Such are the obvious similarities which Pope wished to highlight by putting certain words un-italicized in a text presented in italics. However, there are also important fundamental differences to be noticed between Pope and Ofellus. The two lives do not completely overlap. That is why the line in Horace's original which describes Ofellus' life, "cum pecore et gnatis fortem mercede colonum" (*Sat*. 2.2.115), has been conveniently removed in Pope's parallel Latin text.[18] None of the descriptions of Ofellus in this line matches Pope. Pope is not a robust tenant farmer who makes his subsistence from field work ("fortem mercede colonum"), and he certainly did not have cattle or sons ("cum pecore et gnatis"). In this respect, Pope resembles Horace more than he does Ofellus.[19] Neither Pope nor Horace was a *rusticus* (*Sat*. 2.2.3), a peasant working with cattle, and neither had sons.[20] Pope is well aware of this inconsistency in his attempt to resemble Ofellus, and thus he replaces Ofellus' teaching, "tu pulmentaria quaere | sudando" ("Earn your meals by sweating in toil") (*Sat*. 2.2.20-21) with three asterisks, "***" in the parallel text (Pope's Latin, 14). After all, although Pope positions himself as Ofellus in the *Imitation*, his sympathies lie with Horace and his poetry. It is with Horace that Pope ultimately tries to make connections through the Horatian *Imitations*.

The other phrase which Pope eliminated from his Latin text, "gratus conviva per imbrem | vicinus" (*Sat*. 2.2.119-20), depicts the life of a farmer. As opposed to a friend who

[18] Horace's *Sat*. 2.2 contains 136 lines, but Pope eliminated words and several lines at a time and thus the Latin text in his *Imitation* has 116 lines.
[19] See Stack 1985, 71.
[20] Celibacy and lack of offspring, common points between Pope and Horace, will be discussed later in this chapter.

would come infrequently ("longum post tempus"), the *vicinus* would most likely be a neighbor farmer, a regular visitor who would arrive seeking company when farmers could not work because of the rain ("per imbrem").[21] Pope knew that this does not apply to him and thus discarded the passage from his Latin text.

However, Pope does emphasize "longum post tempus" (Pope's Latin, 99) by leaving it un-italicized. Pope was not a farmer and his guests would not have been neighbor farmers who shared a similar work schedule largely dependent on natural causes such as the rain, but he did invite many friends at his Twickenham home. His aristocratic friends did not all live on estates in the outskirts of London, and so their visits to Twickenham would have been infrequent and marked by long absences ("longum post tempus"). Pope also emphasizes "operum vacuo" in his Latin text. He invited his friends, who often came from far away and thus stayed for stretches of weeks and months, when he was not busy. The phrase "operum vacuo" (100) does not specify what type of work. Pope did not work as a field hand like Ofellus, but he did work on poetry, from which he made his living.

In addition to eliminations and un-italicized words, Pope makes another change. Ofellus' account is presented in the past tense in Horace's poem. The modest feast with guests is described as "bene erat" (*Sat*. 2.2.120) and the serving of the dessert plate as "ornabat" (122). Both verbs employ the imperfect tense. In Pope's parallel text, he transformed them into the future tense: "bene erit" (Pope's Latin, 100) and "ornabit" (102).[22] He is not looking back on a past life, of how things once were, but is envisioning his present and future life at Twickenham. Both of his parents have passed away and he is on strained relations with his closest living kin, Magdalen. He has only his friends and no direct family to rely on for company. He is not on good terms with the ruling circle in the capital either. We are again faced with the huge difference between Pope and Horace. In Pope's *Imitation* of Horace's *Sat*. 2.2, Pope in his praise of the country life associates his own life with the rural and modest living of Ofellus. However, as it is with Horace that he ultimately wishes to find similarities, he manages to revert to the fact that it is with Horace that he shares the love of simple living in the country. Nevertheless, circumstances were vastly different between the two poets. Pope almost had no choice but to live outside of London, whereas Horace was welcome in both worlds.

[21] See Fuchs 1989, 79-80.
[22] See also *Corr*., 1:124-25, in which Pope changes the verb tense in the same manner when quoting Horace.

I have mentioned that Pope invited his friends to Twickenham in times of leisure, when he was not occupied with his work ("operum vacuo," *Sat*. 2.2.119; Pope's Latin, 100). Twickenham was not only a country retreat for him. It was also his place of work where he composed his poetry. Horace writes that in Rome it is difficult to find the concentration needed to compose poetry:

> Praeter cetera me Romaene poemata censes
> scribere posse inter tot curas totque labores? (*Ep*. 2.2.65-66)
>
> Beyond all else, do you suppose that I could write verses at Rome,
> among so many concerns and labors?

When in the bustling city of Rome Horace explains that he is preoccupied with other business which hinders his creative activity.[23] Not only is he granted no time or calm for verses, but he is sometimes required to listen to another's writing and pay visits to the ailing in the outskirts of Rome (*Ep*. 2.2.67-70). The epistle is addressed to his literary friend Julius Florus, and the problem of location, of being in the busy capital, is one of the reasons which he provides for writing not only no poetry but no reply to his friend (*Ep*. 2.2.21-22).

That the capital is not the choicest place for poetic composition is one of the connections Pope finds with Horace:

> But grant I may relapse, for want of Grace,
> Again to rhime, can *London* be called the Place?
> Who there his Muse, or Self, or Soul attends?
> In Crouds and Courts, Law, Business, Feasts and Friends? (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.2.88-91)

Smartly adopting Horace's manner, Pope too claims that there is too much noise and activity unrelated to poetry ("Crouds and Courts, Law, Business, Feasts and Friends," 91). Pope's Twickenham estate was not there only to entertain his guests. That was only when he could spare some time from work ("operum vacuo," *Sat*. 2.2.119; in Pope's Latin text, 100). His home was also his place of work.[24] The rural setting provided for the poet the peace and quiet required for his literary activities. For Horace too, despite his confession of laziness ("me pigrum," *Ep*. 2.2.20), the obligations which he had to attend to in Rome probably did not leave sufficient time and calm for composing poetry. Presumably he could find the leisure and tranquility to concentrate better on his poetic work on his rural farm.

[23] See, for example, Chapter 1 in Peter White's *Promised Verse* (1993) and his explanation: "Friendship with the great meant joining in a round of activities… from morning levee to evening potation" (ibid., 35).
[24] Pope also composed in the country on visits to friends' rural estates. For example, it was when visiting Lord Peterborough at his house at Bevis Mount, Southampton, that Pope was finally able to complete his *Epistle to Arbuthnot*.

Pope and Horace shared an appreciation for the country life. Pope aligns himself with Horace in expressing his predilection for his Twickenham estate over London. However, Horace preferred to stay in the countryside but he maintained strong connections with some of the most powerful in Rome.[25] It is only that he sometimes chooses to be away from Rome. As for Pope, he had aristocratic friends but he is not on good terms with the court and powers in London.[26] At first glance, it is as if, like Horace, Pope chooses to live in the peaceful retirement away from the business of a big city, but it is in fact not his choice. As a Catholic, he could not even live legally in London, and, later in the course of his career, he made many enemies among the London literary and aristocratic elite. Pope liked the quiet at Twickenham, just as Horace loved his home in the country, but unlike Horace, Pope could not breeze with ease like the wind ("ventosus," *Ep*. 1.8.12) between Twickenham and the capital.

II. Mortality: "Near fifty, and without a Wife"[27]

Pope's *First Satire of the Second Book of Horace Imitated*, the first in his Horatian series, was published on 15 February 1733. Less than four months later on 7 June, Pope's mother Edith passed away after a prolonged illness. In the previous year in 1732, he had lost some of his dearest and longest friends. Francis Atterbury (b. 1662), exiled in France following the trial of the Jacobite Conspiracy of 1722, died in March 1732.[28] At the end of that year in December, John Gay (b. 1685), one of Pope's collaborators on *Three Hours after Marriage* (1717) and member of the Scriberlus Club, died of a sudden and painful illness. Pope had endured the deaths of family members and friends before. He had experienced the unexpected death of his father in 1717, and many of his older mentors and literary friends had already passed away: William Walsh (1663-1708); Sir Anthony Englefield (*c.* 1637-1712), grandfather to Martha and Teresa Blount and one of Pope's Catholic neighbor-friends; Charles Montagu (1661-1715), first Earl of Halifax, who offered to become Pope's patron; William Wycherley (1640-1716), dedicatee of his third *Pastoral*, "Autumn," and Sir William Trumbull (1638-1716), to whom he dedicated his first *Pastoral*, "Spring," both early mentors to the young Pope;[29]

[25] Cf. Anderson's comment that Horace "belongs both to the city and to the country" (1982, 111).
[26] Cf. Fuchs: "Horace has, of course, a close connection with the great, while Pope is at odds with those who dominate his age" (1989, 85).
[27] *Hor. Imit. Ep*. 1.7.73.
[28] See Pope's tribute to Atterbury in *Dia*. 2.82-83 (1738).
[29] It was Pope who prepared the posthumous *Poems* of Wycherley which was published in 1729.

Thomas Parnell (1679-1718), another member of the Scriblerus Club;[30] Nicholas Rowe (1674-1718), for whom Pope wrote an epitaph; Dr. Samuel Garth (1661-1719), dedicatee of his second *Pastoral*, "Summer;" and more recently, William Congreve (1670-1729), to whom Pope dedicated his *Iliad* translation. Moreover, in the course of the Horatian *Imitations* from 1733 to 1738, Pope lost more of his long-standing supporters and friends such as Lord Peterborough (1658-1735), John Arbuthnot (1667-1735), and the Catholic Baron, John Caryll (1667-1736).[31]

However, Pope's grief over those he lost in the early 1730s was particularly acute. Upon hearing the news of Gay's death, he lamented to Swift in a letter: "one of the nearest and longest tyes I have ever had, is broken all on a sudden."[32] Pope served as one of the pallbearers at Gay's funeral at Westminster Abbey. Even several months later, Pope is still immersed in grief over his friend:

> I really think those have the worst of it who are left by us if we are true friends. I have felt more (I fancy) in the loss of poor Mr Gay, than I shall suffer in the thought of going away myself into a state that can feel none of this sort of losses.[33]

The fact that Gay was a contemporary must have played a role in Pope's prolonged grief. Gay was only three years his senior, and he was only forty-seven years old at the time of his death. Pope had lived through the loss of all of his early mentors, but they were elderly gentlemen who belonged more to his father's generation than his own. The sudden, premature death of a long-time friend and contemporary makes Pope conscious of his own mortality.

However, Pope is not on his deathbed. Nor is it old age with the physical and mental limits it imposes that preoccupies Pope. He is concerned about how to spend the remainder of his life and about the people who surround him. The loss of family and friends means that he has less and less people to be with him in old age. Pope and Swift disclose to each other their shared feelings of loss and loneliness. Swift writes to Pope on 2 December 1736:

> [I have] the Mortification of not hearing from a very few distant Friends that are left; and, considering how Time and Fortune hath ordered matters, I have hardly one friend left but your Self. What Horace says, Singula de nobis anni precedantues I feel every Month.[34]

For Swift who is in Ireland, his friends are "distant," much more distant than for Pope who entertains guests from all over England at his Twickenham estate. He poignantly confesses

[30] Parnell wrote an introductory piece, "Essay on the life of Homer," for the first volume of Pope's *Iliad* (1715). Like he did later for Wycherley, Pope worked on a posthumous edition of Parnell's poems in December 1721.
[31] There was voluminous correspondence between Caryll and Pope since his early years. Cf. Gordon: "Pope's letters to him show the poet at his most relaxed" (1976, 172).
[32] *Corr*., 3:334.
[33] *Ibid*., 365.
[34] *Ibid*., 4, 44; see 44n. on *precedantues* for *praedantur*.

that Pope is the only friend whom he has left. Citing Horace's *Ep*. 2.2.55 that each year passing takes away something from him,[35] Swift reveals that his feelings are of subtraction and not addition. There is loss without replacement.

Pope shares in this growing concern and replies:

> You ask me if I have got any supply of new Friends to make up for those that are gone? I think that impossible, for not our friends only, but so much of our selves is gone by the mere flux and course of years, that were the same Friends to be restored to us, we could not be restored to our selves, to enjoy them.[36]

For both Pope and Swift, what the years steal is not wealth or inanimate possessions but cherished friends. The loss which they lament is of people, and Pope shares in Swift's lament that there are no new people added to one's life. Pope too feels that he only loses friends with no new "supply" to replenish the lost ones. Like Swift, friends are especially important for Pope who never married and had no children.

Celibacy and the absence of offspring are also common points which Pope shared with Horace. The ancient poet voices this in an *Ode* addressed to Maecenas:

> Martiis caelebs quid agam Kalendis. (*Carm*. 3.8.1)
>
> How should a bachelor like I celebrate the first of March?

It is Matron's Day, which celebrates the goddess of childbirth, Juno Lucina. This is an occasion for festivities, but Horace openly confesses that, as a *caelebs* without children, this celebration does not concern him. His addressee Maecenas was married and with children, but the principal message of this *Ode* is to tell his patron to lay aside his worries over guarding Rome while Augustus is absent on his campaigns in Spain (*Carm*. 3.8.13-28). In *Ep*. 1.2, which is addressed to Lollius Maximus, a young scholar in Rome, Horace states: "Quaeritur argentum puerisque beata creandis | uxor" ("A man seeks money and a beautiful wife to produce offspring") (*Ep*. 1.2.44-45). Horace explains that this is what the typical Roman aspires to, but the poet warns the young man that no possessions can bring a man sound health and a sane mind (47-49). For Horace, wealth and family are merely expectations imposed by society.

Regarding *Carm*. 3.8, Jasper Griffin claims that Horace was by all means "a happy bachelor," and on *Ep*. 1.2 Niall Rudd states that the poet spurned the social duties of marriage

[35] Horace's quoted line translates: "Each year robs something from us." Pope's rendering of this passage will be discussed in the next section.
[36] *Ibid*., 50.

and children.[37] Horace addresses the goddess Lucina and praises the Julian marriage law of 18 B.C.E. in the *Carmen Saeculare* (lines 17-20), but this was a hymn written upon the request of Augustus and as such it is natural for one in his position to uphold the emperor's legislation. Thus the lines from the *Carmen Saeculare* do not allow us to be certain of Horace's real attitude towards the institution of marriage. Apart from his father, whom he recalls with affection and veneration, Horace discloses next to nothing about his family. It is difficult not only to know how many family members he had, if he had any, but also to learn how he viewed them. Although Horace was not bothered as Pope was by a physical deformity which played a role in his remaining unmarried, Horace's bachelorhood and childlessness certainly contributed to the attachment which Pope felt towards the ancient poet.

Whatever the views upheld in the respective societies in which the two poets lived, celibacy and lack of offspring become personal issues for both Pope and Horace as they begin to contemplate old age and realize that they have no heirs. Property, which is usually passed on from one generation to the next, is a concern for Pope. On the question of property, Horace concludes his *Sat*. 2.2 with a long discourse by Ofellus:

saeviat atque novos moveat Fortuna tumultus:
quantum hinc imminuet? quanto aut ego parcius aut vos,
o pueri, nituistis ut huc novus incola venit?
nam propriae telluris erum Natura neque illum
nec me nec quemquam statuit. nos expulit ille, (130)
illum aut nequities aut vafri inscitia iuris,
postremo expellet certe vivacior heres.
nunc ager Umbreni sub nomine, nuper Ofelli
dictus, erit nulli proprius, sed cedet in usum
nunc mihi nunc alii. quocirca vivite fortes (135)
fortiaque adversis opponite pectora rebus." (*Sat.* 2.2.126-36)

Let Fortune be fierce and let her stir up new commotions:
how much will she destroy from here on?
How much more frugally have I or have you,
o boys, been living, since the new inhabitant came here?
For nature appointed neither him nor me nor anyone the lord of the lasting earth:
that man drove us out; a vile act or ignorance of the cunning law,
or, lastly, a more powerful heir will drive him out.
Now the land is under the name of Umbrenus.
A recent saying of Ofellus follows that nobody will have it as his very own
but instead will pass according to use, now to me, now to another.
For which reason, live as strong men and fight with courageous hearts against adverse circumstances.

There is strength and courage to be recognized in Ofellus' speech. He knows that Fortune can be harsh ("saeviat," 126), but he is prepared to confront new troubles ("novos moveat… tumultus," 126). Both "saeviat" and "moveat" are jussive subjunctives, which command or

[37] Griffin 1993, 19; Rudd 1994, 119. Rudd explains that Roman society regarded the producing of children as a necessary objective of marriage, and likewise that marriage was necessary to one's happiness.

propel. Ofellus is courageous in that he almost urges hardships to come in the future ("hinc," 127), and he shows strength in his willingness to face them.

He asks his sons ("o pueri," 128) how much ("quanto," 127), or rather, whether, they have been forced to live more frugally ("parcius," 127) since the new owner took over their land. Ofellus claims that there is no landlord ("neque illum | nec me nec quemquam," 129-30). The land belongs to nature ("propriae telluris… natura," 129), and nature does not assign lords. It is humans who assign owners, sometimes through vile acts and unjust application of the law (131-32). He reminds his sons, who may not be able to inherit any property since his father is now a tenant on the land, that what matters is not ownership ("proprius," 134), but that they work the land in order to make their living ("in usum," 134). In the very last lines we feel once again his strength in his instructions to his sons that they should remain strong ("vivite fortes," 135) and that they should face adversity with brave hearts ("fortiaque adversis opponite pectora rebus," 136). Horace puts this in the mouth of Ofellus, but as he presents the passage in his poetry and even allows it to occupy a significant portion of his poem, we may assume that this is a view of life which Horace supported.

Pope's rendering of this passage is slightly different:

"Pray, heav'n it last! (cries Swift) as you go on;
"I wish to God this house had been your own:
"Pity! to build, without a son or wife:
"Why, you'll enjoy it only all your life." –
Well, if the Use be mine, can it concern one (165)
Whether the Name belong to Pope or Vernon?
What's *Property*? dear Swift! you see it alter
From you to me, from me to Peter Walter,
Or, in a mortgage, prove a Lawyer's share,
Or, in a jointure, vanish from the Heir, (170)
Or in pure Equity (the Case not clear)
The Chanc'ry takes your rents for twenty year:
At best, it falls to some ungracious Son
Who cries, my father's damn'd, and all's my own.
Shades, that to Bacon could retreat afford, (175)
Become the portion of a booby Lord;
And Hemsley once proud Buckingham's delight,
Slides to a Scriv'ner or a City Knight.
Let Lands and Houses have what Lords they will,
Let Us be fix'd, and our own Masters still. (*Hor. Imit. Sat.* 2.2.161-80)

This is Pope's conclusion to the *Hor. Imit. Sat.* 2.2. Whereas Horace ends the poem with Ofellus' teachings, Pope assumes the role of speaker and invents a remark by his friend

Swift.[38] This is because, unlike Ofellus, Pope had no sons to address. He puts emphasis on the topic of ownership in the imaginary speech by Swift. In the lines prior to this passage Pope describes how he entertains his friends with modest yet jovial dinners at his Twickenham estate (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.2.139-60). "'Pray heav'n it last!'" (161) is Swift's response to his friend's lifestyle, his reason for caution being that the house does not even belong to Pope ("'I wish to God this house had been your own'," 162). Swift continues: "'Pity! to build, without a son or wife'" (163), since Pope, even if he did own property, would not be able to bequeath anything he constructs on it to an heir. The pretty gardens and the pleasant country retreat at Twickenham, Swift tells his friend: "'Why, you'll enjoy it only all your life'" (164).[39] Pope has nothing to pass on, and he has nobody to pass on to. The invented speech put in the mouth of Swift also serves as an occasion for Pope to defend himself. Employing the idea of "in usum" from Horace's original (*Sat*. 2.2.134), he replies that what matters is that "the Use be mine" (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.2.165) and that it is of no concern whether his Twickenham home is owned by him or by his landlord Vernon.

Ofellus cites injustices and power struggles as determining factors for who becomes the landlord, or under whose name a certain piece of land is owned. While Horace gives no specific examples, Pope expands on this idea. Once again he puts the Latin terms, "Nequities," "vafri inscitia juris," and "vivacior haeres" (Pope's Latin, 111-112) un-italicized in his parallel text for emphasis. On the question of property and ownership (167), he makes a sarcastic comment about Peter Walter (168) who was buying up estates in the county of Dorset in the southwest of England.[40] Even if one owned land, it could be bought out by an unscrupulous and avaricious scrivener. Moreover, even though one was technically the owner, the land may actually be held in mortgage (169). Or the land may be a jointure, which would mean that upon the death of the owner it would be held by the widow, the wife, for life rather than being passed on to an offspring (170). Or, even if one were to take the case to Chancery to have recourse to equity, the Court of Chancery was notoriously slow and a speedy resolution could not be expected (171-72). All of these point out that ownership does not guarantee that the land will be passed on to one's heir. Such were the "Nequities" and "vafri inscitia juris," or the possibilities of them, which Pope sees in contemporary England.

[38] Swift felt that his character was not portrayed in a positive light in this passage, but he claimed: "it gives me not the least offence, because I am sure he had not the least ill Intention, and how much I have allways loved [Pope], the World as well as Your Lordship [Earl of Oxford] is convinced" (*Corr*., 3:429).
[39] Cf. Pope's *Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.6.9-10: "here a Grievance seems to lie, | All this is mine but till I die."
[40] See Erskine-Hill 1975, 103-31 for this historical figure.

Emphasizing "vivacior haeres" in his Latin text, Pope further illustrates that property passed on to an heir did not always ensure that the inheritance was handled properly. He points out that it could well be an "ungracious Son" (173) who exhibits no gratitude: "my father's damn'd, and all's my own" (174).[41] Pope cites two examples from history, Shades (175) and Hemsley (177). Shades was an estate built near St Albans by Sir Francis Bacon's father, Sir Nicholas. Completed in 1568, it was passed to the Meautis family. The estate was eventually purchased by Sir Harbottle Grimston, and his son left it to his great-nephew William Luckyn who took the name Grimston. Luckyn's nickname "booby Lord" (176) is derived from his play *The Lawyer's Fortune, or Love in a Hollow Tree* (1705). Hemsley was another estate which was owned by the daughter of Lord Fairfax but ownership passed to the Duke of Buckingham upon their marriage in 1657. In 1692 it was sold to the London banker ("Slides to a Scriv'ner or a City Knight," 178). Sir Charles Duncombe purchased it for the sum of £90,000, the most expensive real estate sale in England at the time. Thus Pope makes his claim that the presence of an heir does not necessarily entail proper care of the inheritance.

Similarly, both "Ofelli" and "Umbreni sub nomine" are un-italicized for emphasis. Like Ofellus who lives as a tenant farmer on land owned by a certain Umbrenus, Pope currently rents from Thomas Vernon. Pope can relate to Ofellus. However, the most important thing for Ofellus as a farmer is that the land be *in usum* (*Sat*. 2.2.134). Property comprises a wider meaning for Pope, who points out the ineffective application of laws of the current court system and "ungracious" heirs who dare to sell family property with history to the nouveaux riches such as Peter Walter and Sir Charles Duncombe who, in turn, hoard up land with only wealth and status in mind. Pope depicts a society that is in need of moral improvement. Unlike the case of Ofellus whose heirs will till the same land for many generations to come, regardless of landlord, there is no sense of continuity in Pope's descriptions. Pope sees his native England in decline. Thus his conclusion: "Let Us be fix'd, and our own Masters still" (180) stands on unstable ground. He is "fix'd" to no land as he owns none, and to be "our own Masters" invokes a sense of belonging only to the self and not to the society at large which he criticizes.[42] Far from having a positive outlook towards England and its future, Pope recedes from it, feeling that he can trust only himself.

[41] Stack ties this idea to Pope's cherishment of friendship in putting forth the question: "Is it not better to have a true friend than such a son?" (1985, 74).
[42] Stack argues that at the end of the *Imitation* lies "clearly the Horatian idea of the true inner self" (ibid., 75), but I am more of the opinion, as Fuchs states, that Pope is "pessimistic" and that he exhibits "glacial stoicism" (1989, 84).

On the question of ownership and inheritance, Pope demonstrates that an heir does not necessarily mean that the land will be kept and maintained properly by that offspring. But neither Pope nor Horace has an heir to whom to pass property at death. Horace does not hold fast to property, as he understands that all will end upon one's death:

Si proprium est quod quis libra mercatus et aere est,
quaedam, si credis consultis, mancipat usus.
qui te pascit ager tuus est et vilicus Orbi, (160)
cum segetes occat tibi mox frumenta daturas,
te dominum sentit. das nummos, accipis uvam,
pullos, ova, cadum temeti: nempe modo isto
paulatim mercaris agrum, fortasse trecentis
aut etiam supra nummorum milibus emptum. (165)
quid refert, vivas numerato nuper an olim?
emptor Aricini quondam Veientis et arvi
emptum cenat holus, quamvis aliter putat, emptis
sub noctem gelidam lignis calefactat aenum;
sed vocat usque suum qua populus assita certis (170)
limitibus vicina refringit iurgia, tamquam
sit proprium quidquam puncto quod mobilis horae
nunc prece, nunc pretio, nunc vi, nunc morte suprema
permutet dominos et cedat in altera iura.

Sic quia perpetuus nulli datur usus et heres (175)
heredem alternis velut unda supervenit undam,
quid vici prosunt aut horrea, quidve Calabris
saltibus adiecti Lucani, si metit Orcus
grandia cum parvis, non exorabilis auro? (*Ep*. 2.2.158-79)

If someone is to claim ownership because he has purchased with a balance and a bronze coin,
if you believe the experts, there are some tips which can work to your advantage.
The field which nourishes you is yours, and the manager of Orbius,
when he harrows the arable land soon to yield you grain, he perceives you as the lord.
You pay money, and you receive grapes, pullets, a jar of hard liquor:
naturally, you are buying little by little the farm which you purchased,
perhaps at three hundred thousand sesterces, or even more.
What does it matter, if you live on land paid down recently or a good while before?
The buyer formerly dined on vegetables bought from a farm at Atricia or Veii,
although he thinks otherwise;
he heats the caldron on a frosty night with the logs he bought;
but he calls it entirely his own, to the extent that his poplar,
planted within an inch of the fixed boundaries,
obviates quarrels with neighbors;
Just as if anything were one's own, which, in a moment's lapse of time,
now by an appeal, now by purchasing, now by confiscation, and finally by death,
may change lords and pass the land to the next owner.
Thus, because perpetual use is given to none,
an heir overtakes another heir, as a wave rolls over a wave,
what good are establishments and warehouses?
What good are Lucanian woodlands added to Calabrian,
if Pluto reaps grand and small alike, not to be wheedled with gold?

As in *Sat*. 2.2, Horace celebrates those who live on produce which they farmed and criticizes those who take pride in owning property yet buy from others goods which their land could produce. In this passage he illustrates the vanity of a landowner who made a big purchase at

three hundred thousand sesterces or more (164-65). In addition to the large sum paid for the land, he buys yield from others: "das nummos, accipis uvam, | pullos, ova, cadum temeti" (162-63). The owner is paying double, for the land and for the goods which he buys instead of procuring from his arable land. Horace cynically remarks that, despite this, the owner thinks otherwise ("aliter putat," 168). In another example Horace depicts the owner buying logs for heating when he could use the trees on his land, and he explains that the poplar has been planted only as a marker in order to avoid conflict over territory boundaries with a neighboring landowner (170-71).

The next lines 171-77 recall *Sat*. 2.2.129-35 in which Ofellus describes how ownership can change at any time for various reasons. The use of "nunc" four times in *Ep*. 2.2.173 presents the different possibilities by which one may lose ownership. A similar statement was made by Ofellus regarding land: "cedet in usum | nunc mihi nunc alii" ("[it] will pass according to use, | now to me, now to another") (*Sat*. 2.2.134-35). However, whereas Ofellus in *Sat*. 2.2 believed in *usucapio*, *usus* of land as in one who farmed to yield produce, Horace's perception of *usus* in *Ep*. 2.2 is different. In *Ep*. 2.2 Horace is concerned almost strictly with ownership as it relates to purchase. He presents an actual figure of "trecentis… nummorum milibus" (164-65) as a possible sum of purchase, and his diction in the passage is filled with the language of finance: "libra mercatus et aere est" (158), "dominum" (162), "das nummos" (162), "paulatim mercaris" (164), "emptum" (165), "numerato" (166), "emptor" (167), "emptum" and "emptis" (168), "certis | limitibus" (170-71), and "dominos" (174). The landlord whom he scoffed at for buying produce is nevertheless the *dominus*. Horace's conclusion is: "perpetuus nulli datur usus" ("perpetual use is given to none") (175), and his reason is: "metit Orcus | grandia cum parvis" ("Pluto reaps grand and small alike") (178-79). Pluto, or death, awaits us all, and whatever possessions we may have accumulated, whether *grandia* or *parva*, they will no longer be *in usum* by us. Whereas Ofellus envisions *perpetuus usus* in the sense that his sons will till the land which he tilled, Horace holds an individualistic view as well as insisting on *usus* as in the status as landlord. Horace also cites death earlier ("morte suprema," 173) as one of the possibilities by which one may lose ownership. This shows that Horace has a different perception of land ownership because he has no heir to pass on to, and the passage also demonstrates that at the age of forty-three at the time of publication of the second book of *Epistles*, death is encroaching on his mind.

Frank Stack has argued that Horace, in reaching the conclusion that death is the ultimate end for all, exhibits "not terror or despair but a calm vision of futility."[43] Indeed, while death is a grave idea to introduce, there is no sense of bitterness or resignation in Horace. He keeps a matter-of-fact tone, merely making a statement of how matters stand in reality. Pope is more bitingly particular in his version:

If there be truth in Law, and *Use* can give
A *Property*, that's yours on which you live.
Delightful *Abs-court*, if its Fields afford
Their Fruits to you, confesses you its Lord:
All Worldly's Hens, nay Partridge, sold to town,
His Ven'son too, a Guinea makes your own: (235)
He bought at thousands, what with better wit
You purchase as you want, and bit by bit;
Now, or long since, what diff'rence will be found?
You pay a Penny, and he paid a Pound.
Heathcote himself, and such large-acred Men, (240)
Lords of fat *E'sham*, or of Lincoln Fen,
Buy every stick of Wood that lends them heat,
Buy every Pullet they afford to eat.
Yet these are Wights, who fondly call their own
Half that the Dev'l o'erlooks from Lincoln Town. (245)
The Laws of God, as well as of the Land,
Abhor, a *Perpetuity* should stand:
Estates have wings, and hang in Fortune's pow'r
Loose on the point of ev'ry wav'ring Hour;
Ready, by force, or of your own accord, (250)
By sale, at least by death, to change their Lord.
Man? and *for ever?* Wretch! what woud'st thou have?
Heir urges Heir, like Wave impelling Wave:
All vast Possessions (just the same the case
Whether you call them Villa, Park, or Chace) (255)
Alas, my BATHURST! what will they avail?
Join *Cotswold* Hills to *Saperton*'s fair Dale,
Let rising Granaries and Temples here,
There mingled Farms and Pyramids appear,
Link Towns to Towns with Avenues of Oak, (260)
Enclose whole Downs in Walls, 'tis all a joke!
Inexorable Death shall level all,
And Trees, and Stones, and Farms, and Farmer fall. (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.2.230-63)

While Horace illustrates his point with examples of unnamed persons, Pope does not hesitate to use and mock his contemporaries.

"Worldly" (234) is Wortley and refers to Edward Wortley Montagu and his wife Lady Mary. Pope had already made a nasty comment on them in an earlier imitation claiming that they sold "presented Partridges" (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.2.51), gifts given to them, and he repeats

[43] Stack 1985, 140.

the same attack: "All Worldly's Hens, nay Partridge, sold to town" (234).[44] Like Timon's villa, Pope mentions "*Abs-court*" (232), the site of aristocratic residence in Surrey, and Sir Gilbert Heathcote (240). Heathcote (1652-1733) was one of the founders of the Bank of England, and he had purchased the estate of Normanton in Lincolnshire several years before his death. At his death he was purportedly worth £700,000.[45] These are some examples of "large-acred Men" (240). Following Horace's original, Pope mocks that instead of making use of their land, they purchase everything which they need. He emphasizes their crass ways by repeating "Buy" and placing it at the beginning of each line: "Buy every stick of Wood…" (242) and "Buy every Pullet…" (243). Pope points out that, in spite of their wealth and the extravagance which they can afford, they are still "Wights," human beings (244). However, he also associates them with the "Dev'l" (245).

To contrast this Pope mentions in the next line the "Laws of God" and "[Laws] of the Land," as in nature (246), and introduces the theme, and impossibility, of perpetuity (247). There is a difference to be noticed here between Pope and Horace, as in Horace's original his statement that "perpetus nuli datur usus" (*Ep*. 2.2.175) is in the passive and lacks a subject. The mention of God introduces a graver religious tone in Pope's rendering. Working on Horace's original, Pope accentuates the change in land ownership. In addition to Horace's "unda supervenit undam" "a wave rolls over a wave" (*Ep*. 2.2.176) which Pope renders: "Wave impelling Wave" (253), Pope's diction, "wings" and "hang" (248) and "Loose" and "wav'ring" (249), conveys the idea that things are in constant motion. Pope also captures the unpredictability of ownership. His statement that "Estates… hang in Fortune's pow'r" (248) reminds us that the Pope family had to sell their Binfield home because of anti-Catholic legislation. This could apply to Horace as well in that his property was supposedly confiscated in the civil war. Horace does mention this twist of fortune earlier in the poem (*Ep*. 2.2.50-51), but such memories do not figure in this particular section of the epistle.

Pope treats this passage much more personally than Horace. Unlike the earlier examples of Wortley and Heathcote in which he depicts "large-acred Men" (240) in general, he uses himself as an example. Lord Bathurst (256) had sought advice from Pope about his estate. Bathurst was transferring quality stone from his Saperton home (257) and had intentions for building an obelisk on his property (258). Pope thought that a pyramid might be

[44] See Pope's *Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.2.47-60, and *TE*, 4:57n. for the couple's parsimonious and unkempt ways of living.
[45] *Ibid*., 363.

a better monument to build (259).[46] This shows his love of and expertise in landscape gardening, but his exclamations, - "*Man?* and *for ever?* Wretch!" (252), "Alas" (256), and "'tis all a joke!" (261) - show that instead of taking pride Pope only seems to dwell on futility. Even his interest in architecture and gardening seems like mere attempts to "Link" (260) and "Enclose" (261) property, and he dismisses his passion as a "joke" (261).[47]

Pope arrives at the same conclusion as Horace. In this respect he makes no changes to the original. However, while Horace mentions "Orcus" with no adjective, Pope adds "Inexorable" (262). Death, an inevitable process of nature, seems cruel and cold to Pope. Moreover, it is not only living things such as "Trees" and the "Farmer," but also inanimate objects such as "Stones" and "Farms" (263). There is a sense of destruction in these lines, as Pope describes that death "shall level all" (262). It is not as in Horace that ownership will end upon the individual's death but as if the entire world is headed towards an end in which everything will be razed to the ground. While Horace cites death as the ultimate reason for the uselessness of the vanity in hoarding property, there is no sense of negativity or darkness.[48] He accepts it simply as an inevitable part of nature. However, Pope denounces his own long-time passion for landscape architecture and in his vision of death he sees only hopelessness.

Pope's *Imitation* of *Ep.* 1.7 was the last of his Horatian poems to be written, and it was included in the second part of the second volume of his collected works in 1739. The *Imitation* contains approximately the first half of Horace's *Ep.* 1.7, at which point he cuts off his poem with the lines:

Our old Friend Swift will tell his Story.
"Harley, the Nation's great Support,"-
But you may read it, I stop short. (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 1.7.82-84)

Swift had composed an imitation of the tale of the patron Philippus and his client Volteius from the second half of Horace's *Ep.* 1.7. It was published in 1713 under the title "Address to the Earl of Oxford," and the imitation is a comic portrayal of the relationship between Swift and his patron Robert Harley, first Earl of Oxford and Earl Mortimer (1661-1724). Pope's *The Seventh Epistle of the First Book of Horace. Imitated in the Manner of Dr Swift* was written to complement Swift's imitation.

As usual Pope maintains a personal tone and he describes his own life:

South-sea Subscriptions take who please,

[46] *Corr*., 4:25.
[47] Stack explains that as the poem progresses, "Pope emphasizes not success but failure" (1985, 137).
[48] Cf. Fuchs: "Although Horace shows us death, his theme is really life… Living well is possible. Horace assumes a world which allows us that" (1989, 107).

Leave me but Liberty and Ease.
'Twas what I said to Craggs and Child,
Who prais'd my Modesty, and smil'd.
Give me, I cry'd, (enough for me)
My Bread, and Independency! (70)
So bought an Annual Rent or two.
And liv'd – just as you see I do;
Near fifty, and without a Wife,
I trust that sinking Fund, my Life.
Can I retrench? Yes, mighty well, (75)
Shrink back to my Paternal Cell,
A little House, with Trees a-row,
And like its Master, very low,
There dy'd my Father, no man's Debtor,
And there I'll die, nor worse nor better. (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 1.7.65-80)

Pope is looking back on his life. He recalls the days, some twenty years earlier, when the South Sea speculation was at its height. James Craggs held many government positions and gave Pope some South Sea subscriptions.[49] Sir Francis Child headed the banking firm Child and Co.[50] Pope never cared much for the subscriptions, an indifference which he would be grateful for after the Bubble burst. Today Pope is "Near fifty, and without a Wife" (73). He has no family. In the next line he states: "I trust that sinking Fund, my Life" (74). He feels that his "Fund," his life, is "sinking." There is no rise in energy, quite the opposite. His life does not mean much anymore. We cannot help but sense his solitude and resignation.

The expressions "retrench" (75) and "Shrink back" (76) refer to the fable in Horace's original (*Ep*. 1.7.29-33) of a fox who, after stuffing himself in a corn bin, is unable to get out. A weasel teaches him the hard lesson that in order to come out he must return to his former lean state. In comparing the South Sea days some twenty years ago to the present day, Pope attempts to make the point that he has remained the same. The original, Horace's *Ep*. 1.7, was addressed to Maecenas, and the central theme lies in patronage. Pope, as we know, always refused patrons, and he emphasizes the memory that even twenty years ago he called for "Liberty and Ease" (66) and "Bread, and Independency!" (70). These words are strikingly similar to the last line of Pope's *Imitation of the Sixth Satire of the Second Book of Horace* (1738): "[Give me] A Crust of Bread, and Liberty."[51] Frank Stack has pointed out that Pope's imitations of *Sat*. 2.6 and *Ep*. 1.7, both of which are based on Swift's imitations, may have been written at around the same time.[52] In the conclusion to Pope's imitation of *Sat*. 2.6, the country mouse, which in fact mirrors Pope himself, yearns to return to his country abode.

[49] He was also one of Pope's friends who offered him patronage; see Chapter 5.
[50] Cf. Butt: "Nothing has been discovered of his acquaintance with Pope" (*TE*, 4:352).
[51] *Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.6.221.
[52] Stack 1985, 222; Aden 1969, 85-91.

There is consistency of theme in the imitations of *Sat*. 2.6 and *Ep*. 1.7, as both poems accentuate Pope's preference of the country over city life. Yet most of all, Pope's working on Swift's imitations in the late 1730s is a manifestation of the growing companionship between the two writers whom, as we saw earlier, feel more and more isolated as their family and friends pass away.

To return to the question which Pope asks himself: "Can I retrench?", he answers eagerly: "Yes, mighty well" (75). Unlike the fox in Horace's fable, Pope never entered court life under patronage. He chose to remain independent and, at "Near fifty," he still was. To explore this idea further, let us turn to the corresponding lines in Horace's original:

parvum parva decent. mihi iam non regia Roma,
sed vacuum Tibur placet aut imbelle Tarentum. (*Ep*. 1.7.44-45)

The small befit the small: nowadays it is not the court at Rome
that pleases me, but empty Tibur and peaceful Tarentum.

Tivoli and Tarentum were fashionable resorts for Romans. It is an irony that Horace apparently possessed the wealth to travel and remain there, but he skirts around this by insisting that his inferior social status ("parvum parva decent," 44) is unfit for the court at Rome ("regia Roma," 44).

Like Horace's "parvum parva decent,"[53] Pope shows his modesty in writing that he has "A little House" (77) that is "like its Master, very low" (78).[54] However, he refers to his decision to live outside of London as: "Shrink back to my Paternal Cell" (76). "Shrink" evokes an image of someone withdrawing because of fear and timidity. It is far from a picture of an ideal retirement. Pope explains: "There dy'd my Father" (79). Pope's beginning at Twickenham was instigated by the death of his father. That is why he had to become "Master." One by one his family has gone and he is alone. In the next line he states that, like his father, "there I'll die" (80). There is no mention of death in Horace's original, but for Pope his focus is on death. His statement is not "there I live" or "there I'll live," but "there I'll die" (80). His vision extends beyond retirement. Finally, Pope claims that he will die at Twickenham "nor worse nor better" (80) than his father. There is no sense of pride left in the hard struggles he faced to gain his independence, the fortune from his Homer, or the success of his literary career.

[53] Pope cites this phrase later in a letter to Ralph Allen in the summer of 1739 (*Corr*., 4:191) in which he reveals that the improvements which he made to his house and garden now seem to him nothing but "Vanities" and resolves to end such efforts.
[54] Cf. Stack: "in that place of miniatures Pope experiences humility before death, tragic loneliness, and heroic self-absorption" (1985, 243).

III. Waning Motivation to Write: "What will it leave me, if it snatch my Rhime?"[55]

Country living implies not just a break from the bustling capital and busy life as an active writer, but also withdrawing from the writer's occupation. Pope sees that his motivation to write is waning, and he fashions an overlap of his feelings with Horace's in the *Imitations*. It is another connection which he tries to make with Horace. Horace was never a fast writer. In the first book of *Satires*, he criticized Lucilius' manner of writing hastily (*Sat*. 1.4.9-10), and in the second book of *Satires*, Horace' argument was that it is not possible to compose a thousand verses of quality in a day (*Sat*. 2.1.2-4). However, we also know that Horace could be a lazy writer as well. In *Sat*. 2.3 Damasippus accuses Horace's lifestyle as a writer:

Sic raro scribis ut toto non quater anno
membranam poscas, scriptorum quaeque retexens,
iratus tibi quod vini somnique benignus
nil dignum sermone canas. quid fiet? at ipsis
Saturnalibus huc fugisti sobrius. ergo (5)
dic aliquid dignum promissis: incipe. nil est.
culpantur frustra calami immeritusque laborat
iratis natus paries dis atque poetis. (*Sat*. 2.3.1-8)

You write so seldom, that you ask for parchment not four times in an entire year,
revising each of your writings,
angry at yourself because, bounteous of wine and sleep,
you sing nothing worthy of discussion. What shall be done?
But you fled to this place during the Saturnalian festival sober.
Now be reasonable and tell something worthy of your promises: begin.
There is nothing. In vain the pens are blamed,
and the innocent wall, erected for angry gods and poets, suffers.

We must remember that Damasippus is a character in Horace's poetry through whom Horace expresses himself. Damasippus admits in the speech that Horace is a serious writer. Horace reworks (*retexit*) his writings, and that is part of the reason why it takes so much time for the poet to complete a work (2). However, Damasippus' principal argument is that Horace is lazy. It is only rarely that he sees the poet at work and he calls for writing paper not even four times a year (1-2). Horace does not write frequently. Moreover, Horace likes *vinum* and *somnus* (3), which takes up his time and contributes to his becoming a slow and sluggish writer. Horace can be *iratus* (3), he takes it out on his *calamos* when the right words will not come (7), and we can imagine him shouting or beating at the wall of his house (7-8). According to Damasippus' observation, there is a mixture of perfectionism and laziness in Horace.

[55] *Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.2.77.

In Chapter 6, I mentioned that Horace confesses honestly, albeit in a joking way, private reasons for not meeting his patron Maecenas' deadlines and that it is an indication that the two had an open and honest friendship, unlike with Augustus, whom Horace hesitates about and consistently has to think of glorifying his exploits.[56] In *Epod*. 14, Horace speaks to Maecenas:

candide Maecenas, occidis saepe rogando.
deus, deus nam me vetat
inceptos olim, promissum carmen, iambos
ad umbilicum adducere. (*Epod*. 14.5-8)

Candid Maecenas, you kill me by your frequent asking.
The god, for the god prevents me
from leading to the end of the scroll the poetry promised,
the iambics once begun.

Horace believed in producing quality verse, but he did not spend all of his days at work. In addition to *vinum* and *somnus* (*Sat*. 2.3.3), he was sometimes busy with love affairs. That his patron is killing ("occidis," 5) him by demanding due verses is a comic hyperbole. Horace repeats that it is a god that is keeping him away from his work (6). *Veto, -are* is a verb that is often found in *recusationes*,[57] and this is another example of Horace's resistance to Maecenas' authority. However, this is clearly a comic excuse rather than a polite and careful refusal. Horace's love affairs occupy a significant portion of his *Epodes*. They are the subject of *Epodes* 8, 11, 12, 14, and 15. *Deus* is unnamed (6), but it is most likely Amor, the god of love.[58] In *Epod*. 14, Horace openly confesses that this time he is busy in love with Phryne, a *libertina* (15-16). He expresses no guilt in providing this as the reason for not writing, as he states that the sixth-century Greek poet Anacreon was in love with Bathyllus (9-10) and makes an allusion to Helen to cite that love can even be the cause of a war (13-14). As Horace was on friendly terms with Maecenas, he points his finger at his patron and states that Maecenas is no exception since he too is in love (13).[59] We see here again the mixture of perfectionism and laziness in Horace's manner of writing. Horace postures as a poet who is serious about the quality of his poetry but is not always a serious worker.

Neither of these poems was imitated by Pope, as laziness, being distracted by love affairs, and providing excuses to a patron did not apply to Pope. Where Pope saw a similarity with Horace was in the idea of stopping writing altogether. Retirement from his vocation is on

[56] See Chapter 6, p. 1.
[57] Cf. *Sat*. 1.10.32 and *Carm*. 1.6.10.
[58] See Mankin 1995, 229 and Rudd 2004, 303n.
[59] See ibid., 304-5n. for the possibility that Maecenas was in love with a male actor named Bathyllus.

Pope's mind and age plays a role in this. In *Ep*. 2.2 Horace asks his young literary friend Florus:

> Singula de nobis anni praedantur euntes.
> eripuere iocos, Venerem, convivia, ludum,
> tendunt extorquere poemata. quid faciam vis? (*Ep*. 2.2.55-57)

> The years passing rob something from us, one by one.
> They have snatched away joviality, love, parties, play;
> they aim to wrest me from poetry. What do you wish me to do?

Horace is no longer young. One by one, as each year passes, his interests – *joci*, *Venus*, *convivia*, *ludus* - are taken away. He has no energy for them anymore. Finally, he notices that this extends to his *poemata* too (57). His creative energy is running out.

Pope expands on Horace's passage:

> Years foll'wing Years, steal something ev'ry day,
> At last they steal us from our selves away;
> In one our Frolicks, one Amusements end,
> In one a Mistress drops, in one a Friend: (75)
> This subtle Thief of Life, this paltry Time,
> What will it leave me, if it snatch my Rhime?
> If ev'ry Wheel of that unweary'd Mill
> That turn'd ten thousand Verses, now stands still. (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.2.72-79)

Pope contemplates the passage of time and relates it to theft. Pope's thief is the "Thief of Life" (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.2.76). It is time that steals.[60] The Latin verbs "praedantur" (*Ep*. 2.2.55) and "eripuere" (56) are rendered by Pope as "steal" (*Hor. Imit. Ep.* 2.2.72, 73). Pope's repeated use of the term "steal" in the *Imitation* (20, 25, 72, 73) accentuates his feelings of loss. Following Horace, he states that time steals many things: "Frolicks," "Amusements," "Mistress," and "Friend" (74-75). However, what concerns him most is how he will live the rest of his life, "if [paltry Time] snatch[es] my Rhime?" (77). Looking back on the facility and motivation with which he used to write, Pope refers to his mode of production in his earlier years as an "unweary'd Mill" (78). A mill suggests regular, constant motion, and the image stands in contrast to Horace's pattern of periods of laziness followed by seriousness. However, like Horace, Pope notices that his motivation to write is on the decline. The conditions, "*if* it snatch my Rhime" (77) and "*If* ev'ry Wheel of that unweary'd Mill… now stands still" (78), reveal his disturbing preoccupation that the end of his life as a writer may become reality in the near future.[61] He fears the day when his "Mill" is no longer in motion. Poetry has been the

[60] As early as 1732, shortly after Gay's death, he wrote to Martha Blount: "The world after all is a little pitiful thing; not performing any one promise it makes us, for the future, and *every day taking away* and annulling the joys of the past" (*Corr*. 3:336) (my italics).
[61] My italics.

principal activity of his life, and the "Thief of Life" may soon take it away from him. What will he do without poetry in his life? "What will it leave me?" is Pope's question.

It is a question to which Pope can find no answer, as he continues:

But after all, what wou'd you have me do?
When out of twenty I can please not two. (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.2.80-81)

There is a sense of resignation in Pope. He is battling his own waning motivation to write, and on top of it, few readers admire his poetry. Pope's lines were based on the line by Horace:

Denique non omnes eadem mirantur amantque. (*Ep*. 2.2.58)

Of course, not all men admire and like the same things.

Horace understands that people have different tastes. He knows that it is nearly impossible to expect every reader to appreciate his works. It is like trying to cook a dish that appeals to all dinner guests (*Ep*. 2.2.61-64). It must have been more difficult for Pope to consider reception since, unlike Horace, he was not a court poet and suffered vehement attacks and even threats. Pope declared in his first *Imitation, The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace Imitated* (1733), that he will "Rhyme and Print" (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.100; *TE*, 4, 15) with his pen as his sword.[62] In *The Second Epistle of the Second Book of Horace* (1737), the audacity with which Pope began the Horatian series is no longer evident.

IV. The Younger Generation: "Vive, vale"[63]

Towards the end of his first published poem, Horace states:

… exacto contentus tempore vita
cedat, uti conviva satur. (*Sat*. 1.1.118-19)

When time has run out one should depart life contented,
like a dinner guest who has eaten heartily.

It seems that Horace was always conscious of his mortality. The first book of the *Satires* was published in 35 B.C.E. when Horace was thirty years old. The passage indicates that even as a fairly young adult Horace was conscious of the brevity of time and held the quest to live his life to contentment, so that he would have no regrets upon departing. In fact, throughout his career he seems to have been aware that a day will come for everyone when *vita cedet*.[64]

[62] Cf. "Arm'd for *Virtue* when I point the Pen" (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.105).
[63] *Ep*. 1.6.67.
[64] See Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura*, 3.938, for a similar metaphor of a satisfied dinner guest. See Gowers 2012, 84 for possible influence from Virgil's *Eclogues* and philosophers Aristotle, Epicurus, Chrysippus, and Bion.

This idea may be seen repeatedly in his first collection of *Odes*, published in 23 B.C.E. In the first book, he states:

... sed omnis una manet nox. (*Carm*. 1.28.15)

But one common night awaits all.

In *Carm*. 1.28 Horace gives instructions for a simple burial to a sailor who is approached by a drowned man's spirit (35-36). In the poem, he mentions mythological figures such as Tantalus ("Pelopis genitor," 7), a son of Zeus who mingled with the gods ("conviva deorum," 7),[65] the Trojan prince Tithonus for whom Eos beseeched Zeus for immortality (8), the king of Crete Minos who was killed during a military expedition in Sicily (9), and the Trojan warrior Euphorbus who was slain by Menelaus (10). Horace uses a metaphor, *nox*, for death. It is the same end, *una nox*, that arrives for *omnes*. Even those who are close to the gods are not exempt from it.

Horace's emphasis that even the great will one day die raises another point. In the second book of *Odes*, he addresses the Roman politician Quintus Dellius:

cedes coemptis saltibus et domo
villaque flavus quam Tiberis lavit,
cedes, et exstructis in altum
divitiis potietur heres. (20)

divesne prisco natus ab Inacho
nil interest an pauper et infima
de gente sub divo moreris,
victima nil miserantis Orci.

omnes eodem cogimur, omnium (25)
versatur urna serius ocius
sors exitura et nos in aeternum
exsilium impositura cumbae. (*Carm*. 2.3.17-28)

You will leave, although you have bought up the woodland pastures and home,
and the villa which the blond Tiber washes;
you will leave, and your heir will become master
of the costly riches piled high to the sky.

Whether you remained under the sky
a rich man born from ancient Inachus or poor and from the humblest stock,
it makes no difference,
you will be a victim of pitiless Orcus.

We are all forced to the same end,
the lot of each man is turned in the urn,
sooner or later it will be taken
and will be placed on a skiff into our eternal exile.

[65] See book 11 of the *Odyssey*.

Quintus Dellius (4) was a diplomat who served Publius Cornelius Dolabella, Gaius Cassius Longinus, Mark Antony, and finally Octavian on military campaigns. At home, Horace instructs Dellius on the common destiny that awaits us all: "omnes eodem cogimur" (25). Horace repeats the verb *cedo* to signal that the properties which Dellius has bought, the *saltus*, *domus*, and *villa*, will one day no longer be his. Lines 19-20 recall Ofellus' precept (*Sat*. 2.2.132-35) that an *heres* will be owner of all the wealth which he has accumulated. Horace's point is that *dives* (21) or *pauper* (22), we must all face death. Nor does origin matter, whether one is a descendant of an Argive king (21) or born of the lowest class (22-23). The idea that death is inevitable for all is also found in a later poem in the same book: "sive reges | sive inopes… coloni" ("whether kings or poor farmers") (*Carm*. 2.14.11-12).

In the third book of *Odes*, Horace reiterates the same concepts:

est ut viro vir latius ordinet
arbusta sulcis, hic generosior (10)
descendat in Campum petitor,
moribus hic meliorque fama

contendat, illi turba clientium
sit maior: aeque lege Necessitas
sortitur insignis et imos; (15)
omne capax movet urna nomen. (*Carm*. 3.1.9-16)

It is a fact that a man may arrange
trees in the trenches wider than another,
this candidate, of more noble birth, descends to the Campus Martius,
this man with morals and a better reputation competes,

the number of followers may be greater for yet another:
Necessity by equal law
selects the distinguished and the lowest;
the spacious urn shakes every name.

He describes three candidates running for an election. The first owns vast territories (9), and he is "generosior" than the other two. The second is reputed for his morals and enjoys greater fame. Yet the third is the one who has the most followers. Repeating much the same idea found in *Carm*. 2.3.21-23 that wealth or status does not matter when it comes to one's ultimate end, Horace concludes that everyone will be reduced to ashes in an "urna" (*Carm*. 3.1.16).

Through the course of his career, Horace feels his age advance and death seems nearer to him. But before death comes retirement, and in *Ep*. 1.1, published some three years after the first three books of *Odes*, he tells Maecenas: "non eadem est aetas, non mens" ("I am not the age that I once was, neither is my mind") (*Ep.* 1.1.4). The first book of *Epistles* was published in 20 B.C.E., and the second book followed some eight years later in 12 B.C.E.

Horace addresses his epistles not only to his contemporaries such as Maecenas (*Ep*. 1.1, 1.7, 1.19) and Augustus (*Ep*. 2.2) but also to the young. His addressees include: Lollius Maximus (*Ep*. 1.2, 1.18), a young veteran in the Cantabrian war; his literary friend Julius Florus (*Ep*. 1.3, 2.2); an unidentified Numicius (*Ep*. 1.6); and Tiberius who would later succeed Augustus (*Ep*. 1.9).[66] Once a young aspiring poet earnestly addressing his satires to his new patron Maecenas, Horace in these epistles acts as a senior giving advice and warning to his juniors.

In *Ep*. 1.6, Horace advises Numicius on the importance of virtue (1-31) and warns him about the dangers of wealth (31-49), fame (49-55), gluttony (56-64), and love affairs (65-66). The concluding lines to the poem are:

> Vive, vale. si quod novisti rectius, istis
> candidus imperti; si nil, his utere mecum. (*Ep*. 1.6.67-68)

> Live, farewell. But if you have learned something more proper,
> kindly present me with those; if not, practice these with me.

The two words "Vive, vale" (67) come from an older man wishing the best of luck in life to a junior. However, Horace maintains a positive tone and, instead of living his life in fear of death, he contemplates how to live the days which he still has. Since *Ep*. 1.1 Horace shows an active interest in philosophy.[67] His maxim at the beginning of *Ep*. 1.6 is: "Nil admirari" ("To admire nothing") (1), which draws at once from Stoics and Epicureans and from Pythagoras, Democritus, Hesiod, Sophocles, Homer, and Mimnermus,[68] but in fact Horace does not remain fixed to one school of philosophy or a single philosopher.[69] He considers himself still a student of philosophy,[70] and as much as he has his own wisdom to impart as an older and learned man ("his," 68), it is not as if he is on his deathbed. Horace is open to new ideas ("istis," 67) which may serve as useful guidance for him in the remainder of his life.

This poem was imitated by Pope in 1737. Pope's rendering of the last lines are:

> Adieu – if this advice appear the worst,
> E'en take the Counsel which I gave you first:
> Or better Precepts if you can impart,

[66] In *Ep*. 1.9, instead of using his hard-won status for himself alone, Horace in middle age seeks to help a friend Septimius by asking Tiberius to include him in his circle. The *Ars Poetica* may be added to this list, as the *Pisones*, the addressees, may refer to Lucius Calpurnius Piso, the Pontifex (cos. 15 B.C.E.), and his sons. Piso's father (cos. 58 B.C.E.) was patron to Philodemus and Piso was the patron of Antipater of Thessalonica. Thus it is not inconceivable that Piso's sons, if he had any, shared the literary interests of the family and that Horace in the *AP* was attempting to guide them in their literary pursuits. See Rudd 1989, 19-21 for other possibilities.
[67] See Horace's declaration to Maecenas that he wishes to renounce lyric poetry and turn instead to philosophy (*Ep*. 1.1.10-12).
[68] See Mayer 1994, 156; Fairclough 2005, 284.
[69] Cf. Mayer: "[Horace's] own motto, *nil admirari*, is not in fact owed to any contemporary school, another indication… of his independent approach" (1994, 157).
[70] Cf. *Ep*. 1.17.3.

Why do, I'll follow them with all my heart. (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 1.6.130-33)

Like Horace, Pope addresses this epistle to a younger friend. William Murray (1705-1793), first Earl of Mansfield, was a lawyer and a famed orator. Little is known about the friendship between Pope and Murray, but Murray was certainly instrumental in Pope's literary lawsuits in his later poetic career. The young lawyer advised Pope in the Watson Piracy of his *Letters* of 1737, Curll's piracy of Pope's correspondence with Swift in 1741, the piracy of *Dunciad* IV in 1743 by Jacob Ilive, and the piracy by the engraver Bickham of the *Essay on Man* in 1744.[71] Even after Pope's death in 1744, Murray, together with George Arbuthnot, son of Pope's friend John Arbuthnot, assisted Martha Blount in protecting her bequest from Pope.[72]

Pope renders faithfully Horace's preaching of "Nil admirari:" "Not to Admire, is all the Art I know" (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 1.6.1), and like Horace Pope warns against "Wealth" (69), "Pow'r and Place" (97), "Gluttony" (112), and incestuous "Vice" (120), which the young rising Murray may wrongly admire. However, Pope seems unsure about the advice which he gives. He thinks that, instead of serving as useful guidance, it may "appear the worst" of counsels to the young noble man. As Jacob Fuchs points out, Pope fears the possibility that "Murray may not take his advice."[73] Furthermore, in Horace's original, the poet is open-minded to other and better teachings which Numicius may have learned (*Ep*. 1.6.67-68). But *si nil*, Horace says, then the young man should follow his advice (68). Whereas Horace uses an imperative, "utere" (68), Pope states that if Murray has "better Precepts" (132) to share, then "I'll follow them with all my heart" (133). Horace encourages his younger friend to follow him, but Pope says that he will follow the young lawyer. There is lack of confidence in Pope as he describes to the aspiring Murray the ideal image of a morally just public man.[74] In contrast to Horace's positive outlook in which he invites a younger man to search for and practice together ("mecum," *Ep*. 1.6.68) precepts which may be useful to life, the future looks bleak to Pope.

There is another Horatian *Imitation* which Pope addressed to William Murray: *The First Ode of the Fourth Book of Horace: To Venus*. Although this poem was published first before *The Sixth Epistle of the First Book of Horace Imitated*, both were published in 1737. *Carm*. 4.1 was most likely intended to congratulate Paullus Fabius Maximus (born *c*. 46

[71] See Foxon 1991, 245-50.
[72] See Rumbold 1989, 289. See also Erskine-Hill (2007).
[73] Fuchs 1989, 125.
[74] Cf. Fuchs: "[Pope's] fear is that others do not recognize or respect them" (ibid., 128); and Stack who states that Pope in the *Hor. Imit. Ep*. 1.6 wavers between "idealism and skepticism, confidence and doubt" (1985, 220).

B.C.E., consul in 11 B.C.E.) on his marriage to Marcia, a cousin of Augustus.[75] In the opening lines he pleads to Venus that he is no longer fit for passion (2). He confesses: "non sum qualis eram" ("I am not such as I was," 3). By the fourth book of *Odes*, he describes himself as being around fifty years old ("circa lustra decem," *Carm.* 4.1.6). He tells Venus to direct her commands ("imperiis," 7) to Paullus Maximus:

tempestivius in domum
Pauli purpureis ales oloribus (10)
comissabere Maximi,
si torrere iecur quaeris idoneum.

namque et nobilis et decens
et pro sollicitis non tacitus reis
et centum puer artium (15)
late signa feret militiae tuae. (*Carm.* 4.1.9-16)

It will be timelier for you,
winged with gleaming swans,
to be joined together in the house of Paullus Maximus,
if you seek a suitable passion to inflame.

For he is both noble and handsome,
and not silent in the service of troubled defendants
and the young man of a hundred talents
will carry far and wide the signs of your army.

The image of Venus entering Maximus' residence (9) may be an allusion to the young man's wedding to Marcia.[76] After persuading Venus that Maximus would be better fit for passion than himself, Horace lists many good qualities about the groom. Maximus was an aristocrat ("nobilis," 13), who was to wed the cousin of the Roman ruler Augustus. He was also a good-looking man ("decens," 13) who deserves notice by Venus (16). Horace describes him as if he was a lawyer (14),[77] and he compliments the young man as endowed with *centum artes* (15).[78] Horace feels too old for passion, and he suggests to Venus to turn to the younger generation.

Similarly addressed to Venus, Pope's *Imitation* celebrates Murray and his forthcoming marriage to Elizabeth Finch, daughter of Daniel Finch, the second Earl of Nottingham.[79] Like Horace, Pope too was approaching fifty. Pope tells Venus:

To *Number five* direct your Doves,
There spread round MURRAY all your blooming Loves; (10)
Noble and young, who strikes the heart
With every sprightly, every decent part;
Equal, the injur'd to defend,

[75] Syme 1986, 403.
[76] Thomas 2011, 91.
[77] Syme 1986, 409 states that there remains no evidence of this.
[78] Thomas 2011, 93 notes the strange reference to Maximus as a *puer* in line 15, as he would already have been around thirty years old, and suggests that Horace may be speaking of Cupid as "the eternal *puer*."
[79] The marriage took place on 20 September 1738.

To charm the Mistress, or to fix the Friend.
He, with a hundred Arts refin'd, (15)
Shall stretch thy Conquests over half the kind. (*Hor. Imit. Carm.* 4.1.9-14)

Like Horace who mentions Maximus' villa by the Alban Lake (*Carm*. 4.1.19), Pope says that Venus better go to "*Number five*" (9), Murray's residence at King's Bench Walk. Unlike Pope who was a merchant's son and "sober fifty" (6) in age, Murray belonged to the Scottish nobility, the son of the Fifth Viscount of Stormont. Pope's diction when describing Murray - "strikes" (11), "sprightly" and "decent" (12), "charm" and "fix" (14), and "Conquests" (16) - evokes the image of a young man gifted with both intellect and physical strength.

Murray had been called to the Bar in November 1730 and, taking literally "pro sollicitis non tacitus reis" (*Carm*. 4.1.14),[80] Pope commends the young lawyer: "Equal, the injur'd to defend" (13).[81] It seems that Pope's statement is sincere, as a couple of years later in 1739 he writes to Swift: "There is a Lord Cornbury,[82] a Lord Polwarth, a Mr Murray, & one or two more, with whom I would never fear to hold out against all the Corruption of the world."[83] Pope's description that Murray possessed "a hundred Arts refin'd" (15) is also true. As his older brother James was acquainted with Francis Atterbury, Dean of Westminster School, Murray had moved to London at the age of thirteen to receive his education there. He later graduated from Christ Church, Oxford. Thus he not only received the best education in the classical languages, but one of his "Arts" was that he was a skilled speaker. To this Pope was a contributor as he in fact taught oratory to Murray, not the writing of speeches but their delivery.[84] As James McLaverty remarks, "there can be little doubt that it [the poem] was intended chiefly as a compliment to him [Murray]."[85] Pope's comments on Murray seem sincere and contain no bitterness.

However, after having beseeched Venus to spare him passionate flames, Horace says:

sed cur, heu, Ligurine, cur
    manat rara meas lacrima per genas?
cur facunda parum decoro (35)
    inter verba cadit lingua silentio?

nocturnis ego somniis
    iam captum teneo, iam volucrem sequor
te per gramina Martii

[80] It seems that Pope believed that Maximus in Horace's original was a lawyer; see note 85.
[81] Murray enjoyed a very successful public career, as he was elected a Member of Parliament and appointed Solicitor General in 1742. After Pope's death, Murray became Attorney General in 1754 and Lord Chief Justice in 1756.
[82] Henry Hyde, Viscount Cornbury and Baron Hyde.
[83] *Corr*. 4:178.
[84] See *TE*, 4:372.
[85] McLaverty 2001, 201.

Campi, te per aquas, dure, volubilis. (*Carm*. 4.1.33-40)

But why, ah, Ligurinus, why
does an occasional tear trickle down my cheeks?
Why does my eloquent speech falter
between words in ungraceful silence?

I hold you captive now in my nightly dreams,
I follow you now
flying across the grass of the Campus Martius,
swirling, I follow you, cruel one, through the waters.

The verbs are in the present tense, and for a moment we are led to think that, contrary to his statement at the opening of the poem, Horace is at present in love with a boy named Ligurinus.[86] However, as A.T. Bradshaw has pointed out, the description is more likely "a dream in the present *about the past*."[87] The *gramina Martii Campi* was an athletic ground, and "per aquas" refers to swimming. These were activities geared towards the young and it is highly unlikely that Horace, at *circa lustra decem*, would have been among those athletes.

When thinking of Ligurinus, Horace finds that, though *rarus*, he cannot withhold tears (34). He is not like the strong, handsome Maximus who can lead Venus' army (14 and 16). Unlike Maximus who is *non tacitus* when it comes to standing up for his defendants (14), Horace wonders why he cannot keep himself from faltering in mid-speech (35-36). Horace's actions stand in contrast to the dignified portrait which he earlier presents of Maximus. Throughout the poem Horace makes many contrasts between the young and old. Horace certainly laments his lost youth in the *Ode*, but in naming and speaking highly of the young aristocrat Paullus Maximus, he shows that he is aware that it is time for him to pass the baton to his younger counterparts.

Pope's version is similarly poignant:

- But why? ah tell me, ah too dear!
Steals down my cheek th'involuntary Tear?
Why words so flowing, thoughts so free,
Stop, or turn nonsense at one glance of Thee? (40)
Thee, drest in Fancy's airy beam,
Absent I follow thro' th'extended Dream,
Now, Now I seize, I clasp thy charms,
And now you burst, (ah cruel!) from my arms,
And swiftly shoot along the Mall, (45)
Or softly glide by the Canal,
Now shown by Cynthia's silver Ray,
And now, on rolling Waters snatch'd away. (*Hor. Imit. Carm.* 4.1.37-48)

[86] Like Cinara in *Carm*. 4.1.4, Ligurinus, though it may be a real cognomen, is most likely a fictional character; see Thomas 2011, 88-89 for Cinara and ibid., 100-1 for Ligurinus.
[87] Bradshaw 1970, 153.

In the middle of the poem Pope envisions Murray's future as filled with "smiling Loves" and "young Desires" (26). At his residence, there will be energy and activity: "Exalt the Dance, or animate the Song" (28). There is youth and passion for Murray. By contrast, for Pope there is only "Fancy" (41). Unlike Horace who leaves the possibility that he may really be in love with Ligurinus as he writes, there is no doubt in Pope's version that he is describing a "Dream" (42). Expanding on Horace's repetition of "iam" which occurs twice in line (38), Pope repeats "now" five times in lines 43-48 of his version. There is action in the present: "I follow" (42), "I seize" (43), "I clasp" (43), "you burst" (44), "[you] swiftly shoot" (45), and "[you] softly glide" (46). However, it is only a "Dream" and his beloved is ever elusive.

Just as in *The Second Epistle of the Second Book of Horace* published later in the same year, the image of stealing is a strong presence. In *The First Ode of the Fourth Book of Horace: To Venus*, Pope transforms Horace's Latin "manat" (*Carm*. 4.1.34) into "Steals" (38). The verb *mano, -are* signifies the action of liquid pouring or flowing out. It could also mean the act of shedding tears. However, Pope states that it is his tear that "Steals" (38). He feels that his tear takes away something from him. In addition, in the final line of the poem his object of love is "on rolling Waters snatch'd away." The same verbs, to steal and to snatch, are employed in *The Second Epistle of the Second Book of Horace*:

Years foll'wing Years, *steal* something ev'ry day,
At last they steal us from our selves away;
…
This subtle Thief of Life, this paltry Time,
What will it leave me, if it *snatch* my Rhime? (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.2.72-77)[88]

I have discussed that in this passage it is "Years," or time, that "steal[s]," and it is "Time" which Pope fears may "snatch" his verse. In his *Imitation* of *Carm*. 4.1, it is a "Tear" that "Steals," and it is by the "Waters" that his beloved is "snatch'd." During this period Pope in fact had an inclination to compare the flow of water to the passing of time. He writes in a letter to Swift dated 30 December 1736:

[A]s when the continual washing of a river takes away our flowers and plants, it throws weeds and sedges in their room; so the course of time brings us something, as it deprives us of a great deal.[89]

Pope compares the "continual washing of a river" to the "course of time." Time, like a river flowing, takes away things that he loves and admires ("flowers and plants"), and in their place he finds things of lesser or no significant value ("weeds and sedges"). In his interpretation of the passage of time, the loss is greater than the benefit. At his age he feels that he has lost "a

[88] My italics.
[89] *Corr*., 4:50.

great deal," and even in his "Dream," Pope sees his beloved not in his embrace but "snatch'd away."

Pope never names his object of passion in the poem. Frank Stack assumes that Pope is referring to Martha Blount.[90] Far gone are the days "in the gentle Reign of My Queen *Anne*" (*Hor. Imit. Carm.* 4.1.4), when in his career he wrote deeply emotional poems on love and loss such as *Eloisa to Abelard* and *Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady*, and when in his private life he was infatuated with Teresa Blount and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. It is difficult to find a possibility other than Martha. Following Gay's death in late 1732, Pope wrote to Martha:

> Let us comfort one another, and if possible, study to add as much more friendship to each other… I promise you more and more of mine, which will be the way to deserve more and more of yours.[91]

Pope uses the term "friendship," but there is special affection for his long-time female friend. Finally, Pope may really have been thinking of Martha in his "Fancy" (41), as he signs off a letter to her once with the words: "I'm going to dream of you."[92]

Pope sounds less optimistic than Horace. In his *Imitation* of *Ep*. 1.6, he seems doubtful as to whether the young Murray will take his advice. However, Pope is nevertheless willing to entrust the future to Murray and, by extension, to the younger generation. Pope's days of passion are over. He imagines love in a "Dream." It is illusory and not real. Yet Pope still has hope for the future as, like Horace to Paullus Maximus, he writes a commendatory poem on the occasion of a young aspiring man on his wedding. Marriage invokes the possibility of offspring. Although mortality and death are frequently on Pope's mind in the 1730s, he also knows that there may be birth, life, and continuity.

[90] Stack 1985, 109.
[91] *Corr*., 3:336.
[92] Letter to Martha, 4 July 1739(*ibid.*, 4, 186).

Chapter 10
Virtue: Fall and Redemption

Love of the countryside, thoughts on aging and mortality, and retirement from his literary profession were some of the common points which Pope found with Horace. In 1737, besides *The First Epistle of the Second Book of Horace* which carries political overtones, Pope also published the more personal poems of *The First Ode of the Fourth Book of Horace* in March and *The Second Epistle of the Second Book of Horace* in April. He continued with *The Sixth Epistle of the First Book* in January 1738 and *The First Epistle of the First Book* in March. I demonstrated in the previous chapter that in imitating these Horatian poems, Pope found solace and direction on how to live the remainder of his life. I argued that this was a significant factor in Pope's decision to imitate Horace's poems in middle age. This chapter will be dedicated to Pope's *One Thousand Seven Hundred and Thirty Eight. A Dialogue Something like Horace* and *One Thousand Seven Hundred and Thirty Eight. Dialogue II*, subsequently renamed in 1740 *Epilogue to the Satires. Written in 1738. Dialogue I* and *Dialogue II*, and his posthumously published *1740*, and I shall argue that these poems reveal Pope's parting of ways with Horace as Pope returns to his public self.

The first section will explore Pope's rupture with Horace. The *Dialogues* still bear important links to the Horatian *Imitations*, but Horace is mentioned only in the first *Dialogue*. However, I will show that this does not indicate that Pope lost his esteem for Horace. Rather, Pope finds that the companionship which he sought with Horace over the previous half decade by drawing parallels with the ancient poet's thoughts and expressions is no longer appropriate for him. Horace is no longer suitable as a model as Pope in the two *Dialogues* returns to his public role of promoting virtue and condemning vice, which for him also includes opposition to the current government.

In the second section I will examine Pope's personifications of Virtue and Vice.[1] In the first *Dialogue*, he depicts the triumph of Vice and defeat of Virtue. This is the current state of his nation as it appears in his eyes. Virtue is restored to her respected status in the second *Dialogue*, but for Pope this is an image of England in the future. Thus I will demonstrate that while Pope has hope for the future, he has given up on improvement in the present. At the end

[1] Virtue and Vice are capitalized in this chapter when they refer to Pope's personified figures.

of the two *Dialogues*, Pope announces his intention not to compose any more of these poems, as he deems it dangerous as well as futile to publish them in the present times.

This will lead us to the last section which will be devoted to Pope's fragmentary poem *1740*, in which Pope again expresses hope for the future of his nation. I discussed in Chapter 9 that he entrusts the future to William Murray in matters of private life such as marriage and potential offspring. This chapter will show that Pope expresses hope for the future in public and political matters in his belief that Frederick, Prince of Wales, will make the necessary changes for the nation. Pope could not help but notice the corruption and degradation of the England in which he lived, but he also believed in redemption.

I. Parting with Horace: "Please at Court, and make AUGUSTUS smile"[2]

We immediately see Pope's parting of ways with Horace in the two poems written in 1738. *One Thousand Seven Hundred and Thirty Eight. A Dialogue Something like Horace* was published in May 1738. It is a poem not based on Horace but merely *Something like Horace*. As Jacob Fuchs remarks: "the *Epilogue to the Satires* is *Something Like Horace*, its subtitle, only in being a dialogue."[3] A sequel followed two months later in July, bearing the title *One Thousand Seven Hundred and Thirty Eight. Dialogue II*. The poem contains no indication about Horace. In his octavo edition of 1740, the titles of the two poems were changed to *Epilogue to the Satires. Written in 1738. Dialogue I* and *Epilogue to the Satires. Written in 1738. Dialogue II*. Horace has all but disappeared. However, while these poems are not imitations of any of Horace's works, they serve as conclusions to Pope's Horatian series. Echoes of *The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace Imitated* (1733), Pope's first Horatian *Imitation*, are found in both *Dialogues*.[4] Pope no longer attempts to draw parallels with Horace as he did in the *Imitations*, but instead he presents his own views towards Horace.

A fictional "Friend" opens the speech in *Dialogue* 2:

Not twice a twelvemonth you appear in Print,
And when it comes, the Court see nothing in't. (*Dia*. 1.1-2)

[2] *Dia*. 1.20.
[3] Fuchs 1989, 144.
[4] See *Dia*. 1.7-10 and *Dia*. 2.1-3.

Pope wrote in the notes to this poem: "These two lines are from Horace [*Sat*. ii.iii.1-4]; and the only lines that are so in the whole Poem."[5] The original passage has been discussed in the previous chapter, but its focus was on Horace's potential laziness. Let us take a look at the passage again:

Sic raro scribis ut toto non quarter anno
membranam poscas, scriptorum quaeque retexens,
iratus tibi quod vini somnique benignus
nil dignum sermone canas. quid fiet? (*Sat*. 2.3.1-4)

You write so seldom, that you ask for parchment not four times in an entire year,
revising each of your writings,
angry at yourself because, bounteous of wine and sleep,
you sing nothing worthy of discussion. What shall be done?

Damasippus, as we know, is an art dealer and a ruined banker. While he may believe that the teachings of the Stoic philosopher Stertinius helped him rise from his bankruptcy and may wish to confer the same precepts to others, he is rather critical of Horace. Damasippus does not sound like a sympathetic friend. However, although Pope did not imitate the entirety of *Sat*. 2.3, Damasippus is the model which he uses for the "Friend" in his *Dialogue*. We can already foresee potential constraints in the *Dialogue*, as we may expect the "Friend" to be, perhaps honest and upfront but, certainly not a caring and understanding companion.

Pope's "Friend" may indeed be harsher than Horace's Damasippus. Damasippus accuses Horace of being so lazy as to turn to his writing material not even four times in a year ("toto non quarter anno," 1). The "Friend"'s claim in Pope's version is: "Not twice a twelvemonth" (1). There is of course a difference to be accounted for in that Damasippus refers to Horace's frequency in writing ("scribis," 1), whereas the "Friend" points to how often Pope "appears in Print" (1). The methods of reaching their respective audiences were different for Horace and Pope. For Horace, it may have been a recitation to his literary circle or a manuscript delivered directly to his patron.[6] For Pope, it was necessary that he print and publish. Nevertheless, there may be lack of appreciation on the "Friend"'s part, that he only measures how many times the poet "appears in Print."[7] The "Friend" does not seem to take into account whether the product is a result of hard, long labor or a sloppy, speedily written piece. Moreover, Damasippus remarks that, in the infrequent occurrences on which Horace

[5] *TE*, 4:297n. Stack 1985, 276 is of the opinion that Pope's two *Dialogues* are based on both *Sat*. 2.3 and 2.7, a dialogue that takes place between Horace and his slave Davus during the Saturnalia when slaves were permitted to speak freely, even criticize one's own master.
[6] Horace writes that he does this by way of a messenger; see *Ep*. 1.13.1-3.
[7] Rudd 2005b, 240 points out that, aside from the *Dialogues*, Pope had already published the *Hor. Imit. Ep*. 1.6 and 1.1 in 1738 and the *Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.2 and 2.1 and an edition of his letters in 1737. The words of the "Friend" can hardly be trusted: "we are on our guard against taking this 'friend' seriously" (ibid.).

writes, he produces work that is "nil dignum sermone" (*Sat*. 2.3.4). However, this is in large part due to the poet's tendency to be "vini somnique benignus" (*Sat*. 2.3.3). Damasippus is accusing Horace of a lack of seriousness and concentration. In Pope's version the "Friend"'s claim is slightly different. He states that whatever Pope publishes, "the Court see nothing in't" (2). It is the court's judgment that matters, and the "Friend" is correct in pointing this out. Pope must be cautious of his own safety with regards to matters such as censorship. On the one hand, this is a sagacious remark on the part of the "Friend," but, on the other, it is also true that he remains cold and too matter-of-fact. The "Friend" in Pope's *Dialogues* is hardly a supportive friend.

The theme of friendship takes on a new turn in the two *Dialogues*. I discussed in the previous chapters the importance of friendship in Pope's life. In Chapter 2, I mentioned that imitation proved to be a convenient vehicle for poets such as Cowley, whom Pope admired, who wished to confess his inner thoughts by responding to an earlier work by a different author. Pope became an imitator of Horace in the 1730s and in Chapter 9, I discussed how friendship became especially cherished in Pope's life as he lost his mother and some of his contemporaries. Pope was never able to build good relations at court and he made many personal foes in his career, but he prided himself on having his own set of loyal aristocratic friends. There is frequent mention of friends in the two *Dialogues* (*Dia*. 1.22, 23, 55, 99; *Dia*. 2.91, 93, 94, 100, 115, 118, 121, 123, 134, 143, 167, 203). However, in these poems, friendship, once the source of joy and security in Pope's life, is jeopardized.

In the first *Dialogue* Pope's "Friend" forewarns:

But 'faith your very Friends will soon be sore;
Patriots there are, who wish you'd jest no more. (*Dia*. 1.23-24)

The "Friend" considers it a realistic possibility that, in addition to Pope's personal and political enemies, those whom he considers his friends may fall out with him. Thomas Edwards and Dustin H. Griffin have argued that the two speakers in the *Dialogues*, "Fr." and "P.," are in fact representations of Pope and that the dialogue form serves to accentuate the conflicting attitudes Pope struggled with.[8] The "Friend"'s remark may well reflect an inner fear which Pope feels about himself.

While the statement that Pope's friends may not be content with his satire is in the future tense ("will soon be sore," 23), the "Friend" points out in the present tense that there are already Patriots "who wish you'd jest no more" (24). "*Patriots*" usually referred to those

[8] Edwards 1971, 110; Griffin 1978, 168-69.

in the Opposition party to Walpole's government.[9] Pope was of course on the side of the Opposition, but this would mean that those whom he thought were his political allies in fact do not see him in a sympathetic light because of what he does in his poetry. We may recall that in the very first Horatian *Imitation* Pope had applied his case to Horace's:

THERE are (I scarce can think it, but am told)
There are to whom my Satire seems too bold. (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.1-2)

He had attacked contemporary figures such as Peter Walter (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.3), Francis Charteris (4), and Lord Hervey (6) many times before in his poetry, and he knew that many who were mentioned by name or nickname were apparently, and understandably, incensed. However, it is a little frightening to imagine that those whom he considered to be his friends may not be his allies. The statement is rendered more ominous by the fact that the "Friend" does not name those who wish that Pope would "jest no more." It is one thing to be aware that he may never be reconciled to his long-time personal foes and the court, but it is another to think that his alliances and friendships may not be as solid as he had always assumed.

In the second *Dialogue*, the "Friend" criticizes Pope's manner of pointing out vice in real live figures. The "Friend" thinks that Pope goes overboard in his attacks:

What always *Peter? Peter* thinks you mad,
You make men desp'rate if they once are bad. (*Dia*. 2.58-59)

Pope rebuts by providing a list of those whom he feels deserve his praise:

But does the Court a worthy Man remove?
That instant, I declare, he has my Love: (75)
I shun his Zenith, court his mild Decline;
Thus SOMMERS once, and HALIFAX were mine.
Oft in the clear, still Mirrour of Retreat,
I study'd SHREWSBURY, the wise and great:
CARLETON's calm Sense, and STANHOPE's noble Flame, (80)
Compar'd, and knew their gen'rous End the same:
How pleasing ATTERBURY's softer hour!
How shin'd the Soul, unconquer'd in the Tow'r!
How can I PULT'NEY, CHESTERFIELD forget,
While *Roman* Spirit charms, and *Attic* Wit: (85)
ARGYLE, the State's whole Thunder born to wield,
And shake alike the Senate and the Field:
Or WYNDHAM, just to Freedom and the Throne,
The Master of our Passions, and his own.
Names, which I long have lov'd, nor lov'd in vain, (90)
Rank'd with their Friends, not number'd with their Train;
And if yet higher the proud List should end,
Still let me say! No Follower, but a Friend. (*Dia*. 2.74-93)

[9] See Section III on the political situation at the time of composition of these poems.

In the course of some twenty lines, Pope names or alludes to more than ten figures. John Lord Sommers (77) and the Earl of Halifax (77) were early acquaintances in Pope's life. Both became successful politicians and were supportive of Pope's literary career, offering to be his patron and subscribing to his translation of the *Iliad*.[10] Pope boldly claims that they "were mine" (77). Sommers and Halifax, as well as others in the passage such as Carleton and Chesterfield, had at one time or another in their political careers been dismissed from their office. Atterbury and Wyndham were imprisoned. The passage is a list of real English people in whom Pope found meritorious qualities, and he finds occasion not only to praise them but also to point out the ironic reality of what has happened to these men or merit: "does the Court a worthy Man remove?" (74).

Charles Talbot, the Duke of Shrewsbury (78-79) held many high offices. He was appointed Secretary of State, Lord Chamberlain, ambassador to France, Lord Lieutenant to Ireland, and Lord Treasurer. Pope praises him as "the wise and great" (79). They were acquainted in person.[11] In addition to his prominent political status, the Duke of Shrewsbury was a supporter of the literary arts. He approved of Dryden's works and assisted the author financially in his preparation of a folio edition of his works in 1697. Pope himself submitted an early draft of his *Universal Prayer* in 1715 and it was Shrewsbury who prompted him to compose a versification of John Donne's *Satires*.[12]

Henry Boyle, Baron Carleton, was another renowned politician with whom Pope was acquainted in early adulthood. In public life, he served as Lord of the Treasury, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Secretary of State.

James Stanhope, the first Earl of Stanhope, was a military commander and later held several high posts in his political career much like Carleton. Stanhope was appointed Secretary of State, First Lord of the Treasury, and Chancellor of the Exchequer. However, in contrast to Carleton who was a supporter of Walpole, he joined Sunderland against the Walpole-Townshend faction. Like Sommers, Shrewsbury, and Carleton, Stanhope was known for his wise conduct, sound judgment, and upright and incorrupt character ("CARLETON's calm Sense, and STANHOPE's noble Flame," 80). And like Halifax, he supported Pope in his publication of the translation of *The Iliad*.[13]

[10] See Chapter 5.
[11] See *Corr*., 1:417.
[12] *TE*, 4:386-87.
[13] See Chapter 5 and *Prose Works*, 1:255 for lists of those whom Pope acknowledges in the Preface to the first volume of his translation of *The Iliad*.

Francis Atterbury was the Bishop of Rochester and Dean of Westminster School. He was, of course, one of Pope's dearest friends. When he was imprisoned in the Tower in 1722 for the Jacobite Plot which he led in 1717, Atterbury suggested that Pope testify on his behalf, a request to which Pope willingly agreed.[14] Although Atterbury was exiled to France on 19 June 1723, from where he never returned, some fifteen years later in the composition of this *Dialogue* Pope still remembers the courage of his elderly friend in the face of the cruel treatment which he endured. Pope writes that Atterbury's soul still shined (83) and, though imprisoned and the outcome of the trial was foreseeable, he describes that the Bishop remained "unconquer'd in the Tow'r!" (83).[15]

William Pulteney, the Earl of Bath (84), and Philip Dormer Stanhope, the fourth Earl of Chesterfield (84), were both Pope's contemporaries and had been acquainted with him since as early as 1717. Once loyal supporters of Walpole, they became his fierce opponents, Pulteney on account of not having been given office in the 1720s and Chesterfield upon his dismissal due to his opposition to Walpole's Excise Bill in the 1730s. Pulteney was an eloquent orator, rivaling William Pitt in his reputation. Pope commends Pulteney's "*Roman* Spirit" (85) in delivering his ambitious yet graceful speeches and Chesterfield, who had been Ambassador at the Hague, for his "*Attic* Wit" in conducting skillful diplomacy (85).

John Campbell, second Duke of Argyle, was a military commander who served under the Tory ministry yet changed allegiances to the Whig opposition in 1713, speaking against Queen Anne's government. He was also the leading figure in crushing the Jacobite Rebellion of 1715 and thus contributed to the Hanoverian succession of the throne in England. In lines 86-87, Pope accentuates Argyle's dual status of army chief and statesman by using terms related to war and the military. He describes that Argyle was "the State's whole Thunder born to wield" (86), as if he could create a sort of "Thunder" to be used as a weapon to assert control and authority. His forcefulness was such that he could "shake alike the Senate and the Field" (87). Pope had known Argyle since 1717 or earlier,[16] but at the time of composition of this *Dialogue* it probably mattered more to him that Argyle had recently switched allegiances again and joined the Opposition.

[14] See Atterbury's letter sent from the Tower to Pope on 10 April 1723 (*Corr*., 2:165) and Pope's reply on 20 April (*ibid*., 166-68). Pope wrote two more letters to Atterbury in the Tower (*ibid*., 168-70) before he saw his friend for the last time on 17 June, two days before the banishment.
[15] Cf. Gordon 1976, 170 who states that lines 82-83 are Pope's "tribute to [Atterbury's] courage in adversity."
[16] See *Corr*., 1:417.

Sir William Wyndham, on the other hand, remained a Tory throughout. He was Secretary at War and Chancellor of the Exchequer but was imprisoned following the failure of the Jacobite Rebellion in 1715. He remained close to Bolingbroke even while the latter was in exile, and around the time when the *Dialogue* was written, the new Opposition party which upheld Frederick, Prince of Wales, was eager to include Wyndham in their circle. It is no surprise that Pope, who was in opposition to Walpole's ministry, hailed Wyndham as being "just to Freedom and the Throne" (88). He calls Wyndham "The Master of *our* Passions, and his own" (89),[17] evidently indicating that Wyndham shared the same political views as himself and other Opposition members. Despite his strong will and bold acts against the government, Wyndham was a respected figure in London.

Last of all, though not called by name, Pope makes an allusion to the Prince of Wales: "if yet higher the proud List should end" (92).[18] Pope was cultivating a personal friendship with the Prince and he had recently presented one of his dog Bounce's puppies. Pope even wrote an epigram with the title *Engraved on the Collar of a* Dog *which I gave to his Royal Highness*. The short text is:

I AM his Highness' Dog at *Kew*;
Pray tell me Sir, whose Dog are you?[19]

For Pope, unlike his intimate friends of long years such as Swift, the Prince was a rather recent friend. Nevertheless, the playful tone in this epigram reflects the jovial friendship which the two owners must have shared. The Prince had paid a visit to Pope at Twickenham in 1735.[20] One may recall that in the first Horatian *Imitation* Pope boasted:

There, my Retreat the best Companions grace,
Chiefs, out of War, and Statesmen, out of Place.
…
Envy must own, I live among the Great. (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1. 125-26, 133)

It is no exaggeration to say that Pope lived "among the Great." However, his high profile visitors at Twickenham were "out of War" or "out of Place," those who had retired or fallen from public life. Such is not the case with Frederick, the Prince of Wales. Moreover, Pope's insistence that he is "No follower, but a Friend" (93) of the Prince may be construed as Pope hiding an ulterior motive. While the friendship that was developing between Pope and the

[17] My italics.
[18] See *TE*, 4:318n.
[19] *Ibid*., 6:372. The Prince held his residence at Kew House since 1732. The epigram was written around the year 1736/37 and included in the second volume of Pope's *Works* (1738). See also Lyttelton's letter to Pope on 22 December 1736 (*Corr*., 4:48).
[20] See *TE*, 4:318n.

Prince may have been sincere, there may well be a political motive as well which Pope deems safer not to admit.

Pope continues:

Yet think not Friendship only prompts my Lays;
I follow *Virtue*, where she shines, I praise,
Point she to Priest or Elder, Whig or Tory. (*Dia*. 2.94-96)

Pope adds that the long list of those whom he has just praised is not due to their being his personal friends (94). He turns to his own defense in stating that when he finds virtuous qualities in a person, he does not hesitate to extol (95). He claims that he is indiscriminate in this process. It does not matter what profession the person holds, whether young or old, or to what political faction the person belongs ("Priest or Elder, Whig or Tory," 96). This may have been a sincere intention on Pope's part, but what he has done in lines 74-93 only serves to cast doubt on his statement. Sommers and Halifax held high offices in public life and were fervent supporters of Pope's literary career. However, by the time of composition of the *Dialogues* both had been dead for over two decades. Sommers had passed away in 1716 and Halifax in 1715. Similarly, Pope praises Shrewsbury, Carleton, and Stanhope for their wisdom and incorruptness, but like Sommers and Halifax these figures had long since passed away.[21] Atterbury was one of Pope's closest friends, but he had been exiled to France in 1723 and died there in 1732, never having set foot on English soil again. By contrast, Pulteney, Chesterfield, Argyle, and Wyndham were Pope's contemporaries. They were active in politics in the 1730s as supporters of the new Opposition circle which now emerged around the Prince of Wales, and all contributed to the fall of Walpole's ministry. Pope's mention of these four figures and the allusion to the Prince of Wales adds a strong political flavor to the poem.

The "Friend" does not dwell on the political aspects of Pope's list of meritorious friends but instead turns the topic of the conversation to his original remark. The "Friend"'s criticism was:

What always *Peter? Peter* thinks you mad,
You make men desp'rate if they once are bad. (*Dia*. 2.58-59)

The "Friend" feels that figures such as Peter Walter have become stock characters in Pope's poetry and that Pope uses them over and over again in various poems to point out the vices of English society. The villains are abundant, but there is a dearth of virtuous people. Pope's sudden, albeit long, recitation of honorable friends is not enough to convince the "Friend."

[21] Shrewsbury died in 1718, Carleton in 1725, and Stanhope in 1721.

To Pope's argument that he does not hesitate to praise those who deserve to be recognized ("I follow Virtue, where she shines, I praise," 95), the "Friend" puts forth the question:

Then why so few commended?

To which Pope immediately reiterates his argument:

Not so fierce;
Find you the Virtue, and I'll find the Verse. (*Dia*. 2.94-95)

Pope stands by in his conviction that praise in verse should be bestowed only on those whose virtues are real.

Pope cites a literary example from Roman history to support his argument:

To *Cato, Virgil* pay'd one honest line. (*Dia*. 2.120)

The "one honest line" of Virgil refers to line 670 in the eighth book of the *Aeneid*:

Secretosque pios, his dantem iura Catonem.[22]

And the pious ones set apart, Cato giving them laws.

In the eighth book of the *Aeneid* Aeneas makes preparations for war against Turnus. He is welcomed by the Arcadian king Evander who offers his son Pallas to take part in the battle, but most of all this book contains descriptions of Aeneas' armor which Venus besought Vulcan to forge for her son. Vulcan, along with the Cyclopes, made a helmet, sword, corselet, spear, and shield. The shield depicts scenes of the history of Rome, including the myth of the she-wolf nursing Romulus and Remus, the battle of Actium, Mark Antony with Cleopatra, and the triumph of Augustus. In this description a Cato is mentioned, but Virgil in his line does not specify which Cato. Marcus Porcius Cato (234–149 B.C.E.), or Cato the Elder, was a successful yet merciless military commander in the Second Punic War in modern-day Spain. He insisted on gathering forces for the Third Punic War to ensure the destruction of Carthage. The other possibility is Marcus Porcius Cato Uticensis (95–46 B.C.E.). Known as Cato the Younger, he was the great-grandson of Cato the Elder. He was a republican who was fiercely opposed to the First Triumvirate of Gaius Julius Caesar, Marcus Licinius Crassus, and Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus. Even after the First Triumvirate dissolved at Crassus' death in 53 B.C.E., personal enmities continued between Cato and Caesar. He pursued Caesar, now declared an enemy of the State, and his forces. However in 46 B.C.E., in the African city of Utica, he committed suicide rather than conceding defeat or seeking Caesar's pardon.

[22] Virgil 1907, 294.

Joseph Spence recorded Pope's comment on the line about Virgil:

> The *Aeneid* was evidently a party piece, as much as *Absalom and Achitopel*. Virgil [was] as slavish a writer as any of the gazetteers. I have formerly said that Virgil wrote one honest line:
>
> Secretosque pios, his dantem iura Catonem
>
> (*Aeneid*, viii. 670)
>
> and that, I now believe, was not meant of Cato Uticensis.[23]

Modern scholars generally agree that Virgil was referring to Cato Uticensis.[24] Pope thought the same when he wrote and published the *Dialogue*. He found it courageous of Virgil, a court poet in Augustan Rome, to depict Cato Uticensis, a republican in the Civil War, as a wise and righteous man.[25] Thus he commended Virgil's audacity in writing an "honest" line when it may not have been the safest option for him to do so. The conversation between Pope and Spence took place in 1739, more than a year after the publication of *Dialogue* 2. Pope apparently seems to have changed his mind by then. However, this is not to say that Pope lost his admiration for Virgil. Pope's doubt about whether Virgil meant the republican Cato Uticensis or Cato the Elder reflects a greater anxiety growing in him about his attempt to draw parallels with Augustan poets. Pope slowly arrives at the conclusion that Virgil's situation and that of other Augustan poets simply did not apply to his world. This time he cannot turn away from this truth, and the companionship which Pope sought in Horace over the last half decade likewise comes to a close.

Pope's parting of ways with Horace in fact takes place already in the first *Dialogue*. In the opening section of the poem, the "Friend" points out the difference between Horace and Pope:

> But *Horace*, Sir, was delicate, was nice;
> *Bubo* observes, he lash'd no sort of *Vice:*
> *Horace* would say, *Sir* Billy *serv'd the Crown,*
> Blunt *could do Bus'ness,* H-ggins *knew the Town,*
> In *Sappho* touch the *Failing of the Sex,* (15)
> In rev'rend Bishops note some *small Neglects,*
> And own, the *Spaniard* did a *waggish thing,*
> Who cropt our Ears, and sent them to the King.
> His sly, polite, insinuating stile
> Could please at Court, and make AUGUSTUS smile: (20)
> An artful Manager, that crept between
> His Friend and Shame, and was a kind of *Screen.* (*Dia*. 1.11-22)

Although Jacob Fuchs has stated that the "Friend" in the *Dialogues* is Pope's "enemy" and a "shallow" person, I consider, like Thomas Edwards and Dustin H. Griffin, the "Friend" to be

[23] Spence 1966, 1:229-230.
[24] See ibid., 230n. and *TE*, 4:320n.
[25] Horace also praised him in *Carm*. 1.12.35-36; 2.1.24; and *Ep*. 1.19.13-14. Later writers including Seneca, Lucan, Velleius Paterculus, and Valerius Maximus offered praise of Cato in their works. Precaution may have been necessary, but, unlike Nero, Augustus seems to have tolerated commendations of republicans such as Cato.

another side of Pope which he embodies in an imaginary character.[26] The dialogue form represents Pope's two conflicting selves. On the one hand, Pope feels deep admiration for Horace, yet, on the other, he cannot help but detect the ancient poet's "sly, polite, insinuating stile" to please the powerful.

Horace is described as "delicate" and "nice" (11) and as one who "lash'd no sort of *Vice*" (12). Horace's manner stands in stark contrast to the type of fierce satirical attacks which Pope has expressed in his poetry. The "Friend" proceeds to show how Horace would have written about important English figures contemporary with Pope. By "*Bubo*" (12), Pope usually refers to George Bubb Dodington, Baron Melcombe (1691-1762), and by "*Sir* Billy" (13), Sir William Yonge (d. 1755). Both were prominent Whig figures who were of influence on the political scene, but despite their respectable status they were in fact known, Dodington for his ostentatious ways and Yonge for his oratory which was eloquent yet devoid of sense.[27]

There is a twist to the statement: "Blunt *could do Bus'ness*" (14). Sir John Blunt (1665-1733) was one of the projectors and directors of the South Sea Company. He knew how to "*do Bus'ness*," as he certainly accrued an immense fortune. The tides turned when the South Sea Bubble burst and Blunt, the third richest of the directors, was ordered to surrender his real estate, worth £183,350. Parliament initially allowed him to keep only £1,000, but the sum was later increased to £5,000. Perhaps credit must be given to him for making an honest confession of his charges, yet he also knew how to "*do Bus'ness*" in the way that he still managed to recover enough to bequeath around £13,000 to his family at his death.[28] John Huggins was the Warden of the Fleet prison contemporary to Pope. He sold his office in 1728 but in the following year was charged with the murder of a prisoner. "H–ggins *knew the Town*" (14) refers to the fact that during the trial Huggins sought many gentlemen of influence to testify on his behalf. Huggins was acquitted.[29]

"*Sappho*" was by then a familiar name which Pope used in his poetry to designate Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. "The *Failing of the Sex*" (15) is a glance at her purported love affairs. By "In rev'rend Bishops note some *small Neglects*" (16), Sir Robert Sutton (1672-1746) is intended. One of the directors of the Charitable Corporation, he was found guilty of embezzlement and lost his seat in the House of Commons in 1732.[30] Lines 17-18 describe an

[26] Fuchs 1989, 144. See also note 8.
[27] See *Dia*. 1.68-69 for Pope's attempt at false praise of Dodington and Yonge.
[28] See Erskine-Hill 1975, 193-96.
[29] See *TE*, 4:365.
[30] See *ibid*., 385 for reference to Sutton as "rev'rend Bishops;" see *ibid*., 298n. for his crime being referred to as "*Neglects.*"

incident in which Robert Jenkins, an English captain, had his ears cut off at sea by a Spanish captain. It had grave consequences, as the case served to initiate a war against Spain.[31] However, even such a crime with political and diplomatic significance is told as: "the *Spaniard* did a *waggish thing*" (17), as if the incident was no more than a joke.

Contemporary events and crimes of significance are put in surprisingly mild terms, as if they are a series of trivial news items. Influential yet notorious figures are described as having "*serv'd the Crown*" (13), "*could do Bus'ness*" (14), and "*knew the Town*" (14). They are portrayed as if they were upright, honorable men. Similarly, the gravity of crimes is understated in "*small Neglects*" (16) and "*waggish thing*" (17). As the "Friend" correctly points out, Horace was "sly, polite, insinuating" (19), not honest and sincere. But it was in such a manner that the ancient poet "Could please at Court, and make AUGUSTUS smile" (20). Horace was indeed an "artful Manager" (21), but he knew what he was doing and what it took to win affection at court. Furthermore, the "Friend" characterizes Horace as one who "crept between | His Friend and Shame" (21-22). However, as Frank Stack observes:

> The idea that Horace was just trying to please Augustus does not square with Pope's reading of the *Epistle to Augustus*, and in none of his poems does Horace attempt to shield his friends from shame.[32]

Pope understood that while Horace was a cautious court poet, he was not a blindly willing flatterer. Nonetheless, the "Friend" continues that Horace acted as "a kind of *Screen*" (22). The term "screen" was applied to Sir Robert Walpole who attempted to shield the discovery of frauds committed by certain politicians in their relation to the South Sea Company.[33] The "Friend"'s use of the terms "crept" (21) and "*Screen*" (22) to depict Horace seems rather severe, as if Horace was a stealthy court agent. However, as Howard Erskine-Hill points out, Pope does not reject the "Friend"'s portrayal of Horace.[34]

Horace is never mentioned again in the two *Dialogues*, nor in *1740*. Just as with the line on Virgil, it is not that Pope lost his admiration for Horace. Erskine-Hill accurately captures Pope's development:

> [The passage] does not constitute a moral or political condemnation of the Augustan poet Pope has so often imitated; it does suggest that Horace is no longer an adequate model for the kind of poetry Pope now felt he must write. If Horace was able to draw closer to the principate as time went on, Pope, by contrast, registers a greater sense of estrangement from court, government and indeed the whole national scene.[35]

---

[31] See Section III of this chapter.
[32] Stack 1985, 278.
[33] See *TE*, 4:299n.; Mack 1969, 131-32; Urstad 1999, 28.
[34] Erskine-Hill 1983, 345.
[35] Ibid., 346. Kelsall expresses a similar view: "In the *Epilogue to the Satires* [Pope] abandons a Horatian model as no longer appropriate to the time's deformities, and "Friend" accordingly explains the difference between Pope's harsh application of the whip of satire to the vicious and the Horatian mode under Augustus" (1976, 127).

Pope's rupture with Horace is not due to a loss of esteem for the ancient poet. Rather, it is a rupture caused by the difference in situation, namely the political scene of their respective societies and the positions which each occupied in relation to the court. Gone are the days when Pope rejoiced in finding similarities with Horace on such topics as retreat, retirement, and solitude as he imitated Horace's *Epistles* and *Carm*. 4.1. He found solace in discovering that his private reflections in middle age paralleled Horace's, but in the *Dialogues* Pope returns once again to his public self to commend virtue and condemn vice in contemporary England.

II. Fallen Virtue: "A resolution to publish no more"[36]

In the first Horatian poem, *The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace Imitated*, Pope declares that he is:

arm'd for *Virtue* when I point the Pen. (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.105)

Pope is prepared to be a metaphorical soldier and promoter of virtue. He also writes:

TO VIRTUE ONLY and HER FRIENDS, A FRIEND. (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.121)

The capitalization of these words makes the force of his statement visually palpable. Virtue and vice are personified in Pope's two *Dialogues* some five years later, yet instead of Virtue's glorious victory, Pope sees the triumph of Vice. This is the state of contemporary England as it appears in Pope's eyes:

[Vice's] Birth, her Beauty, Crowds and Courts confess,
Chaste Matrons praise her, and grave Bishops bless:
In golden Chains the willing World she draws,
And hers the Gospel is, and hers the Laws:
Mounts the Tribunal, lifts her scarlet head,
And sees pale Virtue carted in her stead! (150)
Lo! at the Wheels of her Triumphal Car,
Old *England*'s Genius, rough with many a Scar,
Dragg'd in the Dust! his Arms hang idly round,
His Flag inverted trails along the ground!
Our Youth, all liv'ry'd o'er with foreign Gold, (155)
Before her dance; behind her crawl the Old!
See thronging Millions to the Pagod run,
And offer Country, Parent, Wife, or Son!
Hear her black Trumpet thro' the Land proclaim,
That "Not to be corrupted is the Shame." (160)
In Soldier, Churchman, Patriot, Man in Pow'r,
'Tis Av'rice all, Ambition is no more!
See, all our Nobles begging to be Slaves!

[36] Pope's note at the conclusion of *Dia*. 2 (*TE*, 4:327n.).

See, all our Fools aspiring to be Knaves!
The Wit of Cheats, the Courage of a Whore, (165)
Are what ten thousand envy and adore.
All, all look up, with reverential Awe,
On Crimes that scape, or triumph o'er the Law:
While Truth, Worth, Wisdom, daily they decry –
"Nothing is Sacred now but Villany." (*Dia*. 1.145-70)

This is an appalling picture which Pope paints of the state of his nation.

It may be worthwhile to first explore the image of virtue which Pope may have had in mind. Cedric D. Reverand II has shed light on eighteenth-century emblem books which often featured engravings of virtue personified.[37] Pope himself owned Otto van Veen's *Quinti Horatii Flacci Emblemata*, an emblem book which was very popular in his days and which included pictorial representations of virtue.[38] While no image of virtue was one and the same, Reverand gives a traditional eighteenth-century picture of virtue:

> …a helmeted warrior, very much like an Amazon (and intentionally so); she carries in one hand a sheathed sword… while the other hand usually holds a shaft or spear; at times there is a globe beside her or under her foot, suggesting that it is she who is responsible for protecting the world. Often she is depicted in a forceful or aggressive posture, suggesting her strength and power.[39]

Reverand also clarifies that eighteenth-century personifications of virtue symbolized "manly valor" and other qualities of being "courageous and strong in battle."[40] This is the typical image of virtue which Pope would have had in mind and the audience would have been familiar with, but this is far from the picture which Pope describes in the passage.

It is Vice who has emerged as victorious and it is Vice whom the people cheer. Vice has become an object of veneration: "Crowds and Courts confess" (145), "Chaste Matrons praise" (146), and "grave Bishops bless" (146). Instead of the traditional depiction of Virtue standing with a globe, it is Vice that has taken control over the world. She has put the world in shackles: "In golden Chains the willing World she draws" (147). The "Gospel" (148), the "Laws" (148), and the "Tribunal" (149) are all hers. Vice has seized control over the important functions of faith and justice in society. Meanwhile, Virtue is "carted in her stead" (150). Virtue is a defeated prisoner of Vice. While there are emblems from the eighteenth century which depict vice as drawing the triumphal chariot,[41] the triumph of Vice and defeat of Virtue in Pope's description do not evoke positive images. It makes us feel that in a righteous world the roles should be reversed.

[37] See Reverand (1976). See also Weinbrot 1983, 271.
[38] Reverand 1976, 557-58.
[39] Ibid., 558-59.
[40] See ibid., 559-60; citations from 560.
[41] Ibid., 568.

In addition to Virtue in Vice's chariot, there is "Old *England*'s Genius" that is "Dragg'd in the Dust," "at the Wheels of her Triumphal Car" (151-53). By "Genius," Pope may be referring to Lord Bolingbroke, but it is more probable that he attempts to portray the spirit of "Old *England*."[42] "Old *England*" is in itself general and unspecified in time, but Pope is being nostalgic and by "Old *England*'s Genius" he wants to convey the great national character of an England of long ago. Times have changed, and, by all accounts, Pope in this *Dialogue* stresses failure and the hopeless state of the nation. "Old *England*'s Genius," dragged by Vice's victorious chariot, is "rough" (152), bearing many "Scar[s]" (152), and his "Arms hang idly round" (153). He holds an inverted flag (154), which is usually used to signify protest or a nation in a state of distress, but even that symbol "trails along the ground" (154), with no effect for change or the chance to be noticed.

The infiltration of Vice is such that both the "Youth" (155) and the "old" (156) are affected. In fact, they are in "thronging Millions" (157). The energy of the crowd can be felt in Pope's diction of movement and sound. The young "dance" (156) and the "thronging Millions" are in a "run" (157), while Vice blows her "black Trumpet" (159), announcing her slogan: "Not to be corrupted is the Shame" (160). It is a carnival-like scene, as if a parade to celebrate the triumph of Vice. Lines 161-70 describe the distorted perceptions which the people have adopted. The verbs no longer relate to motion but rather they describe the state of mind of the crowd: "begging" and "aspiring" (163-64), "envy" and "adore" (166), and "look up, with reverential Awe" (167). However, the people worship the wrong things. They long to be "Slaves" (163) and "Knaves" (164), and they admire the "Wit of Cheats" (165), the "Courage of a Whore" (165), and "Crimes that scape" (168). Finally, they come up with their own slogan: "Nothing is Sacred now but Villany" (170). There rests no chance that Pope's poetry advocating the concept of virtue will be read or appreciated.

[42] Spence recorded in August 1735 Pope's admiration for Bolingbroke: "Lord Bolingbroke is something superior to anything I have seen in human nature. You know I don't deal much in hyperboles: I quite think him what I say" (1966, 1:121). Besides Pope's great veneration for this intellectual figure who was most learned in politics, history, and philosophy, Bolingbroke at this time represented the failure of the Opposition forces to defeat Walpole's ministry. During the years of his return to England from 1723 to 1735, he had established in December 1726 *The Craftsman*, which became a widely diffused journal for opposition propaganda, and he had numerous loyal supporters such as Wyndham, mentioned earlier. Walpole lost popularity over his Excise Bill and Bolingbroke did not miss this opportunity. His party ran for the general election of 1734, but, perhaps due to Bolingbroke's association with French Jacobites, was defeated. He subsequently returned to exile in France in 1735. By 1738 Bolingbroke makes his intentions clear of making a comeback in his native England. See also Hammond 1980, 113 in which he regards *The First Epistle of The First Book of Horace Imitated*, published in March 1738, to be Pope's reply to Bolingbroke's declaration of his return to England. Bolingbroke does arrive in July 1738, but he departs again, never to return, ten months later.

In the concluding lines to the poem which follow immediately after this passage Pope states:

Yet may this Verse (if such a Verse remain)
Show there was one who held it in disdain. (*Dia*. 1.171-72)

Pope has parted ways with Horace to continue his quest of fighting with, and for, virtue. Even at the expense of jeopardizing his safety, he still refuses to succumb to Horace's "sly, polite, insinuating stile" (*Dia*. 1.11). He states that if his poem was to survive, he hopes that it will "Show there was one who held it in disdain" (172). Pope is in a solitary battle. As of now he feels that he is the only "one" who holds in contempt the degradation of society in his contemporary England. Furthermore, the verb "held" is in the past tense. As we shall see in the next section Pope may still have hopes for a better future for England, but he has largely renounced any hope that his quest for virtue will lead to amelioration in the present. Posterity may look back on his poetry and see that in a demoralized society "there was one who held it in disdain," but he feels the futility of saying, "there *is* one who *holds* it in disdain," as he does not expect anyone to appreciate his stance in the present times.

With his images of fallen Virtue and triumphal Vice, Pope thus presents a doomed vision of England in the first *Dialogue*. However, Pope does not allow himself to sink in utter hopelessness. In the previous section I described the process through which Pope makes his final departure from Horace. Together with this goes his consideration of retirement from the writer's occupation. In the second *Dialogue*, we see a renewed determination in Pope to write and publish. And with it, his depiction of Virtue changes.

In the first *Imitation*, Pope asserts:

I will Rhyme and Print. (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.99)

Pope is bold and daring, and his firm intention to write and to make his writings public by publishing stands out in these lines. Pope reconfirms his intention to publish at the opening of the second *Dialogue*:

Fr.
Tis all a Libel – *Paxton* (Sir) will say.

P.
Not yet, my Friend! to-morrow 'faith it may;
And for that very cause I print to day. (*Dia*. 2.1-3)

In 1722 Nicholas Paxton, then an assistant to the Treasury Solicitor, was offered an annual sum of £200 for the task of reporting any libelous matter in pamphlets and newspapers to the

government and was continuing the assignment in Pope's day.[43] Pope is aware that he must pay heed to his safety and that censors such as Paxton may accuse him of sedition any day. It may happen as early as tomorrow (2), but he insists: "And for that very cause I print to day" (3). He wishes to release to the public as much of his works as possible before he may be prevented from doing so.

Pope has not lost hope. He believes that, one day, virtue will be restored and that England will be redeemed. Towards the end of the second *Dialogue* Pope writes:

Not so, when diadem'd with Rays divine,
Touch'd with the Flame that breaks from Virtue's Shrine,
Her Priestless Muse forbids the Good to dye,
And ope's the Temple of Eternity; (235)
There other *Trophies* deck the truly Brave,
Than such as *Anstis* casts into the Grave;
Far other *Stars* than * and ** wear,
And may descend to *Mordington* from *Stair:*
Such as on HOUGH's unsully'd Mitre shine, (240)
Or beam, good DIGBY! from a Heart like thine.
Let Envy[44] howl while Heav'n's whole Chorus sings,
And bark at Honour not confer'd by Kings;
Let Flatt'ry sickening see the Incense rise,
Sweet to the World, and grateful to the Skies: (245)
Truth guards the Poet, sanctifies the line,
And makes Immortal, Verse as mean as mine.
Yes, the last Pen for Freedom let me draw,
When Truth stands trembling on the edge of Law. (*Dia*. 2.232-49)

Pope presents Virtue, not carted away in Vice's chariot but, restored to her divine status and reinstated at her shrine. A day will arrive when Virtue shines with "Rays divine" (242) and her "Flame" (243). Her muse, though without a priest, will "forbid[forbids] the Good to dye" (234), because it is the "Temple of Eternity" (235). The theme of eternity ties in with Pope's claim that "Truth guards the Poet" (246) and will render "Immortal, Verse as mean as mine" (247). Pope has faith that Virtue and not Vice will emerge victorious one day. It is only that he does not expect it to happen any time soon, seeing the current degradation of society. Similarly, he believes that, with "Truth" as guarantee that his verse will be immortal (246-47), there will come a time in the future when his poetry will be valued.

The current state of things is such that "*Trophies*" (236) and "*Stars*" (238) are the officially recognized symbols of glory. However, Pope argues that in the Temple of Eternity there will be "other *Trophies*" (236) to honor the "truly Brave" (236), than the current ones which heralds such as John Anstis (1669-1744) throws into the grave at the funerals of

[43] Urstad 1999, 32. See also *TE*, 4:313n. and 375.
[44] Cf. Reverand: "it is the very nature of Virtue to be the object of envious attacks" (1976, 563).

influential peers (237). Likewise, there will be "Far other *Stars* than * and ** wear" (238). Scholars usually suppose that the asterisks in this line refer to George and Frederick, King and Prince of Wales.[45] It is clear that Pope does not appreciate the current honors as he states that these stars "may descend to *Mordington* from *Stair*" (239). John Dalrymple, second Earl of Stair (1673-1747), had served as Ambassador to France (1715-1720) and then as Vice-Admiral of Scotland (1720-1733), but he was dismissed from the office after opposing Walpole's Excise Bill. He was not able to regain a post in Walpole's ministry, but he was known by others to be a skilled diplomat and a man of integrity.[46] Of Mordington, John Butt states: "Nothing is known of Lord Mordington except that his wife kept a public gaming house in Covent Garden."[47] Perhaps Mordington was not a respected member of society. Pope seems to draw a contrast between two men who stand at opposite extremes, and so to show that the conferment of honor is arbitrary.

Pope then names two contemporary men of virtue: "HOUGH" (240) and "DIGBY" (241). John Hough (1651-1743) was the President of Magdalen College at Oxford and was later the Bishop of Oxford, Lichfield, and Worcester. Hough was noted for his charity and clemency. "DIGBY" (241) refers to William, fifth Baron Digby of Geashill (1662-1752), father of Robert Digby. Unlike Hough, Digby stood against King James II and the Stuart cause, but he was no less devoted to charity. The Digby family took men such as Thomas Bray under their patronage, and William Digby in his lifetime restored a ruined chapel in Dorsetshire and founded many libraries and charity-schools. Hough and Digby were personal friends, and Hough composed in 1692 the epitaph for Digby's mother.[48] Pope regards them both as unselfish philanthropists and true men of virtue. There is virtue to be recognized in contemporary England, only the court, government, and people are blind to it.

Although Pope has expressed his desire to continue publishing on the hopeful assumption that posterity will acknowledge his poetry, his solitary warfare may nevertheless be coming to an end. In his first *Imitation*, *The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace Imitated* (1733), he proclaimed:

Satire's my Weapon. (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.69)

Five years later in the second *Dialogue*, he states of satire, his weapon:

[45] See *TE*, 4:326n. and commentators such as Rogers 2006, 690.
[46] *TE*, 4:355.
[47] *Ibid*., 326n.
[48] See Erskine-Hill 1975, 132-65 for William Digby and his friendship with Hough, as well as the Digby family's relation to Pope.

O sacred Weapon! left for Truth's defence. (*Dia*. 2.212)

Satire, his weapon, is the vehicle for conveying the truth. With his pen as his sword, Pope insists on the need to write the truth. His fierce satirical attacks in exposing the vices of contemporary figures are his method of revealing the truth. Pope has faith that truth will "guard[guards] the Poet" (246) and will "make[makes] Immortal, Verse as mean as mine" (247). At the moment, however, he feels that "Truth stands trembling on the edge of Law" (249) and that the government censors may be at his back. His satire may soon have to come to an end.

Pope concludes the second and last *Dialogue* with the "Friend" beseeching:

Alas! alas! pray end what you began,
And write next winter more *Essays on Man*. (*Dia*. 2.254-55)

The "Friend" insists to the very end that Pope should content himself with producing work that will be appreciated by a contemporary audience. He suggests continuation of the immensely well-received *Essays on Man*. The "Friend" warned from the beginning that regulators of the press such as Nicholas Paxton might consider Pope's satire to be libelous, and Pope too feels the potential danger which may be encroaching upon him.

At the end of the second *Dialogue* he adds a note:

This was the last poem of the kind printed by our author, with a resolution to publish no more; but to enter thus, in the most plain and solemn manner he could, a sort of PROTEST against that insuperable corruption and depravity of manners, which he had been so unhappy as to live to see. Could he have hoped to have amended any, he had continued those attacks; but bad men were grown so shameless and so powerful, that Ridicule was become as unsafe as it was ineffectual.[49]

Pope calls his *Dialogue* a "PROTEST." It is an act of expressing disagreement or disapproval. Pope shed light on the "insuperable corruption and depravity of manners" in the world in which he lived, a fallen state which he was "unhappy… to see." He provides two reasons for abandoning the project, one, for his safety, and two, because he could see no improvement of the situation with the publication of his "protest." He refers to his "protest" once again in a letter to Swift in May 1739:

I am sinking fast into prose; & if ever I write more, it ought, (at these years, & in these Times) to be something, the Matter of which will give value to the Work, not meerly the Manner. Since my *Protest*, (for so I call the Dialogue of 1738) I have written but ten lines […for the next New Edition of the Dunciad].[50]

Pope does make a comeback with satire in March 1742 with the new fourth book, *The New Dunciad*, the bulk of which was written in the winter of 1741-1742, and the revised and

[49] *TE*, 4:327n.
[50] *Corr*., 4:178.

complete *Dunciad in Four Books* in October 1743.[51] However, his health was failing, and although he had plans for the *Opus Magnum* and the epic *Brutus*, they never materialized.[52] Aside from this grand-scale *Dunciad* of 1743, Pope published no significant collection of poetry after the Horatian *Imitations*.

III. *1740* and the Prince Frederick: A New Hope

There is nonetheless another poem, related to the Horatian *Imitations* yet never published in Pope's lifetime: *1740*.[53] Pope may have contemplated a third *Dialogue*, a plan which he most likely suppressed due to pressure from Walpole.[54] This is not to say that Pope was trying to deceive his audience when he announced his "resolution to publish no more" at the end of the second *Dialogue*. It serves to demonstrate the precarious and desperate state in which Pope found himself in the years between his Horatian poems and *The New Dunciad*. The structure of the poem *1740*, with its numerous dashes and lines that trail off with three dots ("…"), attests to this atmosphere of tension in which Pope lived.[55] While *1740* is not based on a specific work by Horace, there is a link between Pope's *1740*, the two *Dialogues*, and the Horatian *Imitations*. Most of the *Imitations* revealed in their respective titles that they were an imitation of one of Horace's poems.[56] The first *Dialogue* originally bore the title, *One Thousand Seven Hundred and Thirty Eight. A Dialogue Something like Horace*. It contains, albeit very little, the final traces of his association to Horace's poetry. The second was similarly entitled, *One Thousand Seven Hundred and Thirty Eight. Dialogue II*. There is a natural succession to be noticed and, although Pope himself never dared to publish *One Thousand Seven Hundred and Forty*, it can be readily assumed to be a part of Pope's Horatian series.

Similarly, Pope's Horatian series may be considered to come full circle with *1740*. Pope began the series with politics as its principal theme, and he likewise ends with politics,

[51] This was the last of Pope's *Dunciad* publications. The original three-book *Dunciad* appeared in 1728. Notes were added to the original and real names were disclosed in *The Dunciad Variorum* of 1729. A fourth book was published in 1742 as *The New Dunciad*. The abovementioned *Dunciad in Four Books* followed in 1743.
[52] Spence recorded in March 1743 Pope speaking of his epic poem with Brutus as the main character: "Though there is none of it writ as yet, what I look upon as more than half of the work is already done, for 'tis all exactly planned" (1966, 1:153).
[53] See *TE*, 4:330-31 for the discovery of Pope's *One Thousand Seven Hundred and Forty* after his death and its posthumous publication.
[54] *Corr*., 4:114.
[55] Cf. John Butt: "[The poem] is 'ruined' rather than incompleted, for the blanks indicate that Pope feared for what he had written, rather than that he was undecided what to write" (*TE*, 4:331).
[56] See all the titles listed in Chapter 2.

only by now Horace can no longer serve as a model. Addressed to the nation Britain,[57] *1740* is a heavily political poem. One may recall that Pope's first *Imitation, The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace Imitated*, has as its central theme government censorship. The *Imitation* concludes with Pope's rather uncertain yet definitely inauthentic suggestion that he may perhaps write verses "Such as Sir *Robert* would approve" (*Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.1.153) and his imaginary lawyer assenting that this would be a sure way to escape the libel law. Politics was a matter of concern since the first *Imitation* in 1733, and there was heightened excitement for potential change.

The year 1733 witnessed significant defeat for Walpole and his administration. Walpole had always sought to reduce national debt and proposed the introduction of an excise tax. Smuggling was becoming such a problem that it was reducing national tax revenue from trade. In lieu of imposing a tariff on such goods as wine and tobacco to be collected at ports, Walpole intended to levy an excise tax to be collected at warehouses so as to reduce the number of smuggled items which escaped taxes. British merchants were incensed, and public opposition was strong as well. Seeing no chance of success with his proposal, Walpole withdrew the Excise Bill in April 1733 before it was voted on by Parliament. Pope's first *Imitation* was published on 15 February 1733, before the withdrawal of the Excise Bill. Nevertheless, opposition to Walpole's project would have been at its height, and it is difficult to imagine that Pope did not hope that perhaps this would lead to Walpole's downfall. Dissatisfied Whigs leaned towards the Tory Opposition, and for a while Walpole was indeed in danger of losing many of his party members. However, loyal followers still gained a majority in the House of Commons in the general election the next year,[58] and for the time being it seemed as if Walpole had recovered his popularity and authority.

A similar opportunity for the overthrow of Walpole occurred in 1737. Walpole struggled with other bills which met opposition in Parliament.[59] Yet most importantly, Queen Caroline, wife of George II, passed away on 20 November.[60] Walpole was a close friend of Caroline for almost two decades, and it was largely thanks to this friendship with the Queen that he was able to win the trust of George II. Not only was this the year in which Walpole lost his strongest ally at court, but there was also an opponent who was gaining rapid

[57] See lines 1 and 75 of the poem.
[58] Supporters of the Opposition leader Bolingbroke lost and Bolingbroke fled to France in 1735; see Section II.
[59] See *TE*, 4:xxxv.
[60] Cf. *Dia*. 2.80.

popularity: Frederick, Prince of Wales (1705-1751).[61] Frederick was the eldest son of George II and Queen Caroline and father to George III. In conflict with both his father and mother since his arrival in England in 1728, he became the figure of hope for the Patriot Opposition. The Prince's disagreement with the King over the Prince's allowance had been continuing for several years, but it was in 1737 that all ties were cut between parents and son.[62] It was also in this year that the Prince made public his opposition to the court party which supported Walpole and George II.

Walpole was known for his pacific foreign policy. Throughout his years as *de facto* Prime Minister,[63] he had negotiated peace treaties with other European powers such as France, Prussia, and Austria in order to avoid war. However, his pacific stance did not help in protecting English merchant ships from the Spanish.[64] Conflicts on sea with Spanish ships arose partly because Britain had signed the Treaty of Seville in 1729, which forbade trade with Spanish colonies in North America. This led to Spanish ships insisting on inspection of English trade vessels to see that the Treaty was being respected. The incident with Jenkins was the result of this practice.[65] It was upon this that Walpole in 1739 finally waged the War of Jenkins' Ear against Spain. However, Walpole's popularity was decreasing, and his dominance at court waned gradually until, finally, he resigned from office in early 1742. On the other hand, the Opposition leaders found that, despite the Prince's definite fallout with the King, they had been too optimistic in assuming that the Prince would willingly comply with all of their projects for change of policy.

These are the times in which Pope composed the two *Dialogues*. It is no wonder that in his disillusionment he depicted the triumphal chariot of Vice carrying away defeated Virtue. In the second *Dialogue* he describes a state in which Virtue is restored, but it is in the distant future. Pope opens *1740* with the same vision of the deplorable state of his nation which we have seen in the two *Dialogues*:

O WRETCHED B–, jealous now of all,
What God, what mortal, shall prevent thy fall?

[61] Frederick, however, never became king as he predeceased his father, who died in 1760.
[62] This was finally brought about by the fact that in July of that year the Prince relocated his pregnant wife from Hampton Court Palace, the residence of the King and Queen, to St. James' Palace so that his parents could not be present at the birth. Queen Caroline was not reconciled to her son at her death, but the father-son relationship was restored after Walpole's resignation in 1742.
[63] Walpole is known to be the first Prime Minister of Great Britain, but his office is referred to as *de facto* because the Prime Minister did not exist as an official position at the time. Some date his tenure to his appointment as First Lord of the Treasury in 1721, others, at the resignation of Lord Townshend, with whom he shared power, from the Secretary of State for the Northern Department in 1730.
[64] Cf. *Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.2.
[65] See above.

Turn, turn thy eyes from wicked men in place. (*1740*, 1-3)

Pope sees Britain as "jealous" (1). In the eighteenth century jealousy could signify a state of being vigilant or careful in order to protect something. Pope wonders aloud to Britain what mortal or immortal being could "prevent thy fall" (2). "Prevent" suggests that she is heading towards a "fall" but it has not happened yet. She is in a dangerous, precarious state, but there still remains a chance that her "fall" could be prevented. It is not yet too late to make changes and improvements. There is still hope. Pope does not hesitate to state that there are "wicked men in place" (3) at the present court. Pope urges Britain to turn her eyes away from those "wicked men" and to begin making the necessary changes.

Pope does not designate the "mortal" who may rescue Britain from her "fall" (2), but he calls upon one nameless candidate at the conclusion of the poem:

Alas! on one alone our all relies,
Let him be honest, and he must be wise,
Let him no trifler from his school,
Nor like his… still a…
Be but a man! unministered, alone,
And free at once the Senate and the Throne; (90)
Esteem the public love his best supply,
[…]
Rich *with* his… *in* his… strong,
Affect no conquest, but endure no wrong.
Whatever his religion or his blood, (95)
His public virtue makes his title good.
Europe's just balance and our own may stand,
And one man's honesty redeem the land. (*1740*, 85-98)

Although this figure is never named by Pope, it is difficult to find a different possibility than Frederick, Prince of Wales. The candid qualities of being "honest" and "wise" (86) and upholding "public virtue" (96) are in concordance with Pope's descriptions of the Prince in his correspondence with George Lyttelton, secretary to the Prince and Pope's friend.[66]

Just as Pope bestowed hopes for the future in private matters on William Murray in *The First Ode of the Fourth Book of Horace* and *The Sixth Epistle of the First Book of Horace Imitated*, he entrusts the future on the national level to the Prince. The passage indicates that Pope intends a ruler of a nation. He writes: "on one alone our all relies" (85). "Our all" may refer to the people and the public good, but Pope may have had in mind the Opposition party members with whom he shared political ambitions. In the latter case, the figure intended can be no other than the Prince of Wales. Although he has many prominent supporters, the Prince

[66] See for example Lyttelton's letter to Pope on 25 October 1739: "Be therefore as much with him as you can, Animate him to Virtue, to the Virtue least known to Princes, though most necessary for them, Love of the Publick" (*Corr.*, 4:138).

is indeed "alone" (85) in the sense that he has severed ties with both his father and mother, King George II and Queen Caroline. Nor is he on good relations with the King's minister, Sir Robert Walpole. "Alone" carries a slightly different meaning in line 89, as Pope explains what a good public figure should be like. He hopes that there will be a new ruler who has the ability to reign "unministered, alone" (89), unlike the current King who is reliant on his minister Walpole and whose wife must instruct him on political decisions. Pope continues that the new ruler should regard "public love" (91) as the most important thing ("his best supply," 91). He must win the love of the people and work for public benefit.

In matters of diplomacy, Pope hopes that the leader will "Affect no conquest, but endure no wrong" (94). Pope may be giving subtle credit to Walpole for his foreign peace policy in the phrase, "Affect no conquest." One should embrace peace and not be fond of war. However, in the same line Pope certainly criticizes Walpole for avoiding military conflict at the cost of his people. A capable ruler should "endure no wrong." War should be avoided, but not to the extent that the English people suffer damage, as was the case with English merchant ships and Spanish inspectors.

Pope makes his own tolerant attitude apparent when he states: "Whatever his religion or his blood" (95).[67] The Prince was a Protestant, not a Catholic like Pope. Though related to Queen Anne by blood, he was a German from Hanover, not a British native. Still, Pope states that it is "His public virtue [which] makes his title good" (96). Pope had mocked the Hanoverian Kings numerous times in his poetry for their German origins, accent, and even mistress,[68] but he suggests that faith and origins do not matter as long as the ruler makes "public virtue" his priority and strives for the benefit of the people. That is his duty and that is what "makes his title good." In the final line, Pope announces his hope of England's redemption: "And one man's honesty redeem the land" (98).

The passage is like a panegyric, although the Prince has yet to make improvements for England and thus prove his capabilities as a ruler of a nation. I discussed earlier in the chapter that Pope's hope is turned more to the future, of better times to come, rather than to correction of the present. Likewise, if he cannot expect public approval of his work in the present, he hopes that his poetry will be appreciated by posterity. Pope's ambition for fame in posterity recalls Horace's concept of "utilis urbi" (*Ep*. 2.1.124). I suggested in Chapter 8 that in the *Epistle to Augustus* Horace proposes to Augustus the possibility of a symbiotic relationship

[67] On lines 95-98 Griffin 1978, 210n. offers the possibility that Pope may be referring not only to the Prince but also to himself.
[68] See *Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.3, 206-8.

between ruler and poet.[69] Pope summarized Horace's plea in his Advertisement to *The First Epistle of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated*: "[Horace] *concludes, that it was upon* [*Poets*] *the Emperor himself must depend, for his Fame with Posterity*."[70] The mutually beneficial relationship is not limited solely to the composition of commendatory verse about a powerful ruler. It could also be beneficial to both parties in that proper appreciation of gifted poets will be remembered by posterity that there was a ruler who could recognize and supported literary talent.[71] Pope could not expect George II to understand that poets could be "useful to the State" (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.204). He himself was never motivated to write any praise of the King. However, it is apparent that Pope sees Frederick, Prince of Wales, in a positive light. While Pope may never attempt a full-scale panegyric about the Prince, perhaps Pope counts on the Prince to see value in his poetry in the not too distant future. Taken in such a way, in the final line of *1740* Pope expresses his belief for an England redeemed, but he may also be hoping for his own redemption.

[69] Cf. Kelsall 1976, 130 who also compares the ruler in this passage to Augustus. He does not discuss the relationship between a ruler and a poet but maintains that Pope felt the need for an absolute ruler who can at least maintain peace and avoid another civil war: "Pope, no more than Horace, wanted an Augustus, but he recognized that now he must be" (ibid.).
[70] *TE*, 4:192.
[71] See Chapter 8.

CONCLUSION

Fear was a significant factor when Pope came to terminate the Horatian *Imitations*. As Paul Baines notes, the poem *1740* was written "partly in code, apparently in fear of censorship."[72] Censorship is the opposite of freedom. Pope cried for "Liberty,"[73] but as the danger for his own safety increased, he felt that he had no choice but to lay aside his "Pen for Freedom."[74] Fear was the price Pope had to pay in exchange for refusing what he considered as flattery. In the epitaph which he wrote for himself and which was entitled "For One who would not be buried in Westminster Abbey," Pope mentions Horace and Virgil as flatterers of the great:

HEROES, and KINGS! your distance keep:
In peace let one poor Poet sleep,
Who never flatter'd Folks like you:
Let Horace blush, and Virgil too.[75]

The date of composition is unknown, but the epitaph was published in 1738, the year in which he concluded his publication of the Horatian series with the two *Dialogues*. The title "For One who would not be buried in Westminster Abbey" already suggests his consciousness that as a Catholic he is at odds with the majority and the ruling power of his nation and that the public honor of being buried in Westminster Abbey will not be conferred upon him.

Geoffrey Chaucer (*c*. 1343-1400) was the first poet to be buried in what is today called the Poets' Corner in Westminster Abbey. It has since become the resting place for many highly respected English poets. Edmund Spenser, Ben Jonson, Sir John Denham, and Abraham Cowley were some of Pope's predecessors from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries whom he deeply admired and who were buried in the Abbey. Nicholas Rowe (1674-1718), Joseph Addison (1672-1719), and John Gay (1685-1732) were contemporaries whom Pope knew in person and who were also buried there. Pope wrote epitaphs for the Poet Laureate Rowe as well as for Gay.[76] Pope knows that he will not join them.

"HEROES, and KINGS!" recall some lines which Pope wrote for Gay's epitaph.[77] Pope insists that the praiseworthy qualities in Gay are his "Wit," "Simplicity," and "native Humour" and that he was "Form'd to delight," "Above Temptation," and "A safe Companion,

[72] Baines 2007, 160.
[73] *Hor. Imit. Sat*. 2.6.221; *Hor. Imit. Ep*. 1.7.66.
[74] *Dia*. 2.249.
[75] *TE*, 6:376.
[76] See *ibid*., 6:349-50 for Gay's epitaph and *ibid*., 400-1 and Chapter 3 for Rowe's.
[77] See Mack 1985, 733.

and an easy Friend."[78] Pope clarifies that his admiration for Gay is based on these qualities and "not that here [his] Bust | Is mix'd with Heroes, or with Kings [his] dust."[79] Gay had several patrons to support him throughout his literary career. However, he did not enjoy favor from the government as he caricatured Sir Robert Walpole in *The Beggar's Opera* (1728). His sequel *Polly* (1729) was effectively banned, but this only served to enhance its success, as news of the ban on its performance spread and Gay was able to make a considerable fortune through publication by subscription. Pope must have admired Gay's courage and success in adversity, and in the epitaph Pope describes him as "uncorrupted, ev'n among the Great."[80] While it must not have been a pleasure for Pope to know that he would not be allowed burial in the Abbey, one of the highest literary honors in addition to the Poet Laureateship, he is proud that his life and literary merit may remain independently of "HEROES, and KINGS" and instructs them: "your distance keep."

However, his independent stance makes him a loner. In the second line of the epitaph, Pope calls himself "one poor Poet." Pope, of course, was not "poor" in any way. He was endowed with loving family and friends, and he enjoyed financial success. It is however worth recalling the concluding line to his first *Dialogue*, "there was one who held it in disdain" (172), on the deplorable state of England in which he sees the triumph of Vice. There is a sense of aloneness in calling himself "one" in both the epitaph and the first *Dialogue*. As discussed in Chapter 10, in the *Dialogue* Pope feels as if he is the only one who does not cheer the victory of Vice and the defeat of Virtue. In the epitaph, he shows his awareness that he will not belong to the majority of celebrated writers who are accorded a place of honor in the Abbey. However, Pope's referring to himself not by name but simply as "one" is also an expression of his wish to remain anonymous. Unlike others, such as his contemporary Matthew Prior (1664-1721) who made sure that his name appeared in his epitaph and who even bought a lavish monument to be erected for him in the Abbey,[81] Pope does not put his name in the epitaph of 1738, nor on the epitaph printed in 1741 which will be discussed shortly.

[78] Lines 2-7 (*TE*, 6:349-50). Despite the long friendship which began with Gay's dedication of his *Rural Sports* (1713) to Pope and Pope's final tribute to Gay that he was "A safe Companion, and an easy Friend" (7), see Nokes (1995) for insight into the literary friendship which at times exhibited signs of rivalry.
[79] Lines 9-10 (*TE*, 6:350).
[80] Line 6 (*ibid*.).
[81] See Wright and Spears 1959, 1:195 for Prior's epitaph. See Scodel 1988, 629-30 and notes for Pope's possible borrowing of the opening of his epitaph "HEROES, and KINGS" from Prior's "Nobles, and Heralds."

The anonymity may be a show of humility, but one must not mistake this as disguised bitterness for being disallowed burial in the Abbey, or exclusion from a Poet Laureateship. The last stanza to his *Ode on Solitude* shows that it had always been Pope's desire to live a quiet life, and to repose in calm peace:

Thus let me live, unseen, unknown;
Thus unlamented let me dye;
Steal from the world, and not a stone
Tell where I lye. (*Ode on Solitude*, 17-20)

The *Ode on Solitude* was first published in 1717, but composition may have begun as early as 1700, when the poet was only twelve years old. Pope claims that he wishes to be "unseen" and "unknown" in life, and, when death will "steal" him from the world, that he may be "unlamented" and buried in an unmarked grave. This may not sound like words coming from Pope, considering that he certainly had ambitions for fame and success. It may well be a posturing, but earlier lines in the poem indicate that he yearned for serenity and, as the title of the piece suggests, solitude. Pope's definition of happiness (1) was "to breathe his native air, | In his own ground" (3-4) and to have "health of body" (11), "peace of mind" (11), "Quiet by day" (12), "study and ease | Together mix'd" (12-13), and "meditation" (16).[82]

We must remember that the poem was most probably composed during Pope's years at Binfield. As I have shown in Chapter 1, Pope was surrounded by nature and devoted to isolated study, and his time at Binfield was some of the happiest years of his life. Moreover, the work was written before he had known the taste of fame and, as I demonstrated in Chapter 4, the attacks, business negotiations, and litigations which were often unpleasant yet, to a certain extent, inevitable aspects of being a professional poet. However, as I discussed in Chapter 9, even after Pope had achieved fame, his love for the peaceful setting of the countryside for both writing and rest continued to appeal to him. As much as Pope believed in his poetic talent and wished to receive public recognition for it, his private self always yearned for calm and peace. Pope may have thought that the only way to attain such serenity was to call himself "one poor Poet" and in that anonymity to remove himself from the noise and attacks which accompany fame and recognition.

The two names which Pope does evoke in his epitaph are Horace and Virgil. Pope asserts that, unlike Horace and Virgil, he "never flatter'd" the powerful. Pope no longer attempts to draw parallels with Horace but instead positions himself as standing in contrast to Horace and the other notable Augustan poet, Virgil. I discussed in Chapter 3 the popularity of

[82] *TE*, 6:3.

Horace in the eighteenth century, but it was in the context of Horace's works as material for translation. Eighteenth-century views on Horace regarding his relationship with the powerful were a different matter. Peter White has shed light on the prevalent view that has long persisted in Europe which regards Horace and Virgil as court poets.[83] Pope's great predecessor Dryden famously wrote in *A Discourse Concerning the Original and Progress of Satire* (1693) that Horace was "a temporizing poet, a well-mannered court-slave… he is naturally servile." In a letter dated October 1706, the Earl of Shaftesbury wrote about Horace's "debauched, slavish, courtly state" in describing the poet's life with Maecenas, Augustus, and elite society.[84] Pope was no exception in being influenced by this view which prevailed throughout the eighteenth century. Pope too thought of Horace, and Virgil, as those who "flatter'd" the great.

It may also be worthwhile to note that Juvenal was often contrasted with Horace in his attitude towards the powerful. Dryden in the work cited above expresses his judgment that "Juvenal was the greater poet, I mean in satire." He cites as his reasons that Juvenal's "indignation against vice is more vehement" and that "he treats tyranny, and all the vices attending it, as they deserve, with the utmost rigour."[85] The view that Juvenal was superior to Horace in expressing passion, rage, and strong opposition to tyranny in his poetry continued throughout the eighteenth century.[86] This leads me to mention a topic which I would have wished to discuss yet was regretfully unable to due to constraints of space and time. Twentieth-century scholars have pointed out that Pope's Horatian *Imitations* are more Juvenalian than Horatian. Their argument is that Pope is more confrontational and unhesitatingly exhibits opposition to his government. The most notable instances are probably Howard Weinbrot's *Augustus Caesar in "Augustan" England: The Decline of a Classical Norm* (1978) and *Alexander Pope and the Traditions of Formal Verse Satire* (1982). Jacob Fuchs confirms the eighteenth-century trend to rank Juvenal above Horace in satire, but he shows that both poets were employed as exemplary figures in daring to express, albeit in different manners, opposition sentiment against their respective rulers.[87] Other scholars have

[83] White 1993, 96. Modern scholars such as Lyne have also commented on Horace as one who puts on the mask of a "courteous citizen" in Augustus' empire (Lyne 1995, 216).
[84] Dryden 1900, 2:87; Shaftesbury 1900, 360.
[85] Dryden 1900, 2:86-87.
[86] See for example Weinbrot 1978, 165 for the historian Edward Gibbon (1737-94) who denounced Horace, Virgil, and other Augustan and Silver Age poets for contributing to oppressive tyranny and who upheld Juvenal as the sole poet in those eras who opposed unjust political rule.
[87] Fuchs 1989, 46-52.

also touched on the fierce Juvenalian aspect in Pope's Horatian *Imitations*.[88] However, my principal reason for not covering this topic in more detail than it deserves is that my interest lies not in the manner or magnitude of opposition which Pope expresses in the *Imitations* but more in the process of Pope's search, as an outsider, for a companion who shared similar life struggles and views towards life and society. My aim equally has been to reveal the process of Pope's eventual disappointment which leads him to characterize Horace, as he does in the epitaph of 1738, not as a fit companion for him but a flatterer of the powerful.

In his assertion in the epitaph that he is "one poor Poet" who "never flatter'd" the great, Pope assumes that Horace and Virgil cannot make the same claim and thus says: "Let Horace blush, and Virgil too." The term "blush" recalls the Latin "rubeam" which Horace employed in his epistle to Augustus (*Ep*. 2.1.267).[89] In the concluding lines to the epistle, Horace imagines himself as Augustus and states that he would blush in embarrassment if an untalented poet were to write and present him verses of inferior quality (*Ep*. 2.1.264-70). Horace kindly steps in the shoes of his patron and he finds it his duty to produce meritorious verses in order to spare Augustus from embarrassment. The tone in Pope's rendering, as we have already seen in Chapter 8, remains cool. Any writing that contains flattery is nothing but "dirty leaves" in his perception (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.415). Moreover, Pope states: "Well may he blush, who gives it, or receives" (*Hor. Imit. Ep*. 2.1.414). In contrast to Horace who imagines Augustus – the flattered - blushing, Pope accuses both the flatterer and the flattered. Flattery is unacceptable for Pope, and it makes no difference to him whether one is the giver or the receiver. Thus in his epitaph he arrives at the conclusion: "Let Horace blush, and Virgil too." I pointed out as early as Chapter 6 that the relationship with the powerful was the biggest difference between Pope and Horace.[90] There were certainly parallels which Pope found in Horace: the nagging awareness of an outsider from a humble background, his ascent to become a self-made man through luck and effort, his love for country living, and his solitary status as a lifelong bachelor with no heir. However, as Thomas Edwards comments, with each Horatian *Imitation* we hear "an increasing strain in the poet's voice."[91]

What Pope found to be inconceivable for himself in the relationship with the powerful was the state of dependency to which one would necessarily be reduced. That is why he

[88] See for example, among others, Stack 1985, 220; Erskine-Hill 1983, 324-25 and 347; and Grifin 1978, 166.
[89] See Chapter 8.
[90] Cf. Fuchs 1989, 60: "What upsets Pope is the knowledge, of which he seems to gain more with every imitation, that he matters very little in a world where power lies apart from him."
[91] Edwards 1963, 86.

refused all forms of patronage and, still more, to flatter corrupt rulers in his writings. Pope always held fast to his independent spirit. I mentioned earlier that there is another epitaph by Pope. Let us now turn to this piece which was printed in Dodsley's magazine in 1741 and which bears the title "On Himself:"[92]

UNDER this Marble, or under this Sill,
Or under this Turf, or e'en what they will;
Whatever an Heir, or a Friend in his stead,
Or any good Creature shall lay o'er my Head;
Lies He who ne'er car'd, and still cares not a Pin,
What they said, or may say of the Mortal within.
But who living and dying, serene still and free,
Trusts in God, that as well as he was, he shall be.[93]

The repetition of "or" in the epitaph indicates Pope's uncertainty about the circumstances of his death and burial. He knows that Westminster Abbey is not an option for him, and he may have in mind burial beside his parents at Twickenham. However, he purports that he does not know and that it could be under "Marble," a "Sill," some "Turf," or "what they will." The last option, "what they will," suggests that Pope is displaying a nonchalant attitude. Likewise, he describes himself as: "He who ne'er car'd… | What they said." We know that contrary to how Pope speaks of himself, he did care a great deal of what others said about him. Pope kept pamphlet attacks written against him between 1711 and 1733 which he eventually bound together into a four-volume collection.[94] The significance of these lines is that Pope wishes to be remembered as one who was indifferent to what others said of him.

Pope expresses his desire to be "serene… and free." He wishes for serenity in the sense that he, "the Mortal within," is not disturbed by what others say ("What they said, or may say"). He also wishes to be "free," that is, to keep his independence. Like his epitaph of 1738, Pope decides to remain anonymous in the epitaph of 1741. He does not even define himself as a poet, and he does not name others to criticize, as he did with Horace and Virgil in the 1738 version. Pope no longer associates himself with Horace, and he does not even criticize or draw contrasts with him. Pope had always insisted on maintaining his financial independence, and here he returns to his independent self in his poetry as well. Having set himself apart from the ancient pagan poet, Pope asserts his Christian faith that he "Trusts in God." For Pope, it is not his relationship with living political rulers that matters but his own individual relationship to God. As I have mentioned at the beginning of this conclusion, fear

[92] Although authenticity is almost certain, there has been some dispute by scholars as authorship was never formally recognized by Pope nor included in any of his publications; for this see *TE*, 6:387.
[93] *Ibid*., 386.
[94] McLaverty 2001, 177.

of political censorship was unfortunately what Pope had to face in his decision to be "free" in his writings. However, Pope persists in his will to keep his own peace and independence: to be "serene… and free."

The common point which lies in the poetics of both Horace and Pope is their desire for self-expression. Both poets were strongly conscious of their status as outsiders. For Horace, there was a desire to be understood by the elite literary circle which he joined and, most of all, by his two principal patrons Maecenas and Augustus. For Pope, it was the English public at large. Pope sought in Horace, with all their similarities and differences, an ally, someone to provide companionship and guidance. The Horatian *Imitations* constitute a significant part of Pope's oeuvre. However, his poetic talent and fame are not dependent on the ancient poet. Pope carved out a name for himself independently of Horace, and of any British or Roman predecessor for that matter.[95]

[95] Posterity has borrowed expressions from Pope's own creations. His legacy still lives in titles of notable works such as E.M. Forster's *Where Angels Fear to Tread* (1905) (from *Essay on Criticism*, 625) and the more recent film *Eternal Sunshine of the Spotless Mind* (2004) (from *Eloisa to Abelard*, 209).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

LATIN

Aulus Gellius. 1861. *Noctes Atticae*. Edited by M. Hertz. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

Cassius Dio (Lucius Cassius Dio Cocceianus). 1863. *Historia Romana*. Edited by L. Dindorf. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

Cicero (Marcus Tullius Cicero). 1878. *De Natura Deorum. De Divinatione. De Fato. De Re Publica. De Legibus*. Edited by C.F.W. Mueller. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

---. 1988. *Epistulae ad Familiares Libri I-XVI*. Edited by D.R. Shackleton Bailey. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

---. 1987. *Epistulae ad Atticum*. 2 vols. Edited by D.R. Shackleton Bailey. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

---. 1995. *De Oratore*. Edited by K.F. Kumaniecki. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

Ennius (Quintus Ennius). 1967. *Remains of Old Latin. Vol. I. Ennius. Caecilius*. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by E.H. Warmington. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press.

Horace (Quintus Horatius Flaccus). 1989. *Epistles Book II and Epistle to the Pisones ('Ars Poetica')*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Edited by N. Rudd. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 1994. *Epistles Book I*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Edited by R. Mayer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 1995. *Epodes*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Edited by D. Mankin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 2004. *Odes and Epodes*. Loeb Classical Library. Edited and translated by N. Rudd. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press.

---. 2005. *Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica*. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by H.R. Fairclough. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press.

---. 2008. *Opera*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Edited by D.R. Shackleton Bailey. Berlin: De Gruyter.

---. 2011. *Odes Book IV and Carmen Saeculare*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Edited by R.F. Thomas. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 2012. *Satires Book I*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Edited by E. Gowers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Macrobius (Ambrosius Theodosius Macrobius). 2012. *Saturnalia*. Edited by R. Kaster. Oxford: Oxford Classical Texts.

Ovid (Publius Ovidius Naso). 1855. *Amores. Epistulae. De Medic. Fac. Ars Amat. Remedia Amoris*. Edited by R. Merkel. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

Pliny the Elder (Gaius Plinius Secundus). *Naturalis Historiae Libri XXXVII: Libb. XXXIII-XXXVII*. Edited by L. von Jan. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

Quintilian (Marcus Fabius Quintilianus). 1971. *Institutionis Oratoriae Libri XII*. 2 vols. Edited by L. Radermacher. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

Silius Italicus (Tiberius Catius Asconius Silius Italicus). 1987. *Punica*. Edited by J. Delz. Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner.

Statius (Publius Papinius Statius). 1990. *Silvae*. Edited by E. Courtney. Oxford: Oxford Classical Texts.

---. 1973. *Thebais*. Edited by A. Klotz. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

Suetonius (Gaius Suetonius Tranquilius). 1827. *De Vita Caesarum Libri*. Vol. 1. Edited by M. Ihm. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

---. 1907. *Quae Supersunt Omnia. Fasc. II. De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus. Deperditorum Librorum Reliquiae*. Edited by K.L. Roth. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

Tacitus (Publius Cornelius Tacitus). 1952. *Annales*. Edited by C. Halm. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

Virgil (Publius Vergilius Maro). 1907. *Vergili Maronis Opera cum Appendice in Usum Scholarum*. Edited by O. Ribbeck. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

ENGLISH

Bacon, F. 1985. *The Essays*. Edited by J. Pitcher. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Bolingbroke, L.V., H.J. 1968. *Remarks on the History of England*, in *The Works of the Late Honorable Henry St. John, Lord Viscount Bolingbroke*. 5 vols. Edited by D. Mallet. Hildesheim: George Olms.

Cowley, A. 1905. *The Poems of Abraham Cowley*. Edited by A.R. Waller. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Denham, J. 1969. *The Poetical Works of Sir John Denham*. 2nd ed. Edited by T.H. Banks. Hamden: Archon Books.

Dryden J. 1900. *Essays of John Dryden*. Edited by W.P. Ker. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

---. 1942. *The Letters of John Dryden. With Letters Addressed to Him*. Edited by C. E. Ward. Durham: Duke University Press.

Jonson, B. 1925-52. *Ben Jonson*. Edited by Herford, C.H., P. Simpson, and E. Simpson. 11 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Pope, A. 1936. *The Prose Works of Alexander Pope*. Vol. 1, *The Earlier Works 1711-1720*. Edited by N. Ault. Oxford: Blackwell.

---. 1939-1969. *The Twickenham Editions of the Poems of Alexander Pope*. 6 vols. Edited by J. Butt. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.

---. 1956. *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*. 5 vols. Edited by G. Sherburn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 1986. *The Prose Works of Alexander Pope*. Vol. 2, *The Major Works 1725-1744*. Edited by R. Cowler. Hamden, CT: Archon.

---. 1987. *Selected Prose of Alexander Pope*. Edited by P. Hammond. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 2000. *Alexander Pope. Selected Letters*. Edited by H. Erskine-Hill. New York: Oxford University Press.

---. 2006. *Alexander Pope. The Major Works*. Edited by P. Rogers. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Prior, M. 1959. *The Literary Works of Matthew Prior*. 2 vols. Edited by H.B. Wright and M.K. Spears. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roscommon, W.D., Earl of. 1971. *An Essay on Translated Verse 1685 and Horace's Art of Poetry Made English 1684*. Menston: Scolar Press.

Shaftesbury, Earl of, A. 1900. *The Life, Unpublished Letters, and Philosophical Regimen of Anthony, Earl of Shaftesbury*. Edited by B. Rand. London: Swan Sonnenschein.

Spence, J. 1966. *Observations, Anecdotes, and Characters of Books and Men: Collected from Conversation*. 2 vols. Edited by J.M. Osborn. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Spenser, E. 1995. *The Faerie Queene*. *The Complete Works in Verse and Prose of Edmund Spenser*. Edited by Bear, R.S., University of Oregon. www.luminarium.org/renascence-editions/queene1.html (Accessed 18 July 2012)

Swift, J. 1963-65. *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift*. 4 vols. Edited by H. Williams. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 1967. *A Discourse of the Contests and Dissentions between the Nobles and the Commons in Athens and Rome*. Edited by F.H. Ellis. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

---. 1984. *Jonathan Swift. The Major Works*. Edited by A. Ross and D. Woolley. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Warton, J. 1822. *The Works*. 9 vols. London: Printed by J.F. Dove for R. Priestley.

Wilmot, J., Earl of Rochester. 1999. *The Works of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*. Eidted by H. Love. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wortley Montagu, M. 1977. *Essays and Poems and Simplicity, a Comedy*. Edited by R. Halsband and I. Grundy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Aden, J. 1969. *Something like Horace: Studies in the Art and Allusion of Pope's Horatian Satires*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

---. 1978. *Pope's Once and Future Kings: Satire and Politics in the Early Career*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

Alexander, W.H. 1942. "The Enigma of Horace's Mother." *Classical Philology* 37:385-397.

Anderson, W.S. 1982. *Essays on Roman Satire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

---. 1984. "Ironic preambles and satiric self-definition in Horace *Satire* 2.1." *Pacific Coast Philology* 19: 35-42.

Andreau, J. 1999. *Banking and Business in the Roman World*. Translated by J. Lloyd. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Armstrong, A. 1977. "The Apprenticeship of John Donne: Ovid and the Elegies." *English Literary History* 44:419-42.

Armstrong, D. 1986. "*Horatius eques et scriba*: *Satires* 1.6 and 2.7." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 116: 255-88.

Baines, P. 2000. *Alexander Pope*. *Routledge Guides to Literature*. New York: Routledge.

---. 2007. "Crime and punishment." In *The Cambridge Companion to Alexander Pope*, edited by P. Rogers, 150-60. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bassett, E.L. 1953. "Silius Italicus in England." *Classical Philology* 48: 155-68.

Bateson, F.W., and N.A. Joukovsky, eds. 1971. *Alexander Pope: A Critical Anthology*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Bauman, R.A. 1985. *Lawyers in Transitional Politics: A study of the Roman jurists in their political setting in the Late Republic and Triumvirate*. Munich: C.H. Beck.

Benham, A.R. 1955. "Horace and His *Ars Poetica* in English: A Bibliography." *Classical Weekly* 49: 1-5.

Bloom, L. D. 1948. "Pope as a Textual Critic: A Bibliographical Study of His Horatian Text." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 47: 150-55.

Bowditch, P.L. 2001. *Horace and the Gift Economy of Patronage*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Bradshaw, A.T. von S. 1970. "Horace, Odes 4.1." *Classical Quarterly* 20: 142-153.

Brink, C.O. 1963. *Horace on Poetry, 1: Prolegomena to the Literary Epistles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 1971. *Horace on Poetry, 2: The 'Ars Poetica'*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 1982. *Horace on Poetry, 3: Epistles Book II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Broad, J. 1988. "Whigs and Deer-Stealers in Other Guises: A Return to the Origins of the Black Act." *Past and Present* 119: 56-72.

Brooks, H.F. 1949. "The 'Imitation' in English Poetry, Especially in Formal Satire, before the Age of Pope." *Review of English Studies* 25: 124-40.

Brooks-Davies, D. 1985. *Pope's "Dunciad" and the Queen of the Night: A Study of Emotional Jacobitism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Brower, R.A. 1959. *Alexander Pope: The Poetry of Allusion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Brown, L. 1985. *Alexander Pope*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Burrow, C. 2002. "Re-embodying Ovid: Renaissance Afterlives." In *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, edited by P. Hardie, 301-19. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Candido, J. 2000. "Prefatory Matter(s) in the Shakespeare Editions of Nicholas Rowe and Alexander Pope." *Studies in Philology* 97: 210-28.

Casson, L. 2002. *Libraries in the Ancient World*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Clauss, J.J. 1985. "Allusion and Structure in Horace *Satire* 2.1: The Callimachean Response." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 115: 197-206.

Clegg, C.S. 2008. *Press Censorship in England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cloud, J.D. 1989. "Satirists and the law." In *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome*, Exeter Studies in History, edited by S.H. Braund, 49-67. Exeter: Exeter University Press.

Coffey, M. 1976. *Roman Satire*. London: Methuen.

Corbier, M. 2006. *Donner à voir, donner à lire. Mémoire et communication dans la Rome ancienne*. Paris: CNRS.

Crawford, M.H. 1996. *Roman Statutes*. 2 vols. London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London.

Crook, J.A. 1967. *The Law and Life of Rome*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Cruickshanks, E. and H. Erskine-Hill. 1985. "The Waltham Black Act and Jacobitism." *Journal of British Studies* 24: 358-65.

---. 2004. *The Atterbury Plot*. London: Palgrave.

Damon, C. 1995. "Greek Parasites and Roman Patronage." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 97: 181-95.

Davis, P. 2008. *Translation and the Poet's Life: The Ethics of Translating in English Culture, 1646-1726*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Derrida, J. 2001. "What Is a 'Relevant' Translation?" Translated by L. Venuti. *Critical Inquiry* 27: 174-200.

Deutsch, H. 2007. "Pope, self, and world." In *The Cambridge Companion to Alexander Pope*, edited by P. Rogers, 14-24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DuQuesnay, I.M. Le M. 1984. "Horace and Maecenas: the propaganda value of *Sermones* I." In *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, edited by T. Woodman and D. West, 19-58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eagleton, T. 2008. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Earl, D. 1967. *The Moral and Political Tradition of Rome*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Edwards, T. 1963. *This Dark Estate: A Reading of Pope*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

---. 1971. *Imagination and Power: A Study of Poetry on Public Themes*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Elias Jr., A.C. 1982. *Swift at Moor Park*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Erskine-Hill, H. 1967 "Augustans on Augustanism: England, 1655-1759." *Renaissance and Modern Studies* 11: 55-83.

---. 1975. *The Social Milieu of Alexander Pope: Lives, Example and the Poetic Response*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

---. 1979. "Literature and the Jacobite Cause." *Modern Language Studies* 9: 15-28.

---. 1981. "Alexander Pope: The Political Poet in His Time." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 15: 123-48.

--- 1982. "Under Which Caesar? Pope in the Journal of Mrs Charles Caesar, 1724-1741." *Review of English Studies* 33: 436-44.

---. 1983. *The Augustan Idea in English Literature*. London: Edward Arnold.

---. 1996. *Poetry of Opposition and Revolution: Dryden to Wordsworth*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

---. 2007. "Pope and the poetry of opposition." In *The Cambridge Companion to Alexander Pope*, edited by P. Rogers, 134-49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fairer, D. 1989. *The Poetry of Alexander Pope*. Harmondsworth and New York: Penguin Books.

---. 2007. "Pope and the Elizabethans." In *The Cambridge Companion to Alexander Pope*, edited by P. Rogers, 89-104. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Feeney, D.C. 1993. "Horace and the Greek lyric poets." In *Horace 2000: A Celebration. Essays for the Bimillenium*, edited by N. Rudd, 41-63. Bristol and Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

---. 2009. "*Una cum scriptore meo*: Poetry, Principate, and the Traditions of Literary History in the Epistle to Augustus. In *Horace: Satires and Epistles*, edited by K. Freudenburg, 360-85. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ferguson, R. 1986. *The Unbalanced Mind: Pope and the Rule of Passion*. Brighton: Harvester Press.

Ferraro, J. 1993. "Political Discourse in Alexander Pope's 'Episode of Sarpedon': Variations on the Theme of Kingship." *Modern Language Review* 88: 15-25.

Fiske, G.C. 1920. *Lucilius and Horace: A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation*. University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature 7. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Foxon, D. 1975. *English Verse, 1701-1750: A Catalogue of Separately Printed Poems with Notes on Contemporary Collected Editions*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 1991. *Pope and the Early Eighteenth-Century Book Trade*. Revised and edited by J. McLaverty. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fraenkel, E. 1957. *Horace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Freudenburg, K. 2001. *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Frier, B.W. 1985. *The Rise of the Roman Jurists*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Friis-Jensen, K. 2007. "The reception of Horace in the Middle Ages." In *The Cambridge Companion to Horace,* edited by S. Harrison, 291-304. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fuchs, J. 1980. "Women, 'Learned Lumber,' and English Neoclassical Poetry." *Pacific Coast Philology* 15: 27-34.

---. 1989. *Reading Pope's Imitations of Horace*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press.

Galinsky, K. 1996. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gillespie, S. 2005. "The Developing Corpus of Literary Translation." In *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English,* Vol. 3, edited by S. Gillespie and D. Hopkins, 121-48. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gillespie, S. and R. Cummings. 2004. "A Bibliography of Ovidian Translations and Imitations in English." *Translation and Literature* 13: 207-18.

Gillespie, S., and R. Sowerby. 2005. "Translation and Literary Innovation." In *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English,* Vol. 3, edited by S. Gillespie and D. Hopkins, 21-37. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gillespie, S. and P. Wilson. 2005. "The Publishing and Readership of Translation." In *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English,* Vol. 3, edited by S. Gillespie and D. Hopkins, 38-51. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gold, B.K. 1987. *Literary Patronage in Greece and Rome*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Goldberg, S.M. 2005. *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic: Poetry and Its Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gordon, I.R.F. 1976. *A Preface to Pope*. New York: Longman Group.

Grell, O.P., J.I. Israel, and N. Tyacke, eds. 1991. *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Griffin, D. 1978. *Alexander Pope: The Poet in the Poems*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Griffin, J. 1993. "Horace in the Thirties." In *Horace 2000: A Celebration: Essays for the Bimillenium*, edited by N. Rudd, 1-22. Bristol and Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Griffith, R.H. 1922-27. *Alexander Pope: A Bibliography*. 2 vols. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Gruen, E.S. 1992. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca: Cornell Univeristy Press.

Guerinot, J.V. 1969. *Pamphlet Attacks on Alexander Pope 1711-1744: A Descriptive Bibliography*. London: Methuen & Co.

Habinek, T. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Halsband, R. 1975. "Pope's 'Libel and Satire'." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 8: 473-74.

Hammond, B.S. 1980. "'Old England's Genius': Pope's *Epistle to Bolingbroke*." *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 3: 107-26.

Hammond, P. 1993. "Figures of Horace in Dryden's Literary Criticism." In *Horace Made New*, edited by C. Martindale and D. Hopkins, 127-47. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harder, A. 2012. *Callimachus: Aetia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hardie, P. 2012. *Rumour and Renown: Representations of Fama in Western Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haselberger, L. 2002. *Mapping Augustan Rome*. Portsmouth, RI: Journal of Roman Archaeology.

Heath, M. 1999. "Longinus on Sublimity." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 45: 43-74.

Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hodgart, M. 1978. "The subscription list for Pope's *Iliad*, 1715." In *The Dress of Words: Essays on Restoration and Eighteenth Century Literature in Honor of Richmond P. Bond*, edited by R.B. White, Jr., 25-34. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.

Hopkins, D. 2005. "Roman Satire and Epigram." In *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, Vol. 3, edited by S. Gillespie and D. Hopkins, 218-40. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hopkins, D. and P. Rogers. 2005. "The Translator's Trade." In *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, Vol. 3, edited by S. Gillespie and D. Hopkins, 81-95. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Horsfall, N. 1981. "Poets and Patron: Maecenas, Horace and the *Georgics*, Once More." The Macquarie Ancient History Association 3: 1-24

---. 1983. "Poets and Patron Reconsidered." *Ancient Society* 13: 161-66.

---. 1993. "Empty shelves on the Palatine." *Greece and Rome* 40: 58-67.

Hotch, R. 1980. "The Dilemma of an Obedient Son: Pope's *Epistle to Arbuthnot*." In *Pope: Recent Essays by Several Hands*, edited by M. Mack and J.A. Winn, 428-43. Hamden, CT: Archon.

Hunter, R.L. 1985. "Horace on friendship and free speech (*Epistles* 1.18 and *Satires* 1.4)." *Hermes* 113: 480-90.

Iliffe, R. 1992. "'In the Warehouse': Privacy, Property and Priority in the Early Royal Society." *History of Science* 30: 29-68.

Johnson, W.R. 1993. *Horace and the Dialectic of Freedom: Readings in Epistles 1*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Kahane, A. 1994. "Callimachus, Apollonius, and the Poetics of Mud." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 124: 121-33.

Kelly, L. 2005. "The Eighteenth Century to Tytler." In *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, Vol. 3, edited by S. Gillespie and D. Hopkins, 67-78. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kelsall, M. 1976. "Augustus and Pope." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 39: 117-31.

---. 2007. "Landscapes and estates." In *The Cambridge Companion to Alexander Pope*, edited by P. Rogers, 161-74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kenyon, J.P. 1977. *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party, 1689-1720*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kewes, P. 2005. "Drama." In *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, Vol. 3, edited by S. Gillespie and D. Hopkins, 241-52. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kinne, W.A. 1967. *Revivals and Importations of French Comedies in England 1749-1800*. New York: AMS Press.

Klingner, F. 2009. "Horace's Letter to Augustus." In *Horace: Satires and Epistles*, edited by K. Freudenburg, 335-59. New York: Oxford University Press.

Konstan, D. 1995. "Patrons and Friends." *Classical Philology* 90: 328-42.

---. 1997. *Friendship in the Classical World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kropf, C.R. 1974. "Libel and Satire in the Eighteenth Century." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 8: 153-68.

LaFleur, R.A. 1981. "Horace and *Onomasti Komodein*: The Law of Satire." *Aufsteig und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.31.3:1790-1826.

La Penna, A. 2009. "Horace, Augustus, and the Question of the Latin Theatre." In *Horace: Satires and Epistles*, edited by K. Freudenburg, 386-401. New York: Oxford University Press.

Leeman, A.D. 1982. "Rhetorical status in Horace, *Serm*. 2.1." In *Rhetoric Revalued*, edited by B. Vickers, 159-63. Binghamton: Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies, State University of New York.

Leishman, J.B. 1951. *The Monarch of Wit*. London: Hutchinson.

Lejay, P. 1911. *Oeuvres d'Horace, Satires*. Paris: Hachette.

Leranbaum, M. 1977. *Alexander Pope's 'Opus Magnum', 1729-1744*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Levine, J.A. 1967. "Pope's *Epistle to Augustus*, Lines 1-30." *Studies in English Literature* 7:427-51.

Lewis, J. 1996. *The English Fable: Aesop and Literary Culture, 1651-1740*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lindenbaum, P. 1986. *Changing Landscapes: Anti-Pastoral Sentiment in the English Renaissance*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Low, A. 1985. *The Georgic Revolution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lowrie, M. 2005. "Slander and Horse Law in Horace, Sermones 2.1." *Law and Literature* 17: 405-431.

Lyne, R.O.A.M. 1995. *Horace: Behind the Public Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Mack, M. 1969. *The Garden and the City: Retirement and Politics in the Latter Poetry of Pope 1731-1743*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

---. 1982. *Collected in Himself: Essays Critical, Biographical, and Bibliographical on Pope and Some of His Contemporaries*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.

---. 1985. *Alexander Pope: A Life*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Mannheimer, K. 2006. “To the Letter: The Material Text as Space of Adjudication in Pope’s *The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace*.” *Comparative Literature Studies* 43: 1-18.

Maresca, T.E. 1964. “Pope’s Defense of Satire: The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated.” *English Literary History* 31: 366-94.

---. 1966. *Pope’s Horatian Poems*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Martin, P. 1984. *Pursuing Innocent Pleasures: The Gardening World of Alexander Pope*. Hamden, CT: Archon.

Martindale, J. 1993. “The Master of Virtue and Wisdom: The Horace of Ben Jonson and His Heirs.” In *Horace Made New*, edited by C. Martindale and D. Hopkins, 50-85. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matthews, S. 1990. “‘Matter too soft’: Pope and the women’s novel.” In *Pope: New Contexts*, edited by D. Fairer, 103-20. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Mayer, R.G. 1995. “Horace’s *Moyen de Parvenir*.” In *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration*, edited by S. Harrison, 279-95. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McGann, M. 2007. “The reception of Horace in the Renasissance.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, edited by S. Harrison, 305-17. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McGinn, T. 2001. “Satire and the Law: The Case of Horace.” *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 47: 81-102.

McLaverty, J. 1998. “‘Of Which Being Publick the Publick Judge:’ Pope and the Publication of *Verses Address’d to the Imitator of Horace*.” *Studies in Bibliography* 51: 183-204.

---. 2001. *Pope, Print, and Meaning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 2007. “Pope and the Book Trade.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Alexander Pope*, edited by P. Rogers, 186-97. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moles, J. 1987. “Politics, Philosophy, and Friendship in Horace ‘Odes’ 2,7.” *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 25: 59-72.

---. 2002. “Poetry, Philosophy, Politics and Play: *Epistles* 1.” In *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace*, edited by T. Woodman and D. Feeney, 141-57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 2007. “Philosophy and ethics.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, edited by S. Harrison, 165-80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Momigliano, A. 1942. Review of "Freedom of Speech in the Roman Republic," by L. Robinson. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 32: 120-24.

Money, D. 2007. "The reception of Horace in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries." In *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, edited by S. Harrison, 318-33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morris, D.B. 1988. "Pope and the Arts of Pleasure." In *The Enduring Legacy: Alexander Pope Tercentenary Essays*, edited by G. Rousseau and P. Rogers, 95-119. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moul, V. 2010. *Jonson, Horace and the Classical Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Muecke, F. 1993. *Horace, Satires II*. Warminster: Aris and Phillips.

---. 1995. "Law, rhetoric, and genre in Horace, *Satire* 2.1." In *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration*, edited by S. Harrison, 203-18. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nadeau, Y. 2008. *Erotica for Caesar: A Study of the Love-Poetry of Horace, Carmina, Books I to III*. Bruxelles: Latomus.

Nichols, J. 1812-16. *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*. 9 vols. London: Nichols, Son, and Bentley.

Nicolson, M.H., and G. Rousseau. 1968. *"This Long Disease, My Life": Alexander Pope and the Sciences*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Nisbet, R.G.M. 1984. "Horace's *Epodes* and History." In *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, edited by T. Woodman and D. West, 1-18. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 2007. "Horace: life and chronology." In *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, edited by S. Harrison, 7-21. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nisbet, R.G.M. and M. Hubbard. 1970. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 1978. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nisbet, R.G.M. and N. Rudd. 2004. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book III*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nokes, D. 1995. *John Gay: A Profession of Friendship, A Critical Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nussbaum, F. 1984. *The Brink of All We Hate: English Satires on Women, 1660-1750*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.

Oliensis, E. 1998. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parmelee, L.F. 1994. "Printers, Patrons, Readers, and Spies: Importation of French Propaganda in Late Elizabethan England." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 25: 853-72.

Patterson, A. 1991. *Fable of Power: Aesopian Writing and Political History*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Patterson, L.R. 1968. *Copyright in Historical Perspective*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

Paulson, R. 1972. "Satire, Poetry, and Pope." In *English Satire: Papers Read at a Clark Library Seminar, January 15, 1972*, edited by H. Carlson and R. Paulson, 55-106. Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library.

Peterson, R.S. 1981. *Imitation and Praise in the Poems of Ben Jonson*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Pollak, E. 1985. *The Poetics of Sexual Myth: Gender and Ideology in the Verse of Swift and Pope*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ransom, H. 1951. "The personal letter as literary property." *Studies in English* 30:116-31.

Rauh, N.K. 1989. "Auctioneers and the Roman economy." *Historia* 38: 451-71.

Rawson, E. 1985. *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*. London: Duckworth.

---. 1991. "*Discrimina ordinum*: the *lex Julia theatralis*." In *Roman Culture and Society: Collected Papers*, edited by E. Rawson, 508-45. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Reckford, K.J. 1959. "Horace and Maecenas." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 90: 195-208.

---. 1997. "Horatius: the Man and the Hour." *American Journal of Philology* 118: 583-612.

Reverand II, C.D. 1976. "Ut Pictura Poesis, and Pope's 'Satire II, I'." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 9: 553-568.

Reynolds, R. 1975. "'Libels and Satires! Lawless Things Indeed!'" *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 8: 475-77.

Rogers, P. 1974. "The Waltham Blacks and the Black Act." *Historical Journal* 17: 465-86.

---. 1978. "Pope and his Subscribers." *Publishing History* 3: 7-36.

---. 2002. "Nameless Names: Pope, Curll, and the Uses of Anonymity." *New Literary History* 33: 233-45.

---. 2006. *Essays on Pope*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 2007. "Pope in Arcadia: pastoral and its dissolution." In *The Cambridge Companion to Alexander Pope*, edited by P. Rogers, 105-17. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rodgers, R.W. 1949. "Review of Lillian D. Bloom, 'Pope as a Textual Critic: A Bibliographical Study of His Horatian Text.'" *Philological Quarterly* 28: 397-98.

Rogers, R.W. 1955. *The Major Satires of Alexander Pope*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Rose, M. 1992. "The Author in Court: Pope v. Curll (1741)." *Cultural Critique* 21: 197-217.

Rosslyn, F. 1990. *Alexander Pope: A Literary Life*. London: Macmillan.

Røstvig, M.-S. 1954. "Casimire Sarbiewski and the English Ode." *Studies in Philology* 51:443-60.

Rothstein, E. 1981. *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Poetry, 1660-1780*. *Routledge History of English Poetry*. Vol. 3. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Rousseau, G. 2007. "Medicine and the body." In *The Cambridge Companion to Alexander Pope*, edited by P. Rogers, 210-21. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rudd, N. 1966. *The Satires of Horace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 1986. *Themes in Roman Satire*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

---. 1993. "Horace as moralist." In *Horace 2000: A Celebration. Essays for the Bimillenium*, edited by N. Rudd, 64-88. Bristol: University of Michigan Press.

---. 1994. *The Classical Tradition in Operation*. Toronto: Toronto University Press.

---. 2005. *The Common Spring: Essays on Latin and English Poetry*. Exeter: Bristol Phoenix Press.

---. 2005b. "Pope's Farewell to Horace: *Dialogue* I, 1-22." *Translation and Literature* 14: 240-45.

Ruffell, I.A. 2003. "Beyond satire: Horace, Popular Invective and the Segregation of Literature." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 93: 35-65.

Rumbold, V. 1989. *Women's Place in Pope's World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 2007. "Pope and gender." In *The Cambridge Companion to Alexander Pope*, edited by P. Rogers, 198-209. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saller, R.P. 1982. *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schonhorn, M. 1968. "The Audacious Contemporaneity of Pope's *Epistle to Augustus*." *Studies in English Literature* 8: 431-43.

---. 1980. “Pope’s *Epistle to Augustus*: Notes Toward a Mythology.” In *Pope: Recent Essays by Several Hands*, edited by M. Mack and J.A. Winn, 546-64. Hamden, CT: Archon.

Schnurr, C. 1992. “The *lex Julia theatralis* of Augustus: some remarks on seating problems in theatre, amphitheatre and circus.” *LCM* 17: 147-60.

Scodel, J.K. 1988. “‘Your Distance Keep’: Pope’s Epitaphic Stance.” *English Literary History* 55: 615-41.

Seager, R. 1993. “Horace and Augustus: poetry and policy.” In *Horace 2000: A Celebration. Essays for the Bimillenium*, edited by N. Rudd, 23-40. Bristol: University of Michigan Press.

Selden, R. 1984. “Oldham, Pope, and Restoration Satire.” *The Yearbook of English Studies* 14: 109-26.

Sellin, P. 1968. *Daniel Heinsius and Stuart England: With a Short-Title Checklist of the Works of Daniel Heinsius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shankman, S. 1983. *Pope’s “Iliad”: Homer in the Age of Passion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

---. 2007. “Pope’s Homer and his poetic career.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Alexander Pope*, edited by P. Rogers, 63-75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sherburn, G. 1934. *The Early Career of Alexander Pope*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

---. 1958. “New Anecdotes about Alexander Pope.” *Notes and Queries* 203: 343-49.

Simpson, A.E. 2004. “Popular Perceptions of Rape as a Capital Crime in Eighteenth-Century England: The Press and the Trial of Francis Charteris in the Old Bailey, February 1730.” *Law and History Review* 22: 27-70.

Sitter, J. 2007. “Pope’s versification and voice.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Alexander Pope*, edited by P. Rogers, 37-48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sitwell, E. 1930. *Alexander Pope*. London: Faber and Faber.

Sowerby, R. 2005. “Epic.” In *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, Vol. 3, edited by S. Gillespie and D. Hopkins, 149-72. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 2006. *The Augustan Art of Poetry: Augustan Translation of the Classics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spacks, P.M. 1971. *An Argument of Images: The Poetry of Alexander Pope*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Stack, F. 1985. *Pope and Horace: Studies in Imitation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stahl, H. 1985. *Propertius: Love and War: Individual and State Under Augustus*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Steinberg, S.H. 1996. *Five Hundred Years of Printing*. London: The British Library and Oak Knoll Press.

Stockley, V.A. 1929. *German Literature as Known in England 1750-1830*. London: Routledge.

Syme, R. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 1986. *Augustan Aristocracy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Tarrant, R.J. 1996. Review of *Horace: Behind the Public Poetry*, by R.O.A.M. Lyne. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 96.9.15.

Tatum, J. 2009. "*Ultra Legem*: Law and Literature in Horace, *Satires* 2.1." In *Horace: Satires and Epistles*, edited by K. Freudenburg, 231-42. New York: Oxford University Press.

Terzaghi, N. 1965. "Il padre di Orazio." *Atene e Roma* 10: 66-71.

Thomas, C.N. 1994. *Alexander Pope and His Eighteenth-Century Women Readers*. Carbondale and Edwardsville, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.

Tillotson, G. 1938. *On the Poetry of Pope*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

---. 1946. *The Moral Poetry of Pope*. Newcastle upon Tyne: The Literary and Philosophical Society of Newcastle upon Tyne.

Tillotson, G., P. Fussel, Jr., and M. Waingrow, eds. 1969. *Eighteenth-Century English Literature*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Tissol, G. 2005. "Ovid." In *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, Vol. 3, edited by S. Gillespie and D. Hopkins, 204-17. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tomlinson, C. 1983. *Poetry and Metamorphosis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Traina, A. 2009. "Horace and Aristippus: The *Epistles* and the Art of *Conuiuere*." In *Horace: Satires and Epistles*, edited by K. Freudenburg, 287-307. New York: Oxford University Press.

Urstad, T.S. 1999. *Sir Robert Walpole's Poets: The Use of Literature as Pro-Government Propaganda, 1721-1742*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Vincent, H.P. 1939. "Some *Dunciad* litigation." *Philological Quarterly* 18: 285-89.

Vinge, L. 1967. *The Narcissus Theme in Western European Literature up to the Early Nineteenth Century*. Lund: Gleerups.

Wall, C. 2007. "Poetic spaces." In *The Cambridge Companion to Alexander Pope*, edited by P. Rogers, 49-62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1982. "Civilis princeps: Between Citizen and King." *Journal of Roman Studies* 72: 32-48.

Warren, A. 1929. *Alexander Pope as Critic and Humanist*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Watt, I. 1966. "Two Historical Aspects of the Augustan Tradition." In *Studies in the Eighteenth Century: Papers Presented at the David Nichol Smith Memorial Seminar*, edited by R.F. Brissenden, 67-79. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Weinbrot, H.D. 1966. "Translation and Parody: Towards the Genealogy of the Augustan Imitation." *English Literary History* 33: 434-447.

---. 1969. *The Formal Strain: Studies in Augustan Imitation and Satire*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

---. 1974. "History, Horace, and Augustus Caesar: Some Implications for Eighteenth-Century Satire." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 7: 391-414.

---. 1978. *Augustus Caesar in "Augustan" England: The Decline of a Classical Norm*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

---. 1979. "Such as Sir Robert Would Approve? Answers to Pope's Answer from Horace." *Modern Language Studies* 9: 5-14.

---. 1982. *Alexander Pope and the Traditions of Formal Verse Satire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

---. 1983. "Masked Men and Satire and Pope: Toward a Historical Basis for the Eighteenth-Persona." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 16: 265-89.

---. 1988. *Eighteenth-Century Satire: Essays on Text and Context from Dryden to Peter Pindar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 2005. *Menippean Satire Reconsidered: From Antiquity to the Eighteenth Century*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

---. 2007. "Pope and the classics." In *The Cambridge Companion to Alexander Pope*, edited by P. Rogers, 76-88. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

White, P. 1978. "*Amicitia* and the Profession of Poetry in Early Imperial Rome." *Journal of Roman Studies* 68: 74-92.

---. 1993. *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

---. 2007. "Friendship, Patronage and Horatian Socio-poetics." In *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, edited by S. Harrison, 195-206. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, A. 1973. "The 'Angel, Goddess, Montague' of Pope's 'Sober Advice from Horace'." *Modern Philology* 71: 56-58.

Williams, G. 1994. "Public Policies, Private Affairs, and Strategies of Address in the Poetry of Horace." *Classical World* 87: 395-408.

---. 2009. "*Libertino patre natus*: True or False?" In *Horace: Satires and Epistles*, edited by K. Freudenburg, 138-55. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, P. 2005. "Lyric, Pastoral, and Elegy." In *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*., Vol. 3, edited by S. Gillespie and D. Hopkins, 173-90. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Winn, J.A. 1987. *Dryden and His World*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Winnifrith, T. 2005. "Latin Historians." In *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, Vol. 3, edited by S. Gillespie and D. Hopkins, 281-90. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 2005. "Moralists, Orators, and Literary Critics." In *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*., Vol. 3, edited by S. Gillespie and D. Hopkins, 253-71. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Young, B. 2007. "Pope and ideology." In *The Cambridge Companion to Alexander Pope*, edited by P. Rogers, 118-33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Young, P.H. 2003. *The Printed Homer: A 3,000 Year Publishing and Translation History of the Iliad and the Odyssey*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company.

Zetzel, J.E.G. 1980. "Horace's *Liber Sermonum*: the structure of ambiguity." *Arethusa* 13: 59-78.

---. 2002. "Dreaming about Quirinus: Horace's *Satires* and the development of Augustan poetry." In *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace*, edited by T. Woodman and D. Feeney, 38-52. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.