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CHAPTER I

GRANVILLE: A REVALUATION

The literary reputation of George Granville, Lord Lansdowne, has verged upon obscurity for almost two centuries. Except for Johnson, who in his *Lives of the English Poets* declared that Granville's eminence and honesty as a political figure led his literary peers to judge his works leniently, few critics or biographers have taken notice of him.

The fullest study of Granville that has yet appeared, Elizabeth Handasyde's *Granville the Polite*, does present a discussion of most of his works which is at times exceptionally penetrating. But Miss Handasyde's major concern is clearly with Granville's social and political career, and her judgments about the quality of his literary productions are too often inadequately supported by her arguments. The bias of her approach appears in the conclusion of a rather brief chapter on Granville's poetry:

Granville, where he is remembered at all, is now remembered only as a poet; but in fact his poetry forms only the prelude to his career. It was the diversion of his idleness in the years during which his poverty and his obstinate loyalism obliged him to live in a retirement hateful to his sociable temperament and was gradually thrown aside as he became more and more involved in the exciting political game.
Nothing can raise it any higher in the scale of poetical merit; but at least it can be realized that his claim to an inconspicuous niche in English history does not rest so much upon his youthful performances as a poet, as upon the firmer basis of genuine political service to his party and steady loyalty to a defeated cause.²

Such a judgment dismisses Granville's poetry as mediocre without giving it a fair trial. Miss Handasyde's interest is obviously not primarily with Granville's literary output, and most of the remainder of her book, except for two excellent chapters on his dramas, studies only his social and political career. Her judgment of his poetic worth carries little authority, not because it relies on opinion but because it does not support that opinion enough. She apparently expects her readers to take on faith her implication that she has studied Granville's poems in great detail and has presented her findings after mature deliberation. One looks in vain for more than a few specific quotations from Granville's poems to support her arguments; and almost as infrequent are her references even to the titles of any of his poems.

Despite lack of proof, Miss Handasyde's conclusion that Granville's poetry was undistinguished has been allowed to stand by almost every critic who has touched on Granville since she wrote. William B. Piper, for example, sees Granville only as one of "a little band of polite poets" who modeled their works after Waller's.³ And even
such a comprehensive project as George Sherburn's *The Restoration and Eighteenth Century* contains only few and brief references to Granville.4

In striking contrast to the dearth of critical attention that Granville has received since the time of Johnson is the high praise that he was accorded by many literary figures during his own age, including writers of no less eminence than Dryden, Waller, and Pope.5 Nor did Granville's fame depend solely upon his having been eulogized by great men. Two of his plays, *Heroick-Love* and *The She-Gallants*, were enthusiastically received by London audiences.6 His *Jew of Venice* was one of the most successful adaptations of a Shakespearian comedy written during the entire Restoration and eighteenth century.7 Also, several brief biographies and partial editions of his works appeared in the century after his death.8 A discrepancy between the evaluation of a writer by his contemporaries and the judgment of succeeding ages usually justifies a fresh examination of his works with a view towards determining what merit, or lack of it, lies behind his fluctuation in popularity. Such a discrepancy obviously exists to a remarkable degree in the case of Granville's literary reputation. Curiosity over his sudden and almost total loss of popularity would be motive enough for conducting a thorough investigation of the quality and importance of his works.
Somewhat surprising, when one considers Granville's present reputation, is the fact that one needs only to examine his works with attention and without prejudice to discover a great deal of merit in them. He is valuable both as a guide to traditions and techniques of his own time that have since been misinterpreted or forgotten, and as a writer capable of producing instructive and delightful poetry and drama.

Granville's greatest talent lay in his ability to recognize the aesthetically and intellectually viable in the writings of others and to apply his perceptions to the composition of works of his own which were both artistically sound and sensitively calculated to suit the temper of his times. In working on *The Jew of Venice*, for example, Granville's adaptation of *The Merchant of Venice* that is the subject of Chapter Two of this study, he selected one of the several sub-plots that Shakespeare so carefully works out in his great play and fashioned the sub-plot into a unified, highly focused, and suspenseful drama about the nobility of friendship. In order to promote his artistic design, Granville had boldly to deny his Restoration audience one of its principal expectations of a Shakespearian revision--the multiplication and complication of the love plots of the original play; for if Granville had proliferated the love plots in Shakespeare's story, he would have had to abandon much of the thematic unity, focus and suspense that his concentration on the single major theme of
friendship affords his adaptation. Paradoxically, Granville's adherence to one main plot line more than makes up for the disappointment of his Restoration playgoers with respect to love intrigues, since it allows him to employ almost all of the other standard alterations favored by his audience in a Shakespearian adaptation without losing control of the direction and continuity of his work. Restoration playgoers demanded many kinds of changes in Shakespeare's plays, and most of the alterations were thoroughly independent of each other. An adapter trying at once to increase the degree of poetic justice in Shakespeare's story, to observe the classical unities more closely than Shakespeare had, to provide a masque for the revision, and to modernize Shakespeare's language might well find himself unable to incorporate all these changes into one well designed whole. Granville's decision to emphasize a single sub-plot in Shakespeare's play at the expense of its other plots gave him an easily manageable topic which lent itself perfectly to being developed by means of the various specific alterations that Granville employed to please his audience. Thus Granville was able to take a viable element from Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* and rework it into an adaptation shrewdly calculated to appeal to a Restoration audience.

The evolution of Chapter Three occurred as a result of my chance observation of the similarity between a line in Dryden's *Astraea Redux* and one in Granville's "To the
In the midst of an address to Charles II on the occasion of his restoration, Dryden states: "Your goodness only is above the laws." And twenty-five years later, at the time of James II's coronation, Granville says in "To the King": "Thy Justice is a stronger Guard than Laws." Not only are the lines themselves alike in structure and meaning, but they also occur in the context of longer passages which seem similar in intent; both represent an attempt to offer genuine praise to the king while simultaneously imparting advice or warning. Further investigation into the nature of seventeenth-century political poetry led me to the discovery that although many poets of the period offer advice and warning in their panegyrics, only Dryden and Granville so thoroughly fuse praise and admonition that precisely the same words carry both the compliment and the advice or warning. Furthermore, Dryden does so only in one passage of Astraea Redux, while Granville employs the technique throughout three separate political poems. I shall call the type of poetry that emerges from this fusion the admonitory encomium, and I shall try to show in Chapter Three something of the remarkable brilliance involved in Granville's perfection of the form as well as indicate the great effectiveness of the admonitory encomium as a means of offering advice or warning during political times when a more direct admonition might be neither tactful nor safe.
In the "Preface" to his own *Works*, Granville acknowledges himself a disciple of Edmund Waller and states his hope to carry on the tradition of Waller by providing "a faithful Register of the reigning Beauties in the succeeding Age." Granville's statement omits mention of the refinement of English numbers for which Waller has usually been praised. He seems instead to indicate that a major part of Waller's importance involves an original contribution to the tradition of love poetry or the poetry of admiration of women. Since Waller's love poetry is seldom significantly distinguished from that of such contemporaries as Herrick, Suckling, and Carew, Chapter Four of this dissertation undertakes an investigation of Granville's perception of Waller's unique contribution with a view towards determining the accuracy and importance of this perception. The results of that investigation are startling. Not only is Granville correct in his implication that Waller began a new kind of poetry, but proof is offered in Chapter Four that Waller's type of love poetry or, more accurately, his ambiguous lyric, was of great importance throughout the Restoration and the first half of the eighteenth century. And Granville is not only valuable for the hint in his "Preface" concerning Waller's poetry; he also helps to keep that type of poetry alive and flourishing by contributing several interesting poems of his own to the sub-genre and by calling attention to Waller's greatness as a poet at every opportunity.
In Chapters Two through Four we shall see Granville responding directly to the poetry and drama of others, selecting viable elements from their works and fashioning from them works of his own which are both artistically sound and precisely attuned to the temper of his age. Chapter Five will deal with Granville's most original contribution to literature, the *Essay Upon unnatural Flights in Poetry*. Granville's *Essay* was the only piece of English neoclassical poetical criticism to anticipate Pope's *An Essay on Criticism* in the combination of a humorous tone and a fluid movement from precept to example and from one topic to the next with continuity afforded by thematic unity, lexical repetition, and the recurrent use of such technical devices as antithetical imagery and the juxtaposition of unlike passages. This combination promotes in both poems a witty, conversational tone through humor and fluidity and at the same time, by means of the thematic unity, lexical repetition, and recurrent use of certain technical devices, affords both Pope's *Essay* and Granville's *Essay* a subtle, complex undercurrent of continuity which connects the various stages of the argument presented. I shall argue in Chapter Five that Granville's anticipation of Pope in several vitally important respects entitles his *Essay* to a much higher rank in the tradition of English neoclassical poetical criticism than has usually been accorded it.

If Granville had succeeded only occasionally or in
only one tradition as a writer, his work could perhaps be treated at sufficient length in a single article. But the picture of Granville that emerges from a detailed examination of his works portrays a man whose perceptions about many of the literary practices of his forerunners and contemporaries were remarkably acute, and who had the ability to modify and extend those practices in works of his own that were calculated both to conform to his artistic standards and appeal to the taste of his readers or viewers. The aggregate importance of his literary achievement, the fact that he made significant and sometimes vital contributions in four separate literary genres, demands a fuller study of his works than has yet appeared. Hopefully, Granville's literary reputation will recover at least a measure of its former standing once his precise stature in his own age as well as the lasting importance of his perceptions and writings are recognized.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER I


5. See Waller's "To Mr. Granville, On His Verses to King James II," Pope's *Windsor Forest*, and Dryden's "To Mr. Granville, On His Excellent Tragedy Call'd Heroic Love."


7. The play was performed during twenty-five of the thirty-nine seasons between 1701 and 1739. See *The London Stage, 1660-1800*, ed. E.L. Avery (Carbondale, Ill., 1960-- ).


11. I.e., Granville's own age, the age "succeeding" Waller. Granville's "Preface" is not paginated.
The "ambiguous lyric" is my own term. I shall define it at length in Chapter Four.

Granville is heavily indebted for the thematic content of his poem to Dominique Bouhours' *La Manière de bien penser dans les ouvrages d'esprit* (see Handasyde, pp. 64-66). My study of Granville's Essay is concerned with tone and technique rather than theme.
CHAPTER II
GRANVILLE'S THE JEW OF VENICE, A SHAKESPEARIAN ADAPTATION

A considerable amount of thorough and accurate scholarship has been devoted to The Jew of Venice, Granville's revision of Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice. Several writers have presented a scene-by-scene comparison of Granville's play with the original, and they have detailed his additions and deletions in such areas as diction, the unities, and song and spectacle. These writers, by specifically indicating Granville's debts to Shakespeare as well as the ways in which he changed The Merchant of Venice, have furnished the materials for an objective critical evaluation of Granville's work.

Unfortunately, such authors as Hazelton Spencer, Kilbourne, and Odell, as well as a few more recent students of Granville's play, such as Toby Lelyveld, are not usually as responsible in their critical judgments about The Jew of Venice as they are in their scholarly work. Too often Granville's revision has received a vituperative condemnation from a writer whose main emphasis has been on scholarship and who has not even begun to offer convincing arguments to support his critical judgment. Odell, for example, can only cite one general flaw in The Jew of Venice, that being the poor quality of the language in some of
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Granville's original lines. Yet without presenting any other reason for his adverse judgment of Granville's play, Odell singles it out, along with Davenant's *Macbeth* and Tate's *Lear*, as one of the three most disgusting butcheries of Shakespeare written during the entire period. More recently, Toby Lelyveld has outdone Odell in the lack of supporting evidence for his abusive comments about Granville's work. Lelyveld makes the following remarkably extravagant statement: "So indiscriminating is his [Granville's] tampering, that the resultant perversion has only the merest resemblance to its original" (p. 15). Not only does Lelyveld fail to offer one concrete reason for his condemnation of *The Jew of Venice*, but his assertion that Granville's play does not at all resemble its original ignores the painstaking work that Kilbourne and others have done in tracing the many similarities between the two plays.

Even the students of Granville's work whose emphasis has been primarily critical rather than scholarly have often stopped short of a satisfactorily thorough analysis of Granville's intention and execution in his revision. Elizabeth Handasyde, for instance, whose discussion of *The Jew of Venice* is in many ways excellent, notes without following it up a point that I consider a vital key to Granville's artistic intentions:
Granville . . . resisted the temptation to allow his love-story to overbalance the rest of the plot, but kept it in its place, allowing it little more latitude than was given it by Shakespeare. He sees the central moral of the play in the friendship of Antonio and Bassanio, leading the Merchant to a height of self-sacrifice which in the new version is rivalled by that of his devoted friend.

If Miss Handasyde had pushed her interesting observation about the nature of Granville's revision slightly further, she might have come up with a sound critical method by means of which she could have evaluated Granville's achievements in relation to his intentions. But like practically everyone else who has discussed The Jew of Venice, Miss Handasyde focuses on Shakespeare's play rather than Granville's. She complains, for example, that the "Masque of Peleus and Thetis," Granville's own creation which is inserted at the end of Act II, "provides a poor substitute for the meditations of Launcelot Gobbo." Yet in a play such as Granville's, which, as I hope to show, stresses the nobility of friendship as its theme more pointedly and far more exclusively than Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice, the masque, which "emphasizes the power of Love and Friendship," might well be more appropriately included than Launcelot's fooling, however entertaining the clown may be.

The overwhelming tendency of critics to convict Granville of literary atrocities without giving his work a fair trial has left some important issues regarding The
Jew of Venice relatively untouched. One of them, which I have already indicated, involves the question of whether Granville had any definite artistic goals in mind when he undertook the revision. If he had, then one needs to do more in evaluating his play than simply list the areas in which his work is inferior to The Merchant of Venice. To be critically just, one must assess Granville’s accomplishments in terms of what he attempted to achieve. Another issue that demands attention concerns the immense popularity of The Jew of Venice during the first half of the eighteenth century. Granville’s play held the stage to the exclusion of Shakespeare’s from 1701 until 1741. Several critics who have addressed themselves to the task of explaining this impertinent piece of history have attributed the success of The Jew of Venice to the vicious taste of a corrupt age. Such an explanation, though, besides revealing a certain critical ingenuousness in its authors, also fails to take account of the fact that many other Shakespearian revisions of the period which also supposedly pandered to the deformed taste of the times were miserable failures on the stage. Unless Granville’s work contained substantial merits of its own, qualities which made it an interesting play in its own right and not just a servile, mechanical, and unimaginative offering to the predilections of Granville’s audience, then its fate should have been similar to Burnaby’s Love Betray’d and Dennis’ The Comical Gallant. Clearly, then, important
questions about The Jew of Venice remain to be answered. The objectives of this chapter will be to identify Granville's artistic aims in writing his revision, to determine to what extent he achieved those aims, and to provide an explanation for the contemporary success of Granville's play.

The three issues of most importance to this discussion--the popular success of The Jew of Venice, Granville's artistic aims in writing it, and the extent to which the play realizes those aims--are thoroughly interrelated. I believe that Granville did indeed have an artistic goal in mind while composing his revision. He wanted, I think, to fashion from the materials afforded by The Merchant of Venice a meaningful and unified play about the nobility of friendship. I further believe that Granville wanted to employ the conventions and approaches in his revision that would be most likely to please a Restoration audience. I hope to demonstrate that Granville, far from finding his two goals irreconcilable, was actually able to promote his artistic aims by means of the very devices and alterations that were calculated to appeal to the taste of his audience. In other words, Granville, apparently assuming that his audience would appreciate generally sound drama as well as drama tailored to meet certain specific requirements of that audience, remained true to his own artistic principles while insuring the popular success of his play in two
ways: he gave his audience what it demanded of a Shakespearean revision in terms of the nature and direction of its alterations from the original; and he used those more or less standard alterations to promote the development of an artistically sound, thoroughly unified, interesting, and exciting play. The Jew of Venice was able to appeal to the public both as a generally well wrought drama and as a play that fulfilled certain specific requirements of its audience.

Before proceeding with an investigation of the nature and function of Granville's revisions, it will be necessary to take account of one vital exception to the usual pattern of his alterations. In only one respect does Granville ignore the taste of his audience, that being in his deemphasizing of the love plots of Shakespeare's story in the interest of developing a solidly unified play about the nobility of friendship. Practically every revision of a Shakespearean comedy written during the period displays a complication and multiplication of the love plots found in the original. This uniformity in the nature of alterations among so many plays is no doubt largely due to the remarkable popularity of Davenant and Dryden's The Tempest (1667), in which the single love plot in Shakespeare's play becomes incredibly proliferated. The two revisers add to the play's basic group of characters Hippolito, a man who has never seen a woman and who complements Miranda
and another addition, her sister Dorinda, neither of whom has ever seen a man. Also added are Sycorax, Caliban's sister, and Milcha, a companion spirit to Ariel. Armed with their new characters, Davenant and Dryden promote the following love complications: Hippolito loves both Miranda and Dorinda, while only Dorinda loves him in return; Ferdinand and Miranda are in love, as are Ariel and Milcha. And Trinculo attempts to win the hand of Sycorax. 16 The popular success of Davenant and Dryden's version of The Tempest, combined with the fact that Restoration playgoers, delighted with the appearance of actresses on the stage, made no secret of their desire to see "the gay young fashionable couples who were . . . thought almost essential to a modern comedy,"17 clearly had a significant influence on the treatment of love plots by revisers of Shakespeare's comedies. In fact, except for The Jew of Venice, one looks in vain for an adaptation of a Shakespearian comedy written during the Restoration and early eighteenth century that does not contain some complication or proliferation of the love plots in the original.

For Granville to have ignored such an overwhelming tendency in the revisions of his predecessors, one which was, moreover, known to have greatly pleased the taste of the Restoration audience, certainly represented a considerable risk on his part. But the results of Granville's gamble fully justified the dangers involved.
By paring away much of the love intrigue of *The Merchant of Venice*, and by strictly subordinating what remained of it to the story of the jeopardized but noble relationship of Antonio and Bassanio, Granville was able to fashion *The Jew of Venice* into a play with even greater unity, focus, and suspense than its renowned original. The predominance of the theme regarding noble friendship in Granville's adaptation can perhaps be best illustrated by an examination of certain alterations and additions that Granville makes at key points in the story. At the end of Act I of *The Jew of Venice*, when Shylock and Antonio have agreed upon the terms of the loan, Granville adds several lines in which Antonio delivers a number of elevated sentiments concerning his friendship with Bassanio. At one point he states:

> There is not the least Danger, nor can be,  
> 'Or if there were, what is a Pound of Flesh,  
> 'What my whole Body, every Drop of Blood,  
> 'To purchase my Friend's Quiet!”

This is not one of the better speeches in Granville's play, but it does indicate his determination to establish early in *The Jew of Venice* the noble quality of the bond between Antonio and Bassanio.

Another alteration, this one of great importance, occurs at the end of Act II of *The Jew of Venice*. Shakespeare's Act II terminates with the scene in which Portia receives her first intimation that Bassanio has arrived...
in Belmont to pay court to her (II. ix. 84-101), a development of great importance to the major love plot of the original play. But Granville, who omits Shakespeare's II. ix. in his revision, concludes his Act II with a scene of his own invention (II. ii. pp. 158-164) in which the friendship of Antonio and Bassanio is powerfully stressed and in which Shylock's total aversion to the two companions is ominously revealed.

Granville further emphasizes the friendship plot and, by implication, its accompanying theme, through placing the gaoler scene at the climactic position in Act III and through lengthening the confrontation between Shylock and the imprisoned Antonio by incorporating several venomous speeches of Shylock's from an earlier scene in the original play. Shakespeare's Act III concludes with Portia's preparations to go to Venice and rescue her lover's friend (III. iv.). By placing Portia's activity just prior to the trial scene (IV. i.), Shakespeare manages to emphasize the play's major love plot and its friendship plot at the same time. But Granville, by arranging an emotionally charged confrontation between Antonio and Shylock at the exciting moment just preceding Antonio's trial achieves focus and suspense in regard to the friendship plot while utterly abandoning, for the moment, the love plot.

During the trial scene itself, Granville effects
two important changes in Bassanio's behavior which further stress the nobility of his friendship with Antonio. First, Granville's Bassanio unequivocally offers his own life to Shylock in exchange for the one pound of Antonio's flesh (IV. i. pp. 195-196). Then when Shylock contemptuously refuses his offer, Bassanio deliberately commits the capital offense of drawing his sword in a court of law (p. 196). Thus he proves in deed as well as in word that he is willing to die to protect Antonio.

Finally, at the play's conclusion Granville effects an alteration which settles the last doubt about the nature of his revision. After Portia has revealed to Bassanio her role in Antonio's acquittal, she says:

'My Lord; by these small Services to you,
'And to your Friends, I hope I may secure
'Your Love; which, built upon meer Fancy,
'Had else been subjected to Alteration.
(V. i. p. 218)

Bassanio (p. 218) agrees, and with his restatement of Portia's words the play ends. Obviously it is Portia's "friendly" aid to Bassanio's dearest comrade that has cemented Bassanio's love for her. Thus even at the climactic point of the major love concern in Granville's adaptation, the influence of the theme of friendship remains dominant. Clearly, then, the prevalence of the theme of the nobility of friendship at almost every stage of Granville's revision, often at the expense of the original play's love plots, lends thematic unity,
focus, and suspense to the work.

These three elements—unity, focus, and suspense—contribute to the basic artistic soundness of *The Jew of Venice*. And while Granville's particular artistic achievement did not produce a better play than Shakespeare's, a fact to which anyone who has read the two works will unhesitatingly attest, it did afford him the opportunity to incorporate many of the standard alterations of a Shakespearian play demanded by his audience into one solidly designed whole. Granville alters the language of *The Merchant of Venice*, observes the classical unities more closely than Shakespeare did, increases the degree of poetic justice in the play, weeds out the work's tragic elements, and provides a masque; and all these are changes of which Granville could have confidently expected his audience to approve. But he also manipulates these changes so that they conduce to the development of his unified, highly focused, and suspenseful theme regarding the nobility of friendship, a theme that could not have been so artistically polished had Granville complicated the love plots of Shakespeare's story. Thus instead of grinding out a fragmented, chaotic pastiche of devices, approaches, and techniques that were individually calculated to please his audience but that, without being collectively subsumed under a single firm design, were certain to bewilder it, Granville boldly denied his
audience one of its strongest expectations in order to satisfy its other preferences more effectively while remaining true to his own artistic principles.

In attempting to show how Granville both met the demands of his audience and at the same time promoted his own artistic purposes, I shall discuss separately each of several components of drama. I shall first indicate, in regard to each specific element of drama under consideration, the Restoration audience's preferences for the nature and direction of changes in revisions of Shakespeare. Then I shall demonstrate how Granville satisfies the expectations of his audience in his treatment of the component being considered, and how he simultaneously realizes his general artistic intention by use of the same specific devices that are calculated to please his audience.20

One practice adopted by Restoration revisers of Shakespeare with a view towards making his works more appealing to a modern audience involved an extensive reworking of the language of the original plays. James Sutherland has noted that Restoration playgoers found Shakespeare's language "often obsolete and frequently incorrect" (p. 89). And as Christopher Spencer states, "the Augustans . . . wanted the [Shakespeare's] plays to be explicit. Just as characters were conventionalized and generalized, the language was often modified so that it would be more direct."21 Kilbourne
observes that the changes in Shakespeare's language effected by his Restoration adapters usually took the form of the substitution of modern words for obsolete ones, a reduction in the number of figures, the transformation of verse to prose or prose to verse, and the replacement of some of Shakespeare's passages with new ones written by the adapter (pp. 19-20).

Granville kept with the spirit of his times by making many changes in Shakespeare's language, and while one must admit that some of them were unfortunate, Hazelton Spencer has, I think, exaggerated considerably in saying that "abominably garbled dialogue" is one of the chief characteristics of *The Jew of Venice*. Granville's alterations in Portia's "The quality of Mercy" speech and in Bassanio's deliberations before he chooses the lead casket are not happily executed. But in most other cases where Granville changes Shakespeare's language, he preserves the original thought without distortion.

Granville more than atones for his few lapses in altering Shakespeare's language by frequently making his changes conduce to the development of his artistic design— that of writing a unified, well focused, and suspenseful play about the nobility of friendship. Time and again one finds that Granville has effected alterations in Shakespeare's language in order both to satisfy the demands of his audience and to reveal the importance of a
particular event or exchange to the theme of the nobility of friendship. During the trial scene of The Merchant of Venice, Gratiano at one point becomes furious with Shylock and delivers the following bit of censure:

O, be thou damn'd inexecrable dog! 
And for thy life let justice be accus'd. 
Thou almost mak'st me waver in my faith 
To hold opinion with Pythagoras, 
That souls of animals infuse themselves 
Into the trunks of men. Thy currish spirit 
Govern'd a wolf, who, hang'd for human slaughter, 
Even from the gallows did his fell soul fleet, 
And, whilst thou lay'st in thy unhallowed dam, 
Infus'd itself in thee; for thy desires 
Are wolvish, bloody, starv'd, and ravenous.

(IV. i. 128-138)

In The Jew of Venice, the speech appears with significant differences:

Oh, be thou damn'd, inexorable Jew! 
And that thou liv'st, let Justice be accus'd; 
'And Heaven accus'd that such a Wretch was born. 
Thou almost mak'st me waver in my Faith, 
To hold Opinion with Pythagoras, 
That Souls of Animals infuse themselves 
Into the Trunks of Men: Thy Currish Spirit 
Govern'd a Wolf, who hang'd for human Slaughter, 
Even from the Gallows, did his fell Soul fleet, 
And whilst thou layd'st in thy unhallow'd Dam, 
Infus'd itself in thee.

(IV. i. p. 190)

Granville's change of "inexecrable dog" (l. 128) to "inexorable Jew" was probably made with a view towards greater directness. Since the passage focuses primarily on Shylock's menacing viciousness, Granville may have felt that "inexorable," besides suggesting Antonio's chilling plight, would be more in keeping with the tone of the
speech than "inexecrable." His alteration of "And for thy life" (l. 129) to "And that thou liv'st," and his addition of a new line (the one marked with an apostrophe) to develop further the suggestion that the very cosmos was guilty of a sin in allowing Shylock to be born, almost certainly represent an attempt to clarify a line that in the original play seemed vague to Granville. Finally, the omission of the concluding one-and-one-half lines of Shakespeare's passage was probably due to Granville's desire to avoid anything approaching bombast, since he would have been aware of popular disapproval of what were regarded as unrealistically emotional speeches in Shakespeare.

While Granville is making one set of changes in this passage in an attempt to modernize and clarify Shakespeare's language, he is at the same time effecting a more basic alteration that conduces to the development of his theme. In The Jew of Venice, the above speech is given to Bassanio rather than Gratiano, a change which enables Shylock, in three lines composed by Granville, to reply:

'Thy Curses fall on thy own Head, for thus
'Ensnaring thy best Friend, thou didst it, and not I.
'I stand for Law: Thy Prodigality brought him to this.

(IV. i. p. 190)

By giving Gratiano's provoking speech to Bassanio, Granville sets him up for Shylock's crushing rejoinder and thus
stresses the gloomy plight of Antonio and Bassanio, the two noble friends. Clearly, then, Granville's changes in the language of this passage act both to meet the expectations of his audience and to emphasize the major focus of his revision.

Another brief but illuminating example of the dual function of Granville's alterations of Shakespeare's language is afforded by a comparison between the two plays in regard to Bassanio's statement to Portia shortly after the trial has been concluded. In *The Merchant of Venice*, his speech runs:

```
Most worthy gentleman, I and my friend
Have by your wisdom been this day acquitted
Of grievous penalties; in lieu whereof
Three thousand ducats, due unto the Jew,
We freely cope your courteous pains withal.
(IV. i. 408-412)
```

In Granville's revision, the speech appears as follows:

```
'Let me embrace the Man, by whom my Friend
'Has Life: For in that Life I live—
Three thousand Ducats due on Shylock's Bond,
I freely offer to requite your Pain.
(IV. i. p. 201)
```

Here Granville omits three of Shakespeare's lines that he probably regards as nonessential (ll. 408-410), modernizes the diction and construction of another (l. 412), and adds two lines of his own in which Bassanio offers an elevated sentiment about friendship. Once again Granville is able to alter Shakespeare's language so as to further his own artistic intention by underlining the major theme of *The Jew of*
Venice; at the same time he satisfies the demands of his audience by modernizing and clarifying Shakespeare’s language.

Granville’s inclusion of his "Peleus and Thetis: A Masque, Set to Musick" at the end of Act II also serves a dual function. The great popularity of the masque during the late Restoration and early eighteenth century is indicated by Lucyle Hook:

The progress of English drama towards completely sung opera began accelerating in the early 1690’s when more and more instrumental and vocal music and much grander spectacles accompanied every kind of entertainment in London. The extras began to mean more to the audience than the play itself. It was taken for granted that new plays would contain an abundance of instrumental music, dance, and scenic effects, but since the revival of old plays was the bread and butter of the playhouse, the task that confronted Thomas Betterton, the great actor and manager of the only theatre in London, was how to interpolate the desired musical and scenic spectacle into the already-existing play. The problem was solved in many cases by the introduction of a musical entertainment generally known as a masque.

Granville’s masque, which is set to music and which includes a "Variety of Dances" (I, 191), was obviously written in response to the Restoration audience’s proven enjoyment of such entertainments. Once again, though, Granville makes a device intended on the surface to please her audience also promote the play’s major theme, the nobility
of friendship. In Granville's story, Peleus goes to his friend Prometheus in hopes of discovering how to keep Thetis, Peleus' beloved, from the clutches of Jupiter, who has taken a strong interest in her. While Peleus is with Prometheus, Thetis joins them and the three of them face an angry Jupiter when he appears later. Just as Jupiter is about to hurl a thunderbolt at both Peleus and Thetis, who have sworn to die together rather than be divided, Prometheus manages to forget the vulture that is avidly gnawing his liver long enough to prophesy that the son of Thetis will be greater than his father. Jupiter becomes so agitated at hearing this that he resolves at once to abandon his designs on Thetis. Prometheus, whose timely assistance, prompted by his friendship with Peleus, has saved two lives and prevented Jupiter himself from committing an error of cosmic proportions, is freed as his reward. The masque, then, besides affording Granville's audience with music, song, and dance, also reinforces the major theme of *The Jew of Venice*.

A desire both to please the taste of their audience and to adhere to the practices of such French dramatists as Corneille, Racine, and Molière led many Restoration adapters of Shakespeare to observe the classical unities more closely in their revisions than Shakespeare had in his plays. As Kilbourne notes, the unity of time was increased through reducing the number of scenes in each
Shakespearian play as well as by shortening its duration; a greater unity of place was effected by decreasing the number of settings; and the omission of the "underplot, or of the less important characters, or of some of the episodes" served to shore up the unity of action (p. 12).

Many of Granville's alterations of *The Merchant of Venice* are obviously made with a view towards observing the classical unities more closely than Shakespeare had. Granville's treatment of the unities probably presented him with the least difficulty of all dramatic components with respect to which he attempted both to satisfy his audience and promote his own artistic design. If Granville's audience demanded increased unity of time, place, and action, so did his project of writing a unified, highly focused, suspenseful play about the nobility of friendship. The paring away of scenes, characters, and settings which did not directly affect Granville's theme of the nobility of friendship helped him achieve both of his goals.

Regarding the unity of time, William S.E. Coleman has noted (p. 19) that Granville reduces the number of scenes from twenty in *The Merchant of Venice* to nine in his revision. The scenes that Granville eliminates, as well as the ones which he greatly curtails, are usually those dealing primarily with the play's triple love plot. The first scene that is substantially shortened occurs at the very beginning of the play, where Antonio's
melancholy and its possible causes are discussed in *The Merchant of Venice* (I. i. 1-76). Granville, who begins his play with Antonio's "the world is a stage" speech (*MV*, I. i. 77ff.; *JV*, I. i. p. 135), probably considers Shakespeare's concern with Antonio's melancholy to be simply superfluous. A more significant abbreviation appears in the second scene of Act I, where Portia pronounces her judgments about the various suitors that are currently vying for her. In Shakespeare's play (I. ii. 42-149), Portia discusses a Neapolitan prince, County Palatine, a Frenchman, an Englishman, a Scottish lord, a German duke, and, by way of anticipation, Bassanio. In Granville's version (pp. 142-144), only the Frenchman, the Englishman, and "Myn Heer van Gutts," Granville's replacement of Shakespeare's German duke, are treated, with Bassanio being the object of a brief allusion. The shortening of this scene, then, occurs at the expense of the build up to the love plot involving Portia and Bassanio.

Granville omits seven scenes from Shakespeare's Act II, each of which deals either with a love plot or a comic exchange. Deleted in Granville's version are Scene I, in which Morocco makes his first appearance; Scene II, which contains the humorous dialogue between Launcelot and Old Gobbo, the arrangement for Launcelot to leave Shylock's service and enter Bassanio's, and Gratiano's suit to go to Belmont with Bassanio; Scene III, comprised of a dialogue between Jessica and Launcelot, at the conclusion of which
Jessica gives Launcelot a letter to carry to Lorenzo; Scene IV, where Gratiano, Lorenzo, Salarino, and Salanio discuss the scheme for Lorenzo's elopement with Jessica, and Launcelot delivers Jessica's letter to Lorenzo; Scene VII, in which Morocco chooses a casket; Scene VIII, where Salarino and Salanio discuss Lorenzo's elopement with Jessica, Shylock's attempts to have them apprehended, Antonio's loss of a ship, and Antonio's love for Bassanio; and Scene IX, in which Arragon chooses a casket and Portia learns that Bassanio has come to join the group of suitors for her hand. Of all the scenes that Granville deletes here, only Scene VIII has a direct bearing on the friendship of Antonio and Bassanio, and any loss resulting from Granville's omission of that scene is amply recovered by the inclusion of his own banquet scene at the end of Act II (JV, pp. 158-164), where the theme of friendship is heavily stressed. On the other hand, five of the seven scenes that Granville omits from Act II of The Jew of Venice are, in the original play, primarily concerned either with the love plot involving Bassanio and Portia or with that concerning Jessica and Lorenzo.

The next scene omitted by Granville is the opening scene of Act III, where Shylock, Salanio, and Salarino discuss Jessica's elopement and further losses by Antonio, and where Shylock expresses his desire for revenge against both Jessica and Antonio; also included in Shakespeare's scene is the conversation between Shylock and Tubal, from
which Shylock learns of Jessica's behavior in Genoa and Tubal confesses that his agents have not yet been able to make direct contact with her. I think Granville probably omitted this scene with a view towards increasing the dramatic effectiveness of the later confrontation between Shylock and Antonio (MV III. iii. 1-17; JV III. ii. pp. 182-185). Granville begins his third Act with Bassanio's casket scene (MV III. ii.), and once that is completed all the love plots in Granville's play are thoroughly resolved and he can concentrate solely thereafter on building suspense for the trial scene. Indeed, Granville seems almost in a hurry to get the business of the love plots concluded, as he omits the misunderstanding between Portia and Bassanio that occurs in Shakespeare's play prior to Bassanio's choosing the lead casket (MV III. ii. 26-39), and he greatly curtails Bassanio's deliberations about which casket to select (MV III. ii. 40-187; JV III. i. pp. 169-172). After Bassanio learns of Antonio's peril and hastily departs, Granville ends the scene by incorporating Portia's "I never did repent of doing good" speech (MV III. iv. 10-34) from Shakespeare's fourth scene. Little else from Scene IV (which in Shakespeare's play also includes Portia's instructions to Balthasar and the revelation of her plans regarding the trial to Nerissa) appears at any point in Granville's version. Granville also omits Scene V, where Jessica and Launcelot joke about her religion and Jessica delivers her speech on Portia's
beauty and worth. This enables Granville to place his version of Shakespeare's III. iii. (the gaoler scene with Antonio and Shylock) at the climactic position in his own Act III. In Granville's version of the scene, he greatly lengthens the confrontation between Shylock and Antonio, adding passages from speeches by Shylock that occur earlier in Shakespeare's play and are addressed to different listeners (MV III. i. 27-28, 55-76, and selected lines from Shylock's dialogue with Tubal at III. i. 83-136). Granville's changes in Act III, then, enable him to conclude the business of the love plots earlier than Shakespeare does and to move into the trial scene of Act IV with Shylock's violent curses and sinister vows of vengeance still echoing from the close of Act III. Throughout the remainder of his revision, Granville makes no further substantial deletions.

Thus Granville's omission of several scenes from The Merchant of Venice, a practice that promotes greater unity of time in The Jew of Venice and thus presumably pleases Granville's audience, is obviously intended also to help afford unity, focus, and suspense as regards the major concern of Granville's play, the noble friendship of Antonio and Bassanio along with Shylock's menace to it. The scenes that Granville deletes are almost exclusively those dealing primarily with a love plot or some other subordinate matter such as humor. The scenes that concentrate on the friendship of Antonio and Bassanio and the problems that
increasingly beset it are left intact and, indeed, are even expanded at times.

Granville's reduction in *The Jew of Venice* of the number of settings found in *The Merchant of Venice*, a device intended to produce a greater unity of place, also acts to stress the friendship plot at the expense of the love plots. In Shakespeare's work the setting changes nineteen times after the play opens on a street in Venice. Thirteen of the twenty settings are places where the love plots or subordinate concerns are acted out— the eight settings in Belmont, the three settings in or near Shylock's house, and two of the seven settings at a street in Venice. In Granville's play, which has only nine different settings, five are places where the friendship plot is furthered (a street, a public place, a banquet hall, a prison, and a court of justice, all in Venice) and only four represent locations where the love plots are the center of attention (three settings in Belmont and one in front of Shylock's house). The percentage of settings where the friendship plot receives primary focus, then, jumps from thirty-five in Shakespeare's play to fifty-five in Granville's.

Granville increases the unity of action in Shakespeare's story by omitting fully half of the characters in his version of it. Granville does not include Morocco, Arragon, Salanio, Salarino, Tubal, Launcelot, Old Gobbo, Leonardo, Bathasar, or Stephano. At the same time that
Granville's exclusion of these characters contributes to the unity of action in his play, it also conduces to the dominance of the friendship plot over the love plots. None of the characters omitted is of more than minimal importance to the friendship plot in The Merchant of Venice. Salanio and Salarino admittedly do further the development of the plot in their speeches at II. viii. and III. i. in the original play. But as I have noted above, Granville more than compensates for the deletion of these two characters with the content of his own banquet scene at the end of Act II of The Jew of Venice. On the other hand, three of the characters that Granville drops from his version—Morocco, Arragon, and Launcelot—are of significant importance to the love plots of Shakespeare's play, the two former as serious candidates for Portia's hand and the latter as a go-between for Jessica and Lorenzo.

One sees, then, that Granville is able to manipulate his tightening of the classical unities in Shakespeare's story in such a way as to strengthen his own artistic design. Granville's audience demanded a greater unity of time, place, and action than Shakespeare usually afforded in his plays. In The Jew of Venice, Granville satisfied that demand by deleting many scenes, settings, and characters from Shakespeare's play, and he furthered his own artistic purpose by using his omissions to pare away many elements in Shakespeare's play which, had Granville retained
them, might have obstructed the unity, focus, and suspense of his drama about the nobility of friendship.

One alteration in Granville's revision of *The Merchant of Venice* that practically every critic has noticed involves the treatment of Shylock. In *The Merchant of Venice*, Shylock is of course a sinister, venomous being who threatens the elegant world of the other characters. But Shakespeare's Shylock is also in many ways a pitiful and mistreated figure. One feels quite often that Shylock becomes a villain not only because he is an embittered Jew, but also because his tormentors are rather shabby Christians. Certainly there is more than one occasion when Shakespeare lends to Shylock's character "a moment of humanizing pathos" such as William S.E. Coleman notices (p. 23) in Shylock's conversation with Tubal (*MV* III. i. 83-136). The Jew that Granville drew, on the other hand, is from the very beginning a malicious, relentless villain bent on the destruction of his Christian enemies. I think that Granville's changes in Shylock's character once again represented an attempt on the dramatist's part to please his audience while at the same time furthering his artistic design. By making Shylock so thoroughly evil, Granville eliminated any problem of poetic justice and any hint of the mixture of tragedy and comedy in the play's ending, and for both of these alterations Granville would have been applauded by his audience. And by portraying Shylock as a villain even more malevolent and dangerous than
he is in *The Merchant of Venice*, Granville adds suspense to the friendship plot that is of such importance to his play.

Granville's first significant change in the delineation of Shylock's character occurs at the end of Act I, where Antonio and Shylock arrange the terms of the loan. Shylock's "pound of flesh" speech appears in *The Merchant of Venice* as follows:

```
This kindness will I show.
Go with me to a notary, seal me there
Your single bond; and, in a merry sport,
If you repay me not on such a day,
In such a place, such sum or sums as are
Express'd in the condition, let the forfeit
Be nominated for an equal pound
Of your fair flesh, to be cut off and taken
In what part of your body pleaseth me.
(I. iii. 144-152)
```

Although we are naturally suspicious of Shylock's proposal, we cannot be certain that he is not indeed indulging in "merry sport." From all indications, he really does seem to desire Antonio's friendship. The corresponding proposal in *The Jew of Venice*, however, is considerably more sinister:

```
This Kindness will I shew; nay more, I'll take
Antonio's single Bond: And that we may henceforth
'Be Friends, no Penalty will I exact
'But this, meerly for Mirth—
If you repay me not on such a Day, in such a Place,
Such Sum or Sums as are express'd— Be this
The Forfeiture.
'Let me see, What think you of your Nose,
'Or of an Eye— or of— a Pound of Flesh
'To be cut off, and taken from what Part
Of your Body I shall think fit to name.
```
'Thou art too portly, Christian!
'Too much pamper'd— What say you then
'To such a merry Bond?
(I. iii. pp. 150-151)

Shylock's insidious progression from a nose to an eye to a pound of flesh as parts of Antonio's anatomy that he "jokingly" suggests be forfeited if Antonio is unable to repay the loan on time certainly seems to betray an ulterior motive. And the macabre humor involved in Shylock's saying "Thou art too portly, Christian!" also arouses extreme suspicion regarding Shylock's good faith. As Coleman states (p. 21), "Shylock's intentions are made immediately apparent in the new lines with no attempt at subtlety, and he is magnified into a villain in his first scene."

In *The Merchant of Venice*, Shylock departs (II. v.) his house to have dinner with Bassanio and Antonio, but Shakespeare does not devote a scene to the meal. Instead he presents (II. vii.) the elopement of Jessica and Lorenzo while Shylock is away at dinner. Granville, though, seizes the hint afforded by Shakespeare and writes an entire scene (II. ii.), one of the most important in *The Jew of Venice*, dealing with the banquet attended by Shylock, Bassanio, Antonio, and Gratiano. Two important occurrences during this scene further establish Shylock as a scoundrel. At one point during the entertainment each of the companions in turn proposes a toast. After Antonio toasts friendship, Bassanio Portia, and Gratiano women in general, Shylock
attempts to top the efforts of his companions:

'I have a Mistress, that out-shines 'em all—
'Commanding yours,— and yours,— tho' the whole Sex:
'O! may her Charms encrease and multiply;
'My Money is my Mistress! Here's to
'Interest upon Interest.'

(p. 159)

Shylock's base sentiment is properly scorned by the others, who refuse to drink to his toast. Later in the scene, when Antonio and Bassanio are saying a long and affectionate farewell to each other (Bassanio is leaving for Belmont), Shylock says in an aside:

'These two Christian Fools put me in mind
'Of my Money: Just so loth am I to part with that.'

(p. 163)

One other change effected by Granville in the conception of Shylock's character involves Granville's rearranging of speeches from the original play. Act III of The Jew of Venice has only two scenes, the final one being set at a prison in Venice and corresponding roughly to the third scene of Shakespeare's Act III (the gaoler scene). In Granville's scene, though, the confrontation between Shylock and Antonio is greatly lengthened by matter incorporated from the first scene of Shakespeare's Act III, a scene omitted in The Jew of Venice. The substance of Shakespeare's III. i. consists of the discussion of Jessica's elopement and Antonio's losses by Salanio, Salarino, and Shylock, of Shylock's statement concerning
his desire for revenge against his daughter and Antonio, and of the dialogue between Shylock and Tubal. In the third scene of Shakespeare's Act III, where Antonio, in custody of a jailer, is baited by Shylock, the moneylender rails at Antonio for seventeen lines and then exits (MV III. iii. 1-17). In Granville's combination of the two scenes, however, the confrontation between Shylock and Antonio is over sixty lines long (pp. 182-185). The material that Granville selects from Shakespeare's two scenes is generally that which, especially taken out of its original context, makes Shylock appear utterly ruthless. The famous speech beginning "To bait fish withal" (MV III. i. 55-76; JV III. ii. pp. 183-184) is no longer delivered to a couple of gaping courtiers, but is instead directly addressed to Antonio himself, a wretched prisoner who is now as badly in need of mercy as he will later be in the trial scene. Moreover, Granville incorporates from Shylock's conversation with Tubal not the humor that lightens the original scene, and not Shylock's pathetic reference to Leah (MV III. i. 125-128), but rather the Jew's unnatural speech in which he says "I/ would my daughter were dead at my foot, and the/ jewels in her ear! Would she were hears'd at my/ foot, and the ducats in her coffin (MV III. i. 91-94).

Granville's final degradation of Shylock's character occurs at three separate points during the trial scene (IV. i. of both MV and JV). As I have stated above, the
speech in which Gratiano compares Shylock to a wolf (MV IV. 1. 128-138) is transferred to Bassanio in Granville's revision (IV. 1. p. 190). In The Jew of Venice, Shylock responds to Bassanio's attack by viciously taunting him with his responsibility for Antonio's plight (p. 190). Another instance of Shylock's change for the worse appears during an exchange of Granville's invention (pp. 195-196) in which Bassanio connects Shylock's cruelty with his avarice. Bassanio says that since Shylock is so fond of interest, he will pay him interest on the pound of flesh owed by Antonio:

"Here stand I for my Friend. Body for Body,
To endure the Torture: But one Pound of Flesh
Is due from him: Take every Piece of mine,
And tear it off with Pincers."

(p. 195)

Shylock, though, has an answer ready that reveals his almost incredible malevolence:

"To hear a Fool propose: Thou shallow Christian!
To think that I'd consent: I know thee well:
When he hast paid the Forfeit of his Bond,
Thou can'st not chuse but hang thyself for being
The Cause: And so my Ends are serv'd on both.
Proceed to Execution."

(p. 196)

One other touch that Granville invents stems from a suggestion afforded by a line in Shakespeare's play. In what Antonio supposes is his final speech (MV IV. 1. 264-281), he indirectly exhorts Shylock to cut deeply
enough so that Bassanio may see his heart. In Shakespeare's play, Shylock makes no reply. In Granville's version, however, Antonio's request is addressed directly to Shylock, and the villain answers: "Doubt it not, Christian, thus far I will be courteous" (p. 195.)

By presenting Shylock as a vicious and dangerous character who is clearly aligned with the side of evil from the beginning of the play, Granville is able both to satisfy certain of his audience's demands and promote his own artistic purpose. Granville's audience expected to find in plays the operation of poetic justice and the separation of comedy and tragedy. If there is any question of whether Shylock's humiliation and ruin at the end of The Merchant of Venice is poetically just, or of whether his defeat in the original play might not carry with it an element of tragedy, Granville resolves all doubts in his version by stripping every vestige of humanity from Shylock's character and by showing him to be a dangerous and contemptible scoundrel. The alteration of Shylock's character also furthers Granville's artistic design of writing a unified, highly focused, and suspenseful drama about the nobility of friendship. Shylock's villainy is so complete that one becomes aware from his first appearance of the sinister threat that he poses to the friendship of Antonio and Bassanio. By lengthening Shylock's confrontation with Antonio
after the latter is made prisoner, and by placing it directly before the trial scene, Granville achieves both focus and suspense in regard to the friendship of Antonio and Bassanio and the noble response of the comrades to the jeopardy into which Antonio falls.

During the course of this chapter, I have not attempted to prove that The Jew of Venice is a great play or that it compares favorably with The Merchant of Venice. What I have tried to show, however, is that Granville produced a dramatically viable revision in which he both appealed to the taste of his audience and remained true to certain artistic principles. Restoration playgoers demanded of Shakespeare's adapters a closer observance of the unities and poetic justice than Shakespeare's original plays exhibited, and they also desired modernized diction, an increase in song, dance, and spectacle, a stricter separation of tragedy and comedy, and the multiplication and complication of the love plots of the original plays. In The Jew of Venice, Granville fully satisfied every demand of his audience except one--the demand for an increase in the number and complexity of love plots. By disappointing his audience's expectations in one area, Granville was enabled to effect his own artistic project of fashioning a unified, highly focused and suspenseful drama about the nobility of friendship. Moreover, Granville
manipulated the standard alterations favored by his audience in such a way as to make them actually further his artistic design.

Many years ago Montague Summers, in discussing critical responses to Davenant and Dryden's The Tempest and Nahum Tate's King Lear, said that "a drama which lives in the theatre for one hundred and fifty years cannot be ignorantly dismissed with a shrug and a sneer. The reason for such vitality must be seriously pondered and examined." Mr. Summers' statement still serves today as a warning to students who are tempted to reject without close examination a Shakespearian revision, especially one that was popular in its own time, simply because it differs in important respects from its original. The Jew of Venice is not The Merchant of Venice; but neither is it a "perversion" that "has only the merest resemblance to its original," a "rouged corpse," or a "travesty" "clothed ... in abominably garbled dialogue." Instead it is an artistically sound work that was carefully and successfully calculated to appeal to the playgoers of its day. Like other interesting and important works by Granville that have been ignored or dismissed without a fair evaluation, The Jew of Venice deserves a greater amount of responsible critical attention than it has thus far received.
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The line is at least potentially ambiguous. "For thy life" probably means "because you were born," but it could conceivably mean "for the duration of your life" or "as long as you live."

See Marks, p. 148.

Granville's masque appears in the first volume of his Works (pp. 179-191) instead of within the body of the play.


Christopher Spencer (p. 31) notes that the masque "emphasizes the power of Love and Friendship."

See Kilbourne, p. 11.

For the sake of convenience, I shall use the abbreviations MV and JV to designate the two plays when I am giving act, scene, and line numbers.

Coleman (p. 19) has noted that Granville winds up the love plots "in the first scene of Act III."

I. iii. of The Jew of Venice, for example, where the terms of the loan are agreed upon, is lengthened (p. 152) by the exchange of noble sentiments about friendship by Bassanio and Antonio.

Granville's scene (pp. 158-164) is one hundred and twelve lines long, and the depth of Antonio and Bassanio's friendship as well as Shylock's potential menace to it is clearly revealed.

See Kilbourne, pp. 12-16.

Shylock mentions Leah in Granville's version of the speech (p. 184), but Shylock's wonderfully revealing statement, "I would not have given it [Leah's ring] for a wilderness of monkeys" (ll. 127-128), as well as Tubal's remark which provokes it, is omitted.


Lelyveld, p. 15.

Odell, I, 79.
41 Kilbourne, p. 72.

42 Hazelton Spencer, p. 344.
At the time of James II's accession to the throne in 1685, Granville through the writing of three poems, each entitled "To the King," brought to perfection a new form in seventeenth-century political poetry. Despite the fact that many other poets during the century had written panegyrics which contained advice or warning, Granville was, with the possible exception of Dryden, the only author to make use of a poetic form in which advice and warning are so completely incorporated into praise as to become inseparable from it. I shall call this new kind of poem the admonitory encomium.

The following, which is one of three poems written by Granville on the occasion, adequately illustrates the characteristics of the form:

Heroes of old, by Rapine, and by Spoil, 
In Search of Fame, did all the World embroil; 
Thus to their Gods each then ally'd his Name, 
This sprang from Jove, and That from Titan came: 
With equal Valour, and the same Success, 
Dread King, might'st thou the Universe oppress; 
But Christian Laws constrain thy Martial Pride, 
Peace is thy choice, and Piety thy Guide;
By thy Example Kings are taught to sway,
Heroes to fight, and Saints may learn to pray.
From Gods descended, and of Race divine,
Nestor in Council, and Ulysses shine;
But in a Day of Battle, all would yield
To the fierce Master of the sevenfold Shield:
Their very Deities were grac'd no more,
Mars had the Courage, Jove the Thunder bore.
But all Perfections meet in James alone,
And Britain's King is all the Gods in one. 1

On the surface, Granville's poem appears to be pure panegyric. James, the poem states, is not only more than a match for any ancient hero in battle; he is also a brilliant king and an exemplary Christian. In fact, he combines in his person the best qualities of two worlds—rugged ancient valor and prowess in arms with Christian piety and more civilized standards of ruling. Certainly, then, James receives effusive praise in the poem; but it is nevertheless true that every compliment which Granville delivers James must also be taken as an admonition. Proof of this paradoxical statement is afforded by the simple fact that Granville cannot possibly know how James will behave as king. After all, the poem is written at the very beginning of James' reign. Therefore the conduct for which Granville praises James is not that which he is known to have displayed as king, but rather that which the poet believes essential to his successful reign.

If one examines the poem in the context of its
historical background, the admonitory nature of the work becomes even more evident. The paramount issue involved in James II's accession concerned, of course, his religion. Because of his Catholic persuasion, many of the people who would now be his subjects had desperately attempted to prevent his becoming king.\textsuperscript{2} Neither Granville nor anyone else could be certain of what measures of revenge James might try to take against his enemies now that he had inherited a position which carried with it such great political power. Granville must have known, though, that the fear and hostility with which James was regarded by many of his subjects were potentially explosive emotions. As a loyal supporter of the Stuarts, Granville may have felt obligated to advise the king that only the most sensible method of proceeding on his part would be appropriate to the situation.

When the work is viewed more fully in its historical context, one realizes that the technique Granville uses to impart his advice\textsuperscript{3} involves the entire content of the poem. Although he praises James chiefly for what Granville chooses to believe is his general attitude towards foreign policy, both poet and king know that the real issue of the moment
concerns James' domestic policy. Any remark that Granville makes about foreign affairs will be translated immediately into the far more pressing realm of domestic problems. With that knowledge in mind, Granville, through the nature of his praise of James, begins to indicate the proper attitudes and behavior of a modern, Christian king. In the first two lines he implies that "Heroes of old," valiant as they were, perpetrated much needless destruction in their quest for fame. Then in lines three through eight he suggests that these ancient heroes had no higher principle upon which to act than self-interest. Their gods, whose only function was ceremonial, were incapable of offering moral guidance. James, though, who could easily match the bloody deeds of any ancient hero, realizes that the modern, enlightened hero must live by "Christian Laws," that he must prefer peace to war and live in piety. Because James acts upon that knowledge, he is a model king, warrior, and Christian (ll. 9-10). The last eight lines reassert James' superiority over pagan heroes, each of which was allied to only one of many gods, and the poem concludes with the magnificently meaningful line, "And Britain's King is all the Gods in one." James is "all the Gods in one" because
he excels in all skills while an ancient hero needed only to perfect one in order to claim kinship with its related god. But since Granville has made three pointed references in the poem to James' being a good Christian, one cannot miss the implication in the last line that the "King" of "Britain's King," the Christian God who champions peace and rewards holiness, is also "all the Gods in one."

In effect, Granville has presented his advice in such a way that James cannot refuse it on logical or moral grounds. The Christian hero, he has stated, is governed by principles quite different from those under which pagan heroes acted. Since James is the paragon of Christian heroes, he will naturally exhibit the Christian virtues of peacefulness and piety in his conduct as king. When the inevitable transference of Granville's remarks into the realm of domestic affairs takes place, one realizes that there, too, James is expected to behave with exemplary Christian virtue. He must be forgiving to his enemies, and he must rule gently and impartially.

Clearly, then, Granville has offered James considerable counsel in "To the King." But he has done so without openly presenting one word of advice! The entire
poem is, on the surface, comprised totally of rapturous praise. Only when we try to read the poem with a sense of what must then have been the immediate, topical importance of its underlying message can we discern the superb subtlety and complexity of the work. Granville is both praising James and advising him of what attitudes he should bring to his new office; and the same words which contain the praise also offer the advice.

From the preceding analysis of "To the King" can be derived a definition of the poetic form which Granville perfected. The admonitory encomium, then, is a form of political poetry which purports to consist of pure praise, but which uses the praise itself as a vehicle for delivering advice or warning pertaining, at least by implication, to immediate and specific attitudes and actions of the person addressed. Thus in "To the King," Granville's praise of James II as a modern Christian hero and ruler carries with it advice to James to forego any warlike intentions he may have regarding his foreign policy and, as the timing of the poem would strongly indicate, his domestic dealings as well. By praising James' pious and peaceful behavior as king before he has actually served as king, Granville is in effect advising him on how to conduct himself in his new role
and hoping, through that advice, to help avert the open clash between James and his Protestant subjects that is certain to ensue if James seeks revenge against them. In terms of the definition, the praise (that James is an enlightened, Christian king) carries with it the advice (that he must behave like one, not like a pagan) on a specific attitude (James' general attitude regarding foreign policy, but, by strong implication, his more specific attitude about how to deal with his Protestant subjects).

In order for the striking brilliance of Granville's accomplishment to be recognized, it must be viewed in relation to those seventeenth-century panegyrics written prior to Granville's which also contained elements of advice or warning. In the remainder of this chapter, I shall discuss the various tendencies in seventeenth-century panegyric written prior to Granville's which led up to Granville's invention of a new poetic form. First we shall see panegyric as it existed in a "pure" form, that is, a form containing only praise, at the beginning of the century. Next, we shall see in poems by Jonson, Henry King, Cowley, and Cleveland the first indications of change in the nature of panegyric. Then we shall
observe the growing practice of panegyrist during the Rebellion, Interregnum, and Restoration of including significant amounts of advice or warning in their poems of praise. Next we shall see the penultimate stage in the development of the admonitory encomium in Dryden’s *Astraea Redux*, one section of which largely anticipates Granville’s accomplishment. Finally, we shall appreciate the perfection of the form in Granville.

The nature of "pure" English panegyric throughout the first quarter of the seventeenth century is illustrated by Ben Jonson’s "To King James":

```
How, best of Kings, do'st thou a scepter beare!
How, best of Poets, do'st thou laurell weare!
But two things, rare, the Fates had in their store,
   And gave thee both, to shew they could no more,
For such a Poet, while thy dayes were greene,
   Thou wert, as chief of them are said t'have beene.
And such a Prince thou art, wee daily see,
   As chief of those still promise they will be.
Whom should my Muse then flie to, but the best
   Of Kings for grace; of Poets for my test?
```

"To King James" is a panegyric which consists totally of praise. There is no hint in Jonson’s poem of either the explicit admonition that is soon to appear in panegyrics or the subtle blending of advice and warning with praise that is to characterize the admonitory encomium. James I was, of course, neither the best of poets nor the best of
kings. But Jonson is making no attempt here to be critical. As Rachel Trickett observes, "a panegyric proper . . . is a public celebration of virtue, nobility, and splendour, qualities which can be represented by a monarch, a hero, or a statesman whose private character might not bear a more intimate scrutiny." Jonson certainly is writing "panegyric proper," and although he is later to write more complex political poetry, the distance between this work and the admonitory encomium is a wide one.

Although the first significant changes in the nature of seventeenth-century panegyric occur during the early years of Charles I's reign, those changes are not as marked as they might have been under a wiser and more permissive monarch. The king's own violent dislike of being admonished, combined with the repressive influence on literary freedom exerted by the Star Chamber, were largely responsible for the fact that no explicit advice or warning occurred in panegyrics written while he remained on the throne. C.V. Wedgwood has stated:

To the royal ear of Charles I praise alone was welcome; it was a weakness on which his more active and intelligent ministers, Laud and Wentworth, commented with anxiety. Court poetry continued to minister to his self-deception and there
would have been no corrective from the popular ballad poetry of the 1630's, even had he listened to it, for it had become cautious in political comment. The censorship which the king imposed on the printed opinions of his subjects by means of the Star Chamber had had its effect.7

Thus although the turbulent nature of his reign clearly called for a more complex response on the part of his poetical supporters, much of the political poetry addressed to Charles I continued to consist entirely of praise. Robert Herrick's "To the King. Upon his coming with his Army into the West" is a typical product of those poets under Charles I whose political writings "appear altogether remote from reality"8:

Welcome, most welcome to our Vowes and us,  
Most great, and universall Genius!  
The Drooping West, which hitherto has stood  
As one, in long-lamented-widow-hood;  
Looks like a Bride now, or a bed of flowers,  
Newly refresh't, both by the Sun, and showers.  
War, which before was horrid, now appears  
Lovely in you, brave Prince of Cavaliers!  
A deale of courage in each bosome springs  
By your accesse; (O You the best of Kings!)  
Ride on with all white Omens; so, that where  
Your Standard's up, we fix a Conquest there.9

Herrick wrote "To the King" in 1644, and the Charles whom he addressed was then a harassed and desperate man. The fortunes of civil war had not gone well with the king's party, and the very march which occasioned
Herrick's poem was destined to prove unsuccessful. Yet Herrick persists in seeing Charles as the conquering hero who needs only to put in an appearance in order to rout the opposition. The optimism and the reassurance seem as pathetic as they are misguided. One can only agree with C.V. Wedgwood's judgment of Herrick and his fellows:

Trivial in themselves, the compliments of the Court poets were not in the end to be quite so trivial in their results: They stimulated, both in those who wrote and in those who received them, an attitude of mind which weakened the judgment and made king and courtiers alike unable to read the harsher signs of the times.

With Charles demanding, even during the darkest hours of the Rebellion, the type of useless flattery exemplified by Herrick's poem, the climate throughout his reign was hardly favorable to the kind of panegyric that was to develop about the middle of the century— that is, panegyric in which explicit advice and warning accompanied the praise. Nevertheless, a number of authors under Charles' rule did write encomiastic verse in which deviations from its "pure" form, a form consisting entirely of praise, were significant enough to represent a movement towards the eventual development of panegyric that openly offered advice and warning. And that type of panegyric was only one step away from the admonitory encomium, which was distinguished by its thorough intermixing of advice with warning and praise.
The development that does occur in the panegyrics written by several poets under Charles consists of the admission of elements into the form which to some extent qualify or dilute the praise that is offered. One of Ben Jonson's later political poems and a work by Henry King reveal the genuine confusion of poets who desire to praise but who realize that, in some quite vocal quarters at least, their laudatory efforts will be met by scorn. The prevailing tone of these poets is one of injured indignation with their fellow countrymen, whose opposition to Charles has produced what Jonson and King consider a lamentable situation. Jonson's "An Epigram. To our great and good K. Charles on his Anniversary Day," written in 1629, emphasizes the ungratefulness of Charles' subjects as much as it does the king's virtues:

How happy were the Subject, if he knew,
   Most pious King, but his owne good in you!
How many times, Live long, Charles, would he say,
   If he but weigh'd the blessings of this day?
And as it turns our joyfull yeare about,
   For safetie of such Majestie, cry out?
Indeed, when had great Britaine greater cause
   Then now, to love the Soveraigne, and the Lawes?
When you that rainge, are her Example growne,
   And what are bounds to her, you make your owne?
When your assiduous practise doth secure
   That Faith, which she professeth to be pure?
When all your life's a president of dayes,
   And murmure cannot quarrell at your wayes?
How is she barren growne of love! or broke!
   That nothing can her gratitude provoke!
O Times! O Manners! Surfet bred of ease,
   The truly Epidemicall disease!
'T is not alone the Merchant, but the Clowne,
   Is Banke-rupt turn'd! the Cassock, Cloake, and Gowne,
Jonson's poem is obviously not totally comprised of praise. Moreover, the speaker's anxiety and disappointment concerning the king's subjects dull the effect of the praise by distracting the reader's attention from it. The tone of almost helpless bewilderment in Jonson's "Epigram" is replaced by a harsher note in King's "By Occasion of the young Prince his happy Birth. May 29, 1630." King is responding to the widespread disappointment among the Puritans at the birth of Prince Charles. The Puritans had hoped that Charles I, whose queen was a Catholic, would die without a male heir and thus leave open the possibility for England's obtaining a new ruler who had only Protestant connections:

I know, each Malecontent, or giddy man
In his religion, with the Persian,
Adores the Rising Sun; And his false view
Best likes, not what is Best, but what is New.
0 that wee could these Gangrenes so prevent
(For our owne Blessing and their Punishment)
That all such might, who for wild Changes thirst,
Rack't on a hopelesse expectation, burst
To see us fetter time, and by his stay
To a Consistence fixe the flying day;
And in a Solstice by our prayers made,
Reskew our Sun from Death, or Envye's shade.15
(11. 35-46)

The great importance of Jonson's and King's poems lies in the fact that for the first time unpleasant elements are being admitted into panegyric. In these poems the praise is no longer pure; instead it is tempered by references
to the king's political opponents, enemies who have openly defied their monarch and who are backed by a substantial proportion of the populace. Neither Jonson nor King has attempted to advise or warn Charles. Indeed, both poets seem to direct their remarks more towards their discontented countrymen than towards the king. But by admitting alien elements into the form, they have cleared the way for later poets to introduce other material-- admonitions included-- into panegyric.

A decade later, when the Rebellion is, in effect, already underway, Cowley's "On his Majesties Return out of Scotland" carries panegyric a step further towards the inclusion of direct admonition. The occasion of Cowley's poem is Charles I's return from the embarrassing excursion to Scotland in which he attempted to defeat and disband the Covenanters. After rashly raising an army and setting out for the Scottish border, Charles met with resistance from both the Scots and their English supporters which he had not anticipated and which he was unable to overcome. His return to London in 1640 marked the first in a series of uneasy intervals of peace in a country that would not really know internal harmony again for almost half a century.

Cowley's poem does not attempt to disguise the extremely serious nature of the issue that it treats:
'Twas only Heavin could work this wondrous thing,  
And onely work't by such a King.  
Again the Northern Hinds may sing and plow,  
And fear no harm but from the weather now.  
Again may Tradesmen love their pain  
By knowing now for whom they gain.  
The Armour now may be hung up to sight,  
And onely in their Halls the Children fright.

4.

The gain of Civil Wars will not allow  
Bay to the Conquerors Brow.  
At such a Game what fool would venture in,  
Where one must Lose, yet neither side can win?  
How justly would our Neighbours smile  
At these mad quarrels of our Isle  
Sweld with proud hopes to snatch the whole away,  
Whilst we Bet all, and yet for nothing play?17

(11.17-32)

A problem in interpreting the poem lies in the fact that one cannot be certain whether or not Cowley is admonishing Charles, however vaguely and cautiously, for his own part in the beginning of a civil war. One can read Cowley's address as a veiled rebuke or as blind praise more characteristic of the Cavalier poets. In any event, his statement in Stanza Four that there can be no winner in a civil war, his reference to the recent hostilities as "mad quarrels," and his implication that Britain's internal division has made her susceptible to foreign attacks all have a decidedly sobering effect on the exuberance of his praise. Whatever Cowley's intentions may have been, one cannot deny that his poem touches with uncomfortable emphasis upon an action by the king which Charles himself must by then have regarded as a political blunder.
John Cleveland is the first poet of the period to turn the focus of his anxious scolding from the populace directly onto the king himself. "The King's Disguise" is one of the most sensitive, moving, and revealing political poems written during the entire seventeenth century. It reflects the despair of a loyal supporter who has seen his king defeated, humiliated, and made prisoner by his own subjects:

Angell of light, and darknesse too, I doubt,  
Inspir'd within, and yet posses'd without.  
Majestick twilight in the state of grace,  
Yet with an excommunicated face.  
Charles and his Maske are of a different mint,  
A Psalme of mercy in a miscreant print.  
The Sun wears Midnight, Day is Beetle-brow'd,  
And Lightning is in Keldar of a cloud.

Cleveland's eloquent manner of stating that the time is out of joint is quite close in mood to Jonson's and King's poems. The pervading tone of "The King's Disguise" is one of pained confusion, and it results in part from the poet's realization that the conditions under which panegyric can exist have been shattered. Indeed, the speaker in this poem appears as a panegyrist without a subject. He addresses Charles I not as an admiring follower praising a victorious hero, but as a loyal supporter sympathizing with his fallen leader. "The King's Disguise," coming as it does near the end of Charles' reign, represents the same attitude we have seen in poems by Jonson, King, and Cowley: the realization
that in a country bitterly divided and in which the king himself has as many enemies as friends, the idealistic effusions of "pure" panegyric are sadly inadequate as a response to the complexities of the situation.

The differences, then, between Jacobean panegyric and a substantial number of Caroline encomia consists in the introduction into the form, by poets in the later period, of elements which detract from the effectiveness of the praise delivered. These poets do not directly warn or advise Charles, but they do admit harsh and unpleasant truths into a form that, under James I, was employed almost exclusively as a means of offering idealistic praise.

During the Interregnum several important poets carried the changes in panegyric a step further by including explicit advice or warning in their poems of praise. Nowhere in Interregnum panegyric does there occur that thorough blending of praise and admonition that Dryden and Granville are later to achieve; but all other essential characteristics of the admonitory encomium-- the presence in the same poem of praise and advice or warning, with the admonition pertaining to immediate and specific attitudes and actions of the person addressed-- are prevalent in much of the panegyric written under Cromwell.

Marvell's two panegyrics on Cromwell illustrate both the dual presence of praise and admonition in the form and the utter lack of any tendency for these two qualities to
fuse. Admonitions appear in the poems as brief and violent intrusions which disturb the flow of otherwise encomiastic verse. An Horation Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland consists mostly of pure praise until the last two lines:

What may not others fear
If thus he crown each Year!
A Caesar he ere long to Gaul,
To Italy an Hannibal,
And to all States not free
Shall Clymacterick be.
The Pict no shelter now shall find
Within his party-colour'd Mind;
But from this Valour sad
Shrink underneath the Plad:
Happy if in the tufted brake
The English Hunter him mistake;
Nor lay his Hounds in near
The Caledonian Deer.
But thou the Wars and Fortunes Son
March indefatigable on;
And for the last effect
Still keep thy Sword erect:
Besides the force it has to fright
The Spirits of the shady night,
The same Arts that did gain
A Pow'r must it maintain.20
(11. 99-120)

The poem ends with a frightening discord. Throughout all that has preceded the final two lines, the speaker has maintained a stance of judicious confidence in Cromwell and has created the image of a settled rule for England under a firm and powerful leader. But the conclusion of the poem obliterates much of what has gone before it by suddenly admitting that Cromwell's position may not be secure, that he may have to fight again if he is to survive as England's leader. The discordant note in An Horatian Ode is more than matched by a similar one in The First
Anniversary of the Government under O. C. As Marvell addresses Cromwell, once again what seems exclusively praise in interrupted by a startling shift in thought:

Though thou thine Heart from Evil still unstain'd,  
And always hast thy Tongue from fraud refrain'd;  
Thou, who so oft through Storms of thundring Lead  
Hast born securely thine undaunted Head,  
Thy Brest through ponyarding Conspiracies,  
Drawn from the Sheath of lying Prophecies;  
Thee proof beyond all other Force or Skill,  
Our sins endanger, and shall one day kill.  

(11. 167-174)

Marvell's warnings are discordant, shocking, and disturbing, not smoothly integrated into the poems as they would be in the case of an admonitory encomium. His partial anticipation of the admonitory encomium consists in his making the warnings in his poems thoroughly explicit. The task of weaving the admonitions into the very fabric of the encomium remains for later poets to perform.

Not all Interregnum writers who included both praise and admonition in their encomiastic verse relied, as Marvell did, on shock tactics. Milton's "Sonnet XVI. To the Lord General Cromwell" divides neatly, with a smooth transition from praise to warning, in the ninth line:

Cromwell, our chief of men, who through a cloud  
Not of war only, but detractions rude,  
Guided by faith and matchless Fortitude,  
To peace and truth thy glorious way hast plough'd,  
And on the neck of crowned Fortune proud  
Hast rear'd God's Trophies and his work pursu'd,  
While Darwen stream with blood of Scots imbru'd,  
And Dunbar field resounds thy praises loud,  
And Worcester's laureate wreath; yet much remains  
To conquer still; peace hath her victories
No less renown'd than war, new foes arise
Threat'ning to bind our souls with secular chains:
Help us to save free Conscience from the paw
Of hireling wolves whose Gospel is their maw. 22

Despite its differences from Marvell's poems, Milton's work also illustrates the fact that praise and admonition, while they exist side by side in many Interregnum panegyr- ics, simply do not blend together; each remains a separate, independent element within the poem. Slightly more than half of the "Sonnet to Cromwell," or all of the poem that precedes the semicolon in the ninth line, consists totally of praise; from that point on not one more word of praise appears, as the remainder of the poem delivers Milton's advice and warning.

The poems by Marvell and Milton exemplify the kind of panegyric that was to remain most popular in England for the duration of the century-- that in which the elements of praise and advice or warning were not completely fused. Rachel Trickett has stated that "a Restoration panegyric is . . . like a public show, put on by the best actors with the best materials, the stage elaborately set and the audi- ence always in the producer's mind: a Royal Command per- formance in every sense. But there is more to such panegyr- ics than display, for their authors set out to ingratiate and persuade rather than to pay a disinterested compliment."23 Their authors also sometimes set out to warn, and most of them continue to keep separate the admonitions and the praise in their poems. 24 However, at least two poets--
Dryden and Granville-- do attempt to effect a subtle blending of praise with advice or warning in their panegyric; and the admonitory encomium results from their efforts.

Although Dryden's *Astraea Redux* cannot be called an admonitory encomium, one section of the poem does anticipate the form. A.E. Wallace Maurer has shown that the overall structure of *Astraea Redux* is modelled on the classical oration and that Dryden actually addresses, either directly or by implication, three audiences in the poem: Charles II, his English subjects, and the continental nations. In only one part of the poem, a section in which Charles is the chief object of his address, does Dryden anticipate the admonitory encomium:

The land returns, and in the white it wears
The marks of penitence and sorrow bears.
But you, whose goodness your descent doth shew,
Your heav'nly parentage and earthly too;
By that same mildness which your father's crown
Before did ravish, shall secure your own.
Not tied to rules of policy, you find
Revenge less sweet then a forgiving mind.
Thus, when th' Almighty would to Moses give
A sight of all he could behold and live;
A voice before his entry did proclaim
Long-suff'ring, goodness, mercy, in his name.
Your pow'r to justice doth submit your cause,
Your goodness only is above the laws;
Whose rigid letter, while pronounc'd by you
Is softer made. . .

(11. 254-269)

This section of *Astraea Redux* can be viewed in relation to the definition of the admonitory encomium given above: a form of political poetry which purports to consist of pure praise, but which uses praise itself
as a vehicle for delivering advice or warning pertaining, at least by implication, to immediate and specific attitudes and actions of the person addressed. On the surface, these lines do seem to contain nothing but praise. Dryden states that the king is of "heav'nyly parentage," and that he is mild and forgiving. Charles is explicitly compared to Moses, the lawgiver, in lines 262-265; and in lines 268-269 Charles is shown to be Christlike in his ability to mitigate the severity of the law. Dryden also pretends throughout the passage that he is offering not advice, but simply a restatement of Charles' own confirmed intentions. Nevertheless, Dryden does offer both advice and warning; and, in accordance with the next stage of our definition of the form, he employs praise itself as a vehicle for delivering his admonitions. Proof that Dryden is attempting to influence Charles through praising him is afforded by the fact that the poet cannot possible know how he will behave as king. Thus Dryden's praise of Charles represents a means by which the poet can present his own ideas about how Charles should conduct himself in his new position. When Dryden tells Charles that mildness, the downfall of Charles I, will be the very means by which he, Charles II, will solidify his own rule, the poet is, besides offering genuine praise, also encouraging Charles to live up to the spirit of the Declaration at Breda and reassuring him that a course of forgiveness and impartiality towards those who dethroned and executed his father is indeed the
best one for him to follow. Then Dryden asserts that Charles knows better than to ignore or tamper with the country's laws; but the assertion itself, which constitutes praise of Charles, must also be taken as a warning, since Dryden cannot know for certain how Charles will treat the laws once he becomes firmly established as king. When Dryden says "Your goodness only is above the laws," he is being neither vague nor equivocal. Instead, he is strongly implying that the laws are firmly based and that any attempt to ignore them can only bring trouble to the king.30

The blend of praise and admonition in Astraea Redux satisfies what must have been one of Dryden's major motives in writing the poem. The technique enables him to advise the king on deeply important issues and at the same time to express his own respect for Charles and affirm his loyalty to his sovereign.

Thus lines 254-269 of Astraea Redux fit the definition of the admonitory encomium. Dryden's address to Charles seems to consist of pure praise (that Charles is wise and kind enough to realize that he must be merciful and law-abiding as king), but actually contains a warning (that Charles had better proceed as the poet says he will) regarding a specific attitude of Charles' (his intended behavior towards the republicans and other of his political enemies in England). Moreover, the nature of the praise that Dryden offers enables him to employ it as a vehicle
for delivering his admonitions. The same words which convey the praise carry with them the advice and warning.

Granville's perfection of the form involves his intermixing of praise and admonition throughout each of his poems addressed to James. While only one section of Astraea Redux is related to the admonitory encomium, each of Granville's poems to James II is totally within this 'now perfected' form. Analysis of another of Granville's "To the King" poems will emphasize the complete fusion of praise and admonition that occurs in his admonitory encomia:

Tho' Train'd in Arms, and learn'd in Martial Arts, 
Thou choosest, not to conquer Men, but Hearts:  
Expecting Nations for thy Triumphs wait,  
But thou prefer'st the Name of Just and Great.  
So Jove suspends his subject World to Doom,  
Which, would be please to Thunder, he'd consume.  
O! could the Ghosts of mighty Heroes dead,  
Return on Earth, and quit th' Elysian Shade!  
Brutus to James would trust the People's Cause;  
Thy Justice is a stronger Guard than Laws.  
Marius and Sylla would resign to Thee,  
Nor Caesar and great Pompey rivals be;  
Or rivals only, who should best obey,  
And Cato give his Voice for Regal Sway.  

Every couplet in this poem reveals a fusion of praise and advice. Granville once again employs something like a metaphor by referring to James' intentions regarding his Protestant enemies in terms of what Granville chooses to consider the king's international reputation. The first six lines praise James as a great warrior who magnanimously
foregoes conquering the world because he prefers peace and the love of his subjects to global domination. Since Granville cannot know how James will conduct himself as king, his praise must also be taken as advice, as an attempt to influence James' attitudes and behavior. The last eight lines further develop Granville's argument and afford a clear tip-off regarding his intentions. Granville has subtly but decidedly deserted the realm of foreign affairs. The references to Brutus and the "People's Cause," Marius and Sylla, Caesar and Pompey, and Cato all concern domestic conflicts and have little relation to international events. In light of the final eight lines of the poem, the first six must inevitably come to be viewed metaphorically. The awesome power that James so charitably holds in check is suspended over his own subjects' heads. If James is to prove worthy of being placed above Brutus and Cato, then he must become a truly splendid ruler; his justice must indeed be "a stronger Guard than Laws."

Dryden's anticipation of the admonitory encomium and Granville's perfection of the form enabled these poets to respond brilliantly to the complexities of the political situation surrounding them. Each wished to affirm loyalty to his sovereign while advising him to abandon old grudges against political opponents and to reign with kindness and impartiality. The admonitory encomium allowed both poets to achieve their dual purpose in the most effective way
possible-- by fusing praise and admonition so thoroughly that no mind well attuned to the current political situation could perceive either strand of the poets' double meaning without being forced to view the other. Granville's remarkable group of poems addressed to James II, in which the admonitory encomium reaches perfection as a form of poetry, affords further evidence of his being both admirably perceptive of the literary trends of his age and capable of writing original, innovative works of his own.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER III

1 The Genuine Works in Verse and Prose of the Right Honourable George Granville, Lord Lansdowne (London, 1732), I, 9-10. Throughout this chapter I shall, for convenience, refer to all formal, elevated poems of praise as "panegyrics" or "encomia," although these terms are usually applied to longer poems than some of the sonnets, epigrams, and other brief works that I shall cite.

2 David Ogg, in England in the Reign of Charles II (Oxford, 1934), has discussed the problems James had with his Protestant enemies while he was still Duke of York. Ogg notes (II, 584) that James' conflict with the Anglican Church was largely responsible for his banishment to Brussels in 1679. He also records the fact (II, 589, 602-603, and 617) that three bills attempting to bar James from the succession, two of which were actually passed by the House of Commons, were circulated during the period 1679-1681. The wording of the first Exclusion Bill (1679) leaves no doubt of the importance of James' religion to the authors and supporters of the bill. Ogg states that the bill "contained a preamble to the effect that the duke of York had been seduced by the Pope's agents to enter the Church of Rome, and had advanced the power of the French king to the hazard of these kingdoms" (II, 589). France, of course, was then under Catholic rule.

3 Although Granville's two other "To the King" poems contain clearly implied warnings to James regarding the dangers of the abuse of political power, only advice seems to be present here.


6 See C.V. Wedgwood, The King's Peace: 1637-1641 (London, 1955), pp. 143-144. She says of the Star Chamber:

A court created [under Henry VII] to check abuses had developed abuses of its own, and malicious prosecutions in the Star Chamber were not unknown. King Charles, moreover, had used it to silence critics of the Court, Church, or government and, on occasion, critics or libellers of his friends and ministers. Intending to make his subjects fear his authority, he had in a few cases
authorised very heavy fines and humiliating punishments.


8Ibid, p. 203.


11See Wedgwood's *Poetry and Politics Under the Stuarts*, p. 31.

12See Samuel R. Gardiner, *History of England from the Accession of James I. to the Outbreak of the Civil War* (London, 1891), VII, 1-24. In 1629, the year of Jonson's poem, Charles was facing spirited opposition over his recent levy of dues on tonnage and poundage: "the Commons had not only declared the levy of these dues to be illegal, but had encouraged independent merchants to refuse payment to the King's officers" (VII, 1). Charles was also at odds with the Commons over religion, as "at the close of the last session the Remonstrance of the Commons had spoken bitterly of Laud and Neile, and had demanded the suppression of Arminianism in the Church" (VII, 7). I have seen Godfrey Davies' more recent treatment of these events in *The Early Stuarts, 1603-1660* (Oxford, 1959), p. 42. Gardiner's discussion, however, is much fuller.

13Ben Jonson, VIII, 236-237.

14Gardiner (VII, 141-142) says that "the birth of the infant seemed to be a pledge of the permanence of the existing system of government, even if he were not nurtured in his mother's faith to trouble Protestant England when he came to sit upon the throne... . No wonder the Puritans hung their heads whilst bells were ringing and bonfires blazing." Davies (see note 12, above) makes no mention of this.

15The Poems of Henry King, ed. Margaret Crum (Oxford, 1965), pp. 73-75

16See Clarendon, I, 81-131. In discussing the Covenanters, he states: "And this was the first Alarm England receiv'd towards any Trouble, after it had enjoy'd for so many Years the most uninterrupted Prosperity, in a full
and plentiful Peace, that any Nation could be bless'd with" (I, 90). In his general discussion of the subject, Clarendon implies that the Covenanters' activities and Charles' subsequent Scottish campaign were the first in a series of events leading to the Rebellion.

The Scotch Army, under the command of Lesley, was besieging Newark in April of 1646. As the Parliamentary forces were about to beleaguer Oxford, on the 27th, he [Charles I] left it in disguise to surrender himself to the Scots, and after wandering for eight days, voluntarily entered the imprisonment which was to end only with his life.

C.V. Wedgwood, in The King's War: 1641-1647 (London, 1958), p. 554, states: "Late at night the King had his hair cut short and put on a false beard and a suit of drab clothes."


Marvell, I, 103-113.


Trickett, p. 18.

See, for example, Denham's A Panegyrick on His Excellency, The Lord General George Monk, written on the eve of the Restoration; Dryden's "To His Sacred Majesty"; John Dean's A Congratulatory Poem Upon the Happy Ival of His Royal Highness James Duke of York, at Lon April 8, 1682; Mulgrave's "On the Duke of York Banished to Brussels"; and Matthew Prior's "On the Coronation of the Most August Monarch K. James II. and Queen Mary. The 23rd of April, 1685."


Arthur W. Hoffman has anticipated much of my discussion of Astraea Redux in his book John Dryden's Imagery (Gainesville, Fla., 1968), pp. 10-13. And Alan Roper, in Dryden's Poetic Kingdoms (New York, 1965), p. 69, has noted that Dryden addresses Charles as if he were telling the king something he already knew.

This point has been made by both Lillian Feder in "John Dryden's Use of Classical Rhetoric." PMLA, LXIX (1954), 1274, and by Maurer (p. 18).

See David Ogg, England in the Reign of Charles II (Oxford, 1934), I, 152. Ogg says that in the Declaration at Breda (1660) Charles "had declared a general pardon to all (except to such as should be excepted), and had promised a 'liberty to tender consciences,' coupled with a willingness to assent to an Act for securing these objects."


Works, I, 8-9.

He does the same in the "To the King" poem discussed on pp. 51-57, above.

See page 51 above.
CHAPTER FOUR

GRANVILLE, WALLER, AND THE AMBIGUOUS LYRIC

In the preface to his Works, George Granville says that he hopes to carry on the poetical tradition of Edmund Waller by providing "a faithful Register of the reigning Beauties in the succeeding Age." The poems by Waller to which Granville is referring are those that are addressed to various court ladies (the "reigning Beauties") and that have usually been classified by Waller's critics as standard examples of society verse or, more specifically, the sub-genre of society verse which deals with the polite praise and admiration of women. But if Granville is simply praising what he considers a body of traditional society verse in Waller's poetry, then his isolation of Waller as a model for his own poetry of admiration of women is difficult to justify. Surely Granville knew that Ben Jonson, Donne, Carew, Herrick, Lovelace, Suckling and other seventeenth-century poets had also written distinguished society verse in which they celebrated the reigning beauties of their times. Only the fact of Granville's having perceived something extraordinary in Waller's society verse could explain his preference for Waller's work in that genre.
Prompted by curiosity about Granville's statement, I have undertaken a study of Waller's society verse with a view towards determining whether it possesses any qualities that distinguish it from other society verse written during the first half of the seventeenth century. The results of that investigation are startling. Instead of simply innovating within the tradition of society verse, Waller actually created a new form of poetry through fusing the language of love poetry with the tone of the poetry of polite admiration of women. I shall call the form of poetry which Waller invented the ambiguous lyric, since ambiguity is its most salient quality. It is this new form which Granville, I am convinced, is alluding to in his brief but arresting remark about Waller.

In order to see the importance and accuracy of Granville's perception, we must examine Waller's lyrics and determine precisely the nature of his accomplishment. I have said that Waller created the ambiguous lyric by fusing the language of the love lyric with the tone of the poetry of polite admiration of women. By "language of the love lyric" I mean the direct expression, or at least the strong implication, of the speaker's love for the mistress which is often found in the love lyric. For example, Paulus Silentiarius, one of the poets appearing in The Greek Anthology, vows that no other woman will ever induce him to leave Demo; Catullus mounts a scathing attack against one of Lesbia's rivals in beauty
in order to show the depth of his passion for Lesbia; Dante indicates that he could not possibly care for anyone except Beatrice; Wyatt pleads with Rakhell to grant him the proper reward for his constancy in love; and Sidney's "Astrophel" states that Stella is the Platonic form of womanly beauty and virtue, a being so superior to other women that no comparison is possible. In these poems and in untold thousands of others, the language of the love lyric is largely directed towards making clear the speaker's amorous devotion to his mistress.

The tone of the poetry of polite admiration of women, which Waller fused with the language of the love lyric to create the ambiguous lyric, is usually respectfully deferential. The speaker often pays an elegant compliment to the lady addressed, but he seldom displays any evidence of genuine passion for her. Instead he keeps his emotional distance and through the tone of his address conveys the fact that he is merely complimenting her, not making serious love to her. Ben Jonson's "Epigram CXXVI. To Mary Lady Wroth," is a model poem of polite admiration:

Madame, had all antiquitie been lost,
All historie seal'd up, and fables crost;
That we had left us, nor by time, nor place,
Least mention of a Nymph, a Muse, a Grace.
But even their names were to be made a-new,
Who could not but create them all, from you? 10

Jonson offers elegant praise of Lady Wroth's beauty, but
he does not claim to be in love with her. From the time
that Jonson made the poetry of polite admiration popular in
England until Waller began to write his poems to court
ladies, the tone of respectful deference and emotional de-
tachment on the part of the speaker was characteristic of
the form.11

I should like to note one important point before I turn
to an examination of Waller's accomplishment. Critical dis-
satisfaction with Waller's "love poetry" and "society verse"
has been widespread, largely, I think, because most students
of Waller have viewed what I call his ambiguous lyrics as
examples of either love poetry or society verse. The typi-
cal recent treatment of Waller has contained a vague a-
pology for what critics seem to regard as his unconsciously
watered down version of traditional love poetry. John Bux-
ton, for example, notes drily that the formal, polite quali-
ty of Waller's poetry pervades not only his addresses to
court ladies but also those lyrics dealing with "Sacharissa,
the lady Dorothy Sidney with whom he is said to have been
passionately in love."12 In discussing "At Penshurst," a
poem typical of those dedicated to Sacharissa, William Piper
states that Waller "could reduce the sighs of love... to
complimentary gestures."13 Warren L. Chernaik, who con-
centrates on Waller's "poetry of praise," has offered a
reason for what he sees as its insipidity: "Waller uses
the language of love and gallantry to praise the Queen and
other ladies of high position, but he is always conscious
of court decorum and speaks as a distant admirer of clearly inferior rank." Chernaik's statement actually defines the ambiguous lyric, but he does not seem to recognize the significance of his own discovery. He and the other critics persist in wrenching Waller's ambiguous lyrics into the category of either love poetry or society verse, thus denying their existence as examples of an independent form.

I believe that these critics have erred in not taking Waller's poetry on its own terms. When Waller fuses the language of the love lyric with the tone of the poetry of admiration of women, the ambiguous lyric that emerges is unlike either of its sources; it is instead a compound of the two with distinctive qualities of its own, and it is capable of producing uniquely ambiguous effects. "Of the Misreport of Her Being Painted" exemplifies the dominant qualities in Waller's ambiguous lyric:

As when a sort of wolves infest the night
With their wild howlings at fair Cynthia's light,
The noise may chase sweet slumber from our eyes,
But never reach the mistress of the skies;
So with the news of Sacharissa's wrongs
Her vexed servants blame those envious tongues;
Call Love to witness that no painted fire
Can scorch men so, or kindle such desire;
While, unconcerned, she seems to move no more
With this new malice than our loves before;
But from the height of her great love looks down
On both our passions without smile or frown.
So little care of what is done below
Hath the bright dame whom heaven affecteth so!
Paints her, 'tis true, with the same hand which spreads
Like glorious colours through the flowery meads,
When lavish Nature, with her best attire,
Clothes the gay spring, the season of desire;
Paints her, 'tis true, and does her cheek adorn
Waller's poem contains the language of love: the speaker says he loves Sacharissa (l. 10), and he further indicates his strong affection for her by his rousing defense of her beauty. But the general tone of the poem--urbane, distant, extremely respectful--is that of the poetry of polite admiration. The speaker's declaration of love is stripped of some of its significance by the fact that he seems quite content only to belong to the rank and file of Sacharissa's suitors. Obviously, then, Waller has so thoroughly mixed the language of the love lyric with the tone of the poetry of polite admiration of women that his new form of poetry cannot be classified as belonging to either of its parent genres.

When one does accept Waller's new poetic form on its own terms, without trying to make it fit into categories for which it was not fashioned, one discovers that the chief trait of this form involves its rich opportunities for ambiguity. This ambiguity, which results in the reader's difficulty in discerning, from internal evidence at least, just how serious the poet is in his avowal of affection, can be helpful to the poet if his intentions are seriously amorous, and it can also be useful if he simply wishes to convey an elegant compliment. When the poet addresses a lady for whom he has a sincere romantic
affection, as Waller does in the poem to Sacharissa just discussed, the ambiguous lyric allows him to reveal his affection without exposing his feelings to too great a degree— that is, without committing himself so thoroughly that he will be crushed if he meets with a scornful rejection. On the other hand, the ambiguous lyric represents a more flattering and appealing way for a poet to express a compliment to a lady in whom he has no amatory interest than does the poetry of polite admiration of women. The following epigram by Waller is entitled "Written in My Lady Speke's Singing-Book":

Her fair eyes, if they could see
What themselves have wrought in me,
Would at least with pardon look
On this scribbling in her book:
If that she the writer scorn,
This may from the rest be torn,
With the ruin of a part,
But the image of her graces
Fills my heart and leaves no spaces.

Waller here delivers a compliment such as one might expect to find in a poem of polite admiration; but by surrounding his compliment with the language of love (the splendidly suggestive second line, the reference to his heart in the final couplet) he has greatly enhanced the appeal of his poem. Lady Speke, one assumes, cannot help being much more flattered and delighted than she would have been had Waller kept his emotional distance. Thus the ambiguous lyric constitutes an effective alternative to both the dangerous self-exposure of the love lyric and the formal,
distant quality of the poetry of admiration of women.

Granville was the first in the generation of poets following Waller to recognize, publicize, and adopt the new poetic form created by Waller's fusion of the language of love poetry with the tone of the poetry of polite admiration of women. Proof that Granville discerned in Waller's poetry the distinctive poetic form that I have termed the ambiguous lyric does not reside solely in his statement about the nature of Waller's poetry;\(^{18}\) it is also afforded by Granville's own use of the form. In addition to exhibiting a mastery of the basic application of the ambiguous lyric, Granville intensified its inherent ambiguity, a practice which may have influenced later writers who worked in the form.

The ambiguity of Granville's ambiguous lyrics is so pronounced that one never knows, from internal evidence at least, precisely where he stands in relation to the many women whom he addresses. He seems, at times, to be professing love for everyone. "Mira" is the name he gives to the lady whom he presumably loves, the name which serves the same function as Sidney's "Stella" and Waller's "Sacharissa." But as Elizabeth Handasyde humorously points out, Granville breaks all tradition by transferring the name from one woman to another when it suits his purposes to do so.\(^ {19}\) Then there are numerous poems, such as "Under the Lady Mary Villiers' Name," which are very difficult to interpret because of their ambiguity.
If I not love you, Villiers, more
Than ever Mortal lov'd before,
With such a Passion fixt and sure,
As ev'n Possession could not cure,
Never to cease but with my Breath;
May then this Bumper be my Death.20

One is not certain here to what extent the poet is serious about his affection for Lady Villiers. The first three lines seem sincere, but the last three are merely humorously flirtatious. Still, the simple fact that the poem is light and witty in some respects does not preclude the possible truth of the avowal of love which it contains. The ambiguous nature of such works, noticeable in Waller's poems and intensified in Granville's, was to become even more dominant in the ambiguous lyrics of Pope and Swift.

An indication of Granville's possible influence on later writers of the ambiguous lyric is afforded by the frequent and unreserved praise that he accorded Waller. When one considers the magnitude of Granville's own reputation, there can be little doubt that his praise of Waller did much to help maintain an interest in Waller's works long after the poet had died. Waller's reputation would have been great, of course, even if Granville had not lauded and imitated him. But such lines as the following, coming from as important a pen as Granville's, certainly had no damaging effect on the memory of Waller:

_Waller shall never die; of Life secure,_
_As long as Fame, or aged Time endure._
_Waller, the Muse's Darling, free to taste_;
_Of all their Stores, the Master of the Feast;_
Not like old Adam, stinted in his Choice,
But Lord of all the spacious Paradise.
Those Foes to Virtue, Fortune, and Mankind,
Fav'ring his Fame, once, to do Justice join'd;
No carping Critick interrupts his Praise;
No Rival strives, but for a second Place;
No want constrain'd; (the Writer's usual Fate)
A Poet with a plentiful Estate;
The first of Mortals who before the Tomb,
Struck that pernicious Monster, Envy, dumb;
Malice and Pride, those Savages, disarm'd;
Not Orpheus with such powerful Magick charm'd.
Scarce in the Grave can we allow him more,
Than living we agreed to give before.

(11. 12-29)

Granville, then, helped to keep the focus of attention on
Waller for years after the poet's death by writing many
poems in praise of him. Thus he increased the likelihood
that Waller's poetry, his ambiguous lyrics included, would
be imitated by others.

Proof of the importance of Granville's perception
and adoption of the ambiguous lyric is afforded by both
the number and the stature of poets who employed the
form during the next few generations after Waller's death.
William Walsh, Swift, Parnell, Gay, Pope, and Shenstone
are some of the poets who wrote ambiguous lyrics. These
poets, both major and minor, attempted to achieve in the
form that subtle blend of sincerity and playfulness, respect
and intimacy, self-protection and self-revelation that had
characterized Waller's and Granville's poems written in the
sub-genre. Walsh's "Epigram. Written in a Lady's Table-
book" clearly shows Waller's influence:
With what strange raptures would my soul be blest,
Were but her book an emblem of her breast!
As I from that all former marks efface,
And, uncontrol'd, put new ones in their place;
So might I chase all others from her heart,
And my own image in the stead impart.
But, ah! how short the bliss would prove, if he
Who seiz'd it next, might do the same by me! 22

The poem's resemblance to a typical one of Waller's or
Granville's consists in the speaker's personal attesta-
tion of love and in his making the topic of love a cen-
tral concern in a work whose tone more closely resembles
that of a poem of polite admiration than a love lyric.
In other words, the language of the love lyric has been
added to the tone of the poetry of polite admiration of
women to produce a warm and elegant compliment. Other
poems that reveal a similar influence by Waller are Shen-
stone's "Impromptu to Miss Utrecia Smith" 23 and John Gay's
"To Miss Jane Scott." 24

Pope and Swift are the two poets whose use of the
ambiguous lyric most resembles Granville's, as they also
fully utilize the form's inherent ambiguity. Pope's
"Epistle to Miss Blount, on her leaving the Town, after
the Coronation" is probably the most excellent poem ever
written in the sub-genre created by Waller:

So when your slave, at some dear, idle time,
(Not plagu'd with headachs, or the want of rhime)
Stands in the streets, abstracted from the crew,
And while he seems to study, thinks of you:
Just when his fancy points your sprightly eyes,
Or sees the blush of soft Parthenia rise,
Gay pats my shoulder, and you vanish quite;
Streets, chairs, and coxcombs rush upon my sight;
Vext to be still in town, I knit my brow,
Look sow'r, and hum a tune-- as you may now. 25
(11. 41-50)

For all that is light, even bantering in the "Epistle,"
there remain a haunting quality of seriousness, a sense
that more is at stake than the poet wishes to reveal
explicitly. One simply cannot be certain, from internal
evidence at least, just how close the poet and Miss
Blount are. The poem could represent either a serious
indication of romantic affection or nothing more than a
witty exercise in point of view. As I have noted before,
such impenetrable ambiguity can serve any of several im-
portant functions for the poet. For example, it can en-
able him to offer a warm compliment to a woman whom he
respects but in whom he has no romantic interest; or it
can allow him to evince a sincere affection without com-
mitting himself too strongly, without exposing himself
to rejection.

Swift also makes frequent use of the ambiguity af-
forded by the form. He asks of Stella, "At Fifty six, if
this be true,/ Am I a Poet fit for you?/ Or at the Age of
Forty three,/ Are you a Subject fit for me?" 26 The implied
answer is "no"; yet Swift continues to write "love" poetry
to Stella. "On Stella's Birth-day. Written AD. 1718"
represents a fascinating example of how ambiguity can
absolutely riddle a poem written in this sub-genre:

Stella this Day is thirty four,
(We shan't dispute a Year or more)
However Stella, be not troubled,
Although Thy Size and Years are doubled,
Since first I saw Thee at Sixteen
The brightest Virgin on the Green,
So little is thy Form declin'd
Made up so largly in thy Mind.
Oh, would it please the Gods to split
Thy Beauty, Size, and Years, and Wit,
No Age could furnish out a Pair
Of Nymphs so gracefull, Wise and fair
With half the Lustre of your Eyes,
With half your Wit, your Years and Size:
And then before it grew too late,
How should I beg of gentle Fate,
(That either Nymph might have her Swain,)
To split my Worship too in twain.27

After Swift has his fun by referring to Stella's "Size and Years," he then assumes a more sober tone and delivers what seem genuine indications of deep affection. Still, the distance that he establishes by his playfulness in the opening lines lingers throughout much of the poem. Rachel Trickett has offered an interesting explanation for the puzzling nature of the birthday poems:

He [Swift] shares with Pope a determination to tell the truth, but, unlike Pope, he wants to show that this can be done by paring down the elements of the craft, or consciously laughing at them. His birthday poems to Stella make great play with the poetic pains he endures every year to produce them for the occasion, but the whole intention is to insist that true honesty and simplicity need no complications of device in the style . . . . When the true compliment comes it is written with a genuine passion which derives partly from his disgust at the false standards on which most women are judged.28

According to Miss Trickett, then, Swift's praise of Stella is genuine, while his rather violent attacks of "honesty" are directed not at Stella but at other poets who cling to
worn, empty techniques of celebrating their mistresses. Swift has applied to his own purposes the ambiguities inherent in the ambiguous lyric.

Thus the importance of Granville's perception of the new form of poetry created by Waller is clearly borne out by the number and the stature of poets who employed the form during the Restoration and the first half of the eighteenth century. Moreover, besides recognizing the existence of the ambiguous lyric, Granville also wrote many poems of his own in the sub-genre; and by fully utilizing in his own poems the inherent ambiguity of the form, he anticipated the treatment of the ambiguous lyric by such authors as Pope and Swift. Finally, Granville's frequent praise of Waller helped keep other poets' interest in Waller at a high level long after the poet's death and therefore increased the probability that other poets would recognize and imitate Waller's accomplishment. Whether one considers Granville's contribution to the ambiguous lyric from the standpoint of his recognition of it, his participation in it, his helping to make it more widely known, or his possible influence on later poets who wrote in the sub-genre, one cannot doubt his great importance to the form.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER IV


3. M.H. Abrams, in A Glossary of Literary Terms (New York, 1957), defines society verse as "brief epigrammatic or lyrical verse dealing with the surface concerns or events of polite society. It is sometimes satiric, but in the mood of badinage rather than severity; and when it deals with love, it does so flirtatiously or in the mode of elegant and witty compliment, rather than with high seriousness" (p. 102). My argument is concerned only with that species of society verse that offers an elegant compliment to a lady; for the sake of accuracy I shall call it "the poetry of polite praise and admiration of women."

4. For a full discussion of this form, see pp. 85-88, below.


11. See, for example, Suckling's "Upon the Black Spots Worn by My Lady D.E.""; Herrick's "On Tomasin Parsons"; Carew's "On sight of a Gentlemans face in the water"; and Edward, Lord Herbert of Cherbury's "The Green-Sickness Beauty."
12 Buxton, p. 93.
13 Piper, p. 260.
14 Chernaik, p. 54. Alexander Ward Allison, in Toward an Augustan Poetic: Edmund Waller's "Reform" of English Poetry (Lexington, Ky., 1962), and H.M. Richmond, in The School of Love: The Evolution of the Stuart Love Lyric (Princeton, 1964), have also noticed that Waller's "love" poetry is different from that of the poets who preceded him; but neither of these critics mentions anything approximating what I have called the ambiguous lyric.


17 Ibid, II, 1.

18 See note 1, above.


20 Works, I, 156.


CHAPTER V  

GRANVILLE, POPE AND POETICAL CRITICISM

In several important respects, George Granville's Essay Upon unnatural Flights in Poetry (1701) anticipates Pope's An Essay on Criticism to a greater extent than did any other piece of English poetical criticism written during the Restoration and early eighteenth century. Specifically, Granville combined a humorous tone and a fluid movement from precept to example and from one topic to the next with means promoting continuity, namely thematic unity, lexical repetition, and the recurrent use of technical devices such as antithetical imagery and the juxtaposition of unlike passages. This combination, which was also effected by Pope in An Essay on Criticism, affords an amusing, wittily conversational surface through the humor and the fluidity and at the same time, by means of thematic unity and the repetition of key words and technical devices, provides a subtle, complex undertone of continuity which connects the various stages of the argument presented. The aim of this chapter will be to
illuminate the arresting quality of Granville's achievement through examining his *Essay* and Pope's *Essay* against the background of other Restoration and early eighteenth-century poetical essays in criticism.

I shall first discuss the appearance and function of humor, fluidity, and continuity in *An Essay on Criticism*. After treating each element separately, I shall then attempt to illustrate the effect of the combination of the three qualities in the poem. Several critics have stated that humor is one of the Essay's most dominant and important traits. Reuben A. Brower, for example, asserts that the amusement afforded by the Essay in its "verses and passages of critical and satirical wit" has been largely responsible for the work's popular survival. And Jacob Adler believes that humor acts in the poem as an agent which produces delight, the counterpart of the instruction provided by precepts. No passage better exemplifies the Essay's amusing and delightful side than the one in which Pope inveighs against critics who are unreasonably partial to "proper" versification in a poem:

But most by Numbers judge a Poet's Song,  
And smooth or rough, with them, is right or wrong;  
In the bright Muse tho' thousand Charms conspire,  
Her Voice is all these tuneful Fools admire,  
Who haunt Parnassus but to please their Ear,
Not mend their Minds; as some to Church repair,
Not for the Doctrine, but the Musick there.
These Equal Syllables alone require,
Tho' oft the Ear the open Vowels tire,
While Expletives their feeble Aid do join,
And ten low Words oft creep in one dull Line,
While they ring round the same unvary'd Chimes,
With sure Returns of still expected Rhymes.
Where-e1'er you find the cooling Western Breeze,
In the next Line, it whispers thro' the Trees:
If Chrystal Streams with pleasing Murmurs creep,
The Reader's threaten'd (not in vain) with Sleep.
Then, at the last, and only Couplet fraught
With some unmeaning Thing they call a Thought,
A needless Alexandrine ends the Song,
That like a wounded Snake, drags its slow length along.3

This is only one of many passages in the poem where a humorous tone predominates. The importance of Pope's humor resides in the fact that it allows him to deliver precepts with wit and elegance instead of simply listing them in an argumentative or authoritative manner. As soon as he has finished laughing one idea or practice out of all consideration, he moves on to an even more comical treatment of the next. Thus after presenting a general argument in the first seven lines of the passage above, he disposes of slavishly precise versification in two lines, of expletives and monosyllables in two more, of dull, unoriginal rhyming in six, and of Alexandrines in four. The reader laughs his way through the passage, scarcely aware that he is being instructed as well as amused. Through
frequently employing a humorous tone, Pope is enabled to create in many parts of An Essay on Criticism an atmosphere more like that of the drawing room than the lecture hall. 4

The fluidity in Pope's Essay appears both in its easy movement back and forth between precept and example and in its smooth transitions from one topic to the next. In regard to the former, Jacob Adler sees the fluidity as part of a complex of devices intended to promote condensation throughout the poem. 5 Charles Sanders, who thinks that one of the main purposes of the poem is to teach the doctrine of the mean between extremes in writing, says that the movement from precept to example is often also a movement from a passage exemplifying "judgment" to one illustrating "wit." Sanders concludes that through effecting a fluid movement, one without obvious transitions, between such passages, Pope is attempting to reveal that the fusion of "wit" and "judgment" results in writing which strikes the mean. 6

I would argue that the fluid movement between precept and example serves at least one other function in An Essay on Criticism, one which is similar in its effects to the humorous tone Pope frequently employs. The fluidity helps remove Pope from the awkward position of the dull lecturer
and allows him to proceed in an interesting and conversational manner while still making his point. In writing any piece of didactic poetical criticism, the poet must always be tempted to move in a constant, repeated, and finally predictable pattern from precept to example. After all, his purpose is to set down a series of critical principles in as convincing a manner as possible. The most immediately obvious method (and probably the easiest) for him to adopt is to state a precept in some detail, support it with a couple of examples, and then move on to a new sequence of precept and example. But this method has the almost inescapable consequence of causing the poet to sound as if he is forever teaching, exhorting, and admonishing. Everything is made subordinate to the statement and defense of the rules laid down in the poem. Examples seem dragged in only to afford proof or authority for precepts. The effect of this arrangement can be exceptionally dull, and Pope seems to have taken pains to discover and employ an alternative means of delivering his precepts and examples.

Pope's most obvious method of escaping the rigid precept-to-example structure occurs in parts of the passage cited above. When he says "And ten low Words oft
creep in one dull line" (l. 347), he is both warning against the excessive use of monosyllables and demonstrating the effect that too many of them in one line can produce. In other words, precept and example are totally fused; and the example, instead of appearing dredged up simply as proof of the rule, is actually as important as the rule itself, since the two are so inextricably interwoven that one cannot be removed without the destruction of the other. This is really more than fluidity—it is miscibility.

The full range of effects that the Essay produces by its easy movement between precept and example requires for its illustration the examination of a larger unit than a single line. I have said that Pope's technique allows him to appear as an interesting conversationalist rather than a preacher or lecturer. The following passage illustrates my meaning:

If Wit so much from Ign'rance undergo,
Ah let not Learning too commence its Foe!
Of old, those met Rewards who cou'd excel,
And such were Prais'd who but endeavour'd well;
The' Triumphs were to Gen'ral's only due,
Crowns were reserv'd to grace the Soldiers too.
Now, they who reach Parnassus' lofty Crown,
Employ their Pains to spurn some others down;
And while Self-Love each jealous Writer rules,
Contending Wits become the Sport of Fools.
These lines can be analyzed first from the standpoint of the movement within them between precept and example and then with a view towards determining what effect that movement has on the implied personality of the speaker. The paragraph opens with a brief injunction to the learned against their "commencing" to be enemies of wit (ll. 508-9). The precept requires explanation, and Pope moves at once to an example in which he clarifies the word "commence." By means of an analogy between literature and war, Pope indicates that writers once stood together instead of fighting among themselves. Ancient authors, he says, forged a community of mutual understanding and sympathy. Such was their respect for the honorable profession of letters that they applauded each other for even attempting to write well (ll. 510-13). Pope then proceeds to another example through which he illustrates the lamentable effects of intelligent people's being at war with wit (ll. 514-19). The substance of this example, a consideration of the
selfish practices among modern men of letters, spawns a new precept with which the paragraph concludes (ll. 520-25). Here Pope urges the members of his literary audience not to give in to self-love, pride, and desire for fame as so many moderns have done, but to judge the works of others with "Good-Nature and Good-Sense." Thus we see that the opening precept gives rise to an example which leads to another example, and that from the second example develops a new precept, or at least a greatly elaborated version of the beginning precept.

Pope's refusal to follow a rigid precept-to-example structure in this passage permits him to appear in his best light before the reader. He does not seem to be lecturing or preaching so much as conversing. One part of his argument suggests the next, and he seems simply to throw in several interesting examples and illustrations that occur to him, sometimes deriving a new direction in his argument from one of his examples. Thus he begins with a plea that learning will not become the enemy of wit (ll. 508-09) and is immediately led to think of older days when a nobler code existed among literary men (ll. 510-13). Finished with his consideration of the ancients, he is struck by the sad contrast to them afforded by today's
breed of cutthroats (ll. 514-19). His thoughts about modern abuses of the spirit of literature lead naturally to an eloquent appeal to his listeners that they keep their own judgments free from the selfish corruption of the age (ll. 520-25).

If Pope had consistently moved from precept to example and back to a new precept, there would have been no essential connection between each example and the succeeding precept. With the current flowing only from precept to example, there would have been as many organizational units as there were distinct sets of precept-example. The result, of course, would have been a formal listing of one precept after another, each supported by appropriate examples, with the emphasis on the rules. The examples would have had the subordinate function of illustrating, clarifying, or lending authority to the precepts. But as Pope has actually arranged the paragraph, the current flows from precept to example, from one example to another, and from the second example to a new precept. The paragraph as a whole becomes the unit of organization, and the argument can move fluidly back and forth between precept and example. Like a witty conversationalist, the poet entertains us with what seems to be a series of interesting
ramblings but which turns out to have unity, thrust, and point. In short, he delights us as he seemingly "without Method talks us into Sense" (l. 654).

Pope's Essay also exhibits this graceful fluidity in its smooth transitions from one topic to the next. Arthur Fenner, Jr. has stated:

Each paragraph has the internal unity of its separate topic, but at the same time its first lines bear a close relation of some sort to those that precede them, and its last to those that follow. For all its directness, each paragraph assists and is assisted by its neighbors and forms a link between them.  

Fenner also says that "whole paragraphs may be considered transitions, and the poem moves along smoothly from point to point" (p. 232). The paragraph comprising lines forty-six to fifty-one affords an example of what Fenner has noted:

But you who seek to give and merit Fame,  
And justly bear a Critick's noble Name,  
Be sure your self and your own Reach to know,  
How far your Genius, Taste, and Learning go;  
Launch not beyond your Depth, but be discreet,  
And mark that Point where Sense and Dulness meet.

Pope has just concluded (ll. 36-45) an attack on writers who do not know "themselves and their own reach," who have
run the gamut from being wits through being poets and critics and have ended as "plain Fools" (l. 37). Thus the entire paragraph quoted above relates back to the one preceding it, as Pope instructs his hearers not to be like those "half-form' d Insects" (l. 41) that he has just discussed, but to discover for what office the combination of their learning, talent, and inclination best suits them. The paragraph also looks ahead to the one following it (ll. 52-67), where Pope asserts that the human mind is so constructed that any given man can be a genius in only one field. Part of knowing oneself and one's own reach might consist in knowing some of the natural limitations attaching to the human condition. The paragraph comprising lines forty-six to fifty-two, then, which stands alone as an individual unit of instruction from Pope to aspiring critics, also serves as a transition between two topics. It clarifies the errors of those "Witlings" discussed in the paragraph preceding it, and it prepares the way for the pronouncements about man's mental capacity in the next paragraph.

I believe that this technique, like the others I have discussed to this point, chiefly contributes to the reader's delight. It allows the poet to move from one topic to the
next in a fluid, graceful, conversational manner, and thus it represents a welcome alternative to the poet's announcing in a self-conscious way that he has finished with one stage of his flight and will now test his Pegasus' wings on a new one. On the other hand, Pope's method does provide a transition, however subtle, and thus is superior to a technique which jolts along from one topic to the next with no indication at all that a change is coming. Pope's transitions are subtle enough to avoid annoying the reader by calling attention to themselves, while they are explicit enough to insure the reader's recognition of them.

Humor and fluidity lend a witty, conversational tone to Pope's Essay which permits an attractive presentation of Pope's didactic argument. The different kinds of continuity in the poem, which I shall now consider, help keep that argument under control by relating its various stages to each other. Critics who have investigated the overall organization of Pope's Essay have discovered three separate elements running throughout the poem which promote continuity—thematic unity, lexical repetition, and the recurrent use of certain technical devices. Arthur Fenner, Jr. discusses the Essay's thematic unity:

The first section proposes the general basis
for right judgment, and the second offers concrete examples of right judgment and wrong. But the third abandons concern about whether the critic is right or wrong (though it assumes he is right), and dwells on his motives and actions as a moral being. Section III would seem to represent a radical shift in purpose, from one decidedly professional and intellectual to one decidedly moral. But Pope does not write at this point as if he were adding another purpose to his first, like a new subject, but as if he were drawing the consequences of premises he has already established.®

Fenner argues convincingly that the seemingly "radical shift in purpose" in the third part of Pope's Essay has indeed received elaborate preparation during the course of the poem. The critic's office, Fenner says, is presented as increasingly moral throughout the second section, where a consideration of the hardships of poets gradually replaces emphasis on rules of correct writing as a major concern of critics; in other words, the critic's responsibility comes to be seen as moral and humanistic instead of just aesthetic. Accompanying this shift in emphasis, Fenner says, is a growing tendency throughout the Essay for the faults of critics to be judged not only as errors, as they are in the first section, but as actual sins (p. 234). Finally, Fenner argues that the Essay's repeated treatment of pride, a trait that is depicted in more and
more reprehensible terms as the poem progresses, prepares the way for the moral concerns of the work's final section (p. 236). Thus according to Fenner the shift in emphasis in the Essay's final part from a treatment of rules and illustrations regarding proper critical judgment to an examination of morality in the critic is thematically consistent; the third section of the work grows out of the first two.

William Empson has examined lexical repetition in An Essay on Criticism. By "lexical repetition" I mean the recurrent use of one or more "key words" whose connotations, and sometimes denotations as well, vary according to the context in which they occur. According to Empson, "wit" is the key word in An Essay on Criticism. The word had many different connotations for Pope and his audience, and Empson says that Pope was able to evoke any one set of connotations, and sometimes two or more sets at the same time, by means of the context surrounding each appearance of "wit."

Regarding recurrent uses of technical devices in Pope's Essay, Martin Kallich has established that sixty separate instances of balanced antitheses occur in the imagery of the poem. And Charles Sanders has noted that
Pope frequently juxtaposes an entire passage exemplifying "wit" with another illustrating "judgment." Sanders means that many times during the poem a paragraph containing imaginative brilliance and a considerable amount of figurative language (characteristics of "wit") is juxtaposed with a section which consists largely of sober, down to earth reasoning or instruction (characteristics of "judgment").

It is my contention that these three elements—thematic unity, lexical repetition, and a group of recurring technical devices—which critics have discerned throughout most or all of An Essay on Criticism, act together to provide a complex, multifaceted continuity in the poem. A thorough analysis of continuity in Pope's Essay is, of course, beyond the scope of this chapter. What I propose to do instead is examine a selected passage in relation to other passages which precede and follow it; in that way I hope to give a sound indication of the undertone of continuity that I believe exists throughout the entire work:

Nature to all things fix'd the Limits fit,  
And wisely curb'd proud Man's pretending Wit:  
As on the Land while here the Ocean gains,  
In other Parts it leaves wide sandy Plains;  
Thus in the Soul while Memory prevails,
The solid Pow'r of Understanding fails;  
Where Beams of warm Imagination play,  
The Memory's soft Figures melt away.  
One Science only will one Genius fit;  
So vast is Art, so narrow Human Wit;  
Not only bounded to peculiar Arts,  
But oft in those, confin'd to single Parts.  
Like Kings we lose the Conquests gain'd before,  
By vain Ambition still to make them more:  
Each might his several Province well command,  
Wou'd all but stoop to what they understand.  
(11. 52-67)

These lines occur in the first section of the Essay,  
which, according to Fenner, "proposes the general basis  
for right judgment."¹³  The thematic connection of this  
paragraph with the rest of the section consists in its de­  
lineating a part of that general basis. Here Pope states  
that before an aspiring critic can judge correctly, he  
must know the limitations of the human mind. The para­  
graph preceding this one (11. 46-51) admonishes the critic  
to know himself and his own capabilities. The passage  
following it (11. 68-87) is the famous one informing the  
critic that he must "First follow Nature." Thus the para­  
graph quoted above contains one of three dictates laid  
down in successive paragraphs to the critic who wishes to  
learn "the general basis for right judgment": know your  
own limitations, know the limitations of the human mind,  
and follow nature as your guide in judging. Obviously,
then, thematic continuity exists among this paragraph and those preceding and following it.

In discussing lexical repetition, I shall concur with Empson's judgment that "wit" is a key word in Pope's Essay, although I think that in a wider study such words as "nature" and "sense," which Empson himself suggests, and "pride" might also reward investigation. In the passage quoted above, "wit" appears in lines fifty-three and sixty-one. In both cases its meaning is clearly "mental capacity," the only meaning that will fit with the overall argument of the passage— that man's mental capacity is subject to certain limitations. Two paragraphs earlier, though (11. 36-45), when Pope ridicules those "half-form'd Insects" (1. 41) who lack self-knowledge and who have run the gamut by being wits, then poets, then critics, and finally "plain Fools" (1. 37), "wit" has two different meanings, neither of which is similar to that in the passage quoted above. In lines thirty-six and thirty-eight, "wit" refers to the fashionable, sophisticated man about town, a person who can be seen at all the plays and coffee houses and who possesses some knowledge of the arts and a ready sense of humor. In line forty-five, where Pope uses the phrase "vain Wit," he is referring to the dullard, the
false wit who only has pretensions to being clever and knowledgeable. Once again, these meanings of "wit" are dictated by the context of the argument in which they occur. Pope forces the meaning of "sophisticated man about town" on "wit" in lines thirty-six and thirty-eight by arranging the word in series with "Poets" (l. 36) and "Criticks" (l. 37). The only non-satirical definition of a "wit" which fits the series is the one I have given, one that establishes a "wit" as a man who, like a poet and critic, derives his label from his connection with the arts. On the other hand, Pope's contemptuous reference to a "vain Wit" in line forty-five leaves no doubt that he is alluding to a dull, affected pretender to intelligence and sophistication, a false wit.

In the paragraph following the one quoted above (ll. 68-87) appears the line "For Wit and Judgment often are at strife" (l. 82). This passage is the one which begins "First follow Nature" (l. 68), and in it Pope explains that to follow nature is, among other things, to strike the proper balance of wit and judgment. Here the argument itself does not force a certain meaning of "wit," since anytime we see "wit" and "judgment" juxtaposed we know that "wit" means the imaginative faculty, which vents
itself by means of inventions and figurative language and which is tempered by the solidity and restraint of "judgment." Nevertheless, the signification of "wit" in this paragraph is different from its meaning in either of the other two just discussed.

The constant repetition of the key word "wit" throughout Pope's Essay helps establish an undercurrent of continuity in the work. As "wit" appears in passage after passage with its connotations, and sometimes its denotations as well, altered to suit the various needs of Pope's exposition, the word repeatedly acts as a signal that the argument has taken a new turn. But since we do not forget the meanings that previous stages of the argument of the poem have elicited from the word even when "wit" appears in a new context and with a different meaning, we are constantly aware of what the word has meant before, in other contexts, as well as what it means in the present one; from that derives our sense of a relationship among the various stages of the argument of the poem where "wit" occurs. One might say that "wit" acts as an index to the developing argument of the poem.

The recurrent use of antithetical imagery and the frequent juxtaposition of unlike passages in Pope's Essay
are illustrated by the paragraph under consideration. Two sets of antithetical images may be discerned. The first (ll. 54-59) compares the shifting domain of sea and land at the edge of the shore to the action in the mind of memory-understanding and memory-imagination. Just as the sea loses to one shore what it gains from another, so the operation of understanding fails exactly in proportion to the extent that memory becomes active, while memory in turn loses its power when the imagination is in operation. The second antithetical image (ll. 64-67) compares the workings of the human mind to the actions of kings. Just as kings who attempt to conquer new territory may suffer such defeats that they lose the possessions with which they began, so men who try to master all areas of knowledge and skill are in danger of losing their ability in the one area where nature intended them to excel. Conversely, men who are content to learn thoroughly the one discipline for which they are suited resemble wise kings who attempt to govern their own dominions well rather than to conquer new territories at every opportunity.

Three paragraphs before the passage quoted above (ll. 19-25), Pope employs antithetical imagery in order to show that false learning can corrupt good sense. Each human
mind, he says, is endowed with a quantity of good sense, and may be compared to a thinly traced but justly executed sketch. Then he develops the comparison further:

But as the slightest Sketch, if justly trac'd,
Is by ill Colouring but the more disgrac'd,
So by false Learning is good Sense defac'd.

(11. 23-25)

Another instance of antithetical imagery appears in the "First follow Nature" paragraph (11. 68-87). The opposite effects of wit and judgment upon poetry are compared to two different ways of riding a horse. Wit "spur[s]" (1. 84) the beast and "provoke[s] his Speed" (1. 85), while judgment "guide[s]" (1. 84), "restrain[s]" (1. 85), and "check[s]" (1. 87). The four examples of antithesis just discussed represent only a small fraction of the amount of antithetical imagery that appears throughout the poem. Since antithetical imagery is at least partially involved in the development of one passage after another, the device unquestionably lends an undertone of continuity to the work.

Pope also employs the technique of juxtaposing the paragraph quoted above, which exemplifies "wit," with the one following it (11. 68-87, the paragraph beginning "First follow Nature"), which illustrates "judgment."
Charles Sanders says that the passage quoted above contains "swelling metaphors" and "ironic quips," both of which are manifestations of the operation of "wit," while the paragraph following it is characterized by restraint and sobriety, qualities which accompany the operation of "judgment." The juxtaposition of unlike passages occurs throughout Pope's Essay. For example, one of the two paragraphs preceding the one quoted above displays what might be called "wit," and the other seems grounded in "judgment." The former (11. 36-45) is filled with clever comparisons. Dullards with literary pretensions who lack the ability to be either wits or critics are, like "heavy Mules," "neither Horse nor Ass" (l. 39). And "half-learn'd Witlings" (l. 40), who have failed to master any discipline but who have dabbled in all of them, are like "half-form'd Insects" (l. 41). This paragraph yields to one (11. 46-51) which contains no developed figure of speech, but which consists entirely of serious advice to the aspiring critic. "Judgment" is the dominant quality here, just as "wit" was in the preceding paragraph. The frequent juxtaposition of unlike passages acts throughout Pope's Essay with the recurrent use of antithetical imagery to provide an undertone of technical continuity to the work.
I have now examined separately the nature and effect of humor, fluidity, and continuity in *An Essay on Criticism*. The task remains of showing how these three elements work together in the poem to produce a fine balance of liveliness and solidity which helps make the work superior to any other piece of English poetical criticism written during Pope's time. The following passage begins just after Pope (ll. 578-84) has informed aspiring critics that an important function of their office is that of offering advice to writers:

'Twere well, might Criticks still this Freedom take;  
But Appius reddens at each Word you speak,  
And stares, Tremendous! with a threatening Eye,  
Like some fierce Tyrant in Old Tapestry!  
Fear most to tax an Honourable Fool,  
Whose Right it is, uncensur'd to be dull;  
Such without Wit are Poets when they please,  
As without Learning they can take Degrees.  
Leave dang'rous Truths to unsuccessful Satyrs,  
And Flattery to fulsome Dedicators,  
Whom, when they Praise, the World believes no more,  
Than when they promise to give Scribling o'er.  
'Tis best sometimes your Censure to restrain,  
And charitably let the Dull be vain;  
Your Silence there is better than your Spite,  
For who can rail so long as they can write?  
Still humming on, their drowsy Course they keep,  
And lash'd so long, like Tops, are lash'd asleep.  
False Steps but help them to renew the Race,  
As after Stumbling, Jades will mend their Pace.  
What Crouds of these, impenitently bold,  
In Sounds and jingling Syllables grown old,  
Still run on Poets in a raging Vein,  
Ev'n to the Dregs and Squeezings of the Brain;
Strain out the last, dull droppings of their Sense,
And Rhyme with all the Rage of Impotence!

(11. 584-609)

One notices first of all that the passage is packed with humor. In fact, every topic taken up by Pope in the paragraph receives a humorous treatment. "Appius" (11. 585-87), dull noblemen with literary aspirations (11. 588-591), flatterers (11. 593-95), and poor poets in general (11. 596-609) are all ridiculed. To say that the tone of this passage is humorous would be something of an understatement.

A fluid movement between precept and example combines with the humorous tone of this passage to produce a witty, conversational effect. Pope begins by attaching a condition to the precept he has delivered in the preceding paragraph. The critic, he implies (1. 584), is not always free to offer advice to writers. He then employs the example of "Appius" (11. 585-87) to clarify his meaning. The words "threatning" (1. 586) and "fierce" (1. 587) in Pope's treatment of "Appius" lead him naturally into a new precept having to do with what the critic must fear the most—giving advice to "an Honourable Fool" (1. 588). This precept regarding what the critic must fear to do gives way to the more general command, "Leave dangerous
Truths to unsuccessful Satyrs" (l. 592); Pope then naturally thinks of the opposite of "dangerous Truths," and he accordingly delivers a new precept concerning flattery (ll. 593-95). Next he presents a final bit of advice, telling critics that under some circumstances they may find silence the best alternative open to them (ll. 596-99). Pope concludes the paragraph with a long example of the attitudes and practices of dull writers. The argument, then, proceeds from precept to example and back to three other precepts before closing with a long example. The passage is everywhere humorous, and its movement between precept and example is constantly fluid. One stage of the argument almost casually suggests the next, as it might to someone conversing. This witty, conversational effect dominates the passage and is largely responsible for its great charm.

This paragraph is also part of a fluid movement from one topic to the next. As I have already stated, Pope in the preceding passage (ll. 578-83) instructs critics to advise writers whenever they see the necessity to do so. The paragraph quoted above, though, cautions critics not to waste their time advising stupid or untalented writers. Pope's discussion of dull writers leads naturally into the
topic of the next paragraph (ll. 610-30), the abuses of dull critics, which in turn gives way to the long history of criticism with which the poem concludes.

Thus the Essay's humorous tone and its fluid movement between precept and example and from one topic to the next are largely responsible for the poem's witty, conversational effect, an effect which, I believe, constitutes the work's chief means of producing delight. But these elements that foster delight have no necessary control over the continuity of the poem's argument. The humor appears sporadically, especially in the first and third sections; and the fluidity, which operates everywhere in the poem, is nevertheless unpredictable in its patterns of movement. One cannot say, for example, that Pope develops each stage of his argument through a movement from precept-1 to example-1 to example-2 and finally to precept-2. The pattern of movement varies with each passage. If there were no controls over the continuity of Pope's developing argument, his work would be in danger of exemplifying all "wit" and no "judgment." The unrestrained play of humor and fluidity would dominate the poem, and the various sections of Pope's argument might then seem essentially unrelated to each other.
There are, of course, elements which promote continuity in Pope's Essay, and I believe that they work side by side with the qualities that produce delight, both in the paragraph cited above and in the work as a whole. This passage is thematically related to the entire third section of the poem, which, as Fenner says, "abandons concern about whether the critic is right or wrong (though it assumes he is right), and dwells on his motives and actions as a moral being." Here, of course, Pope is cautioning the critic that he may run into insurmountable obstacles (in the form of choleric or stupid writers) in exercising his moral obligation to instruct authors in the principles of good writing. Thus the thematic continuity which runs throughout each part of the poem is evidenced by the thematic relationship between this passage and the rest of the third section.

Lexical repetition takes the form in this paragraph of the key word "wit" appearing with yet a different meaning from any we have seen before. In discussing dull noblemen who write dull poetry Pope says:

Such without Wit are Poets when they please,
As without Learning they can take Degrees.
(11. 590-91)
Here "wit" probably means the poetical faculty, the rich imagination and perception necessary to anyone wishing to write good poetry. It clearly does not refer to a sophisticated man about town who knows a good deal about literature, a false wit, a certain quality in one's writing, or the intellectual capacity of the human brain—meanings that Pope has attached to the word earlier in the poem. Still, one remembers those other connotations and the arguments surrounding them even while realizing that Pope is now employing the word in a different manner. Thus the repetition of a key word contributes in this passage to the poem's undercurrent of continuity.

One rather complex antithetical image cluster appears in this paragraph. Pope explains why it sometimes does no good to correct poor writers:

Still humming on, their drowsy Course they keep,
And <u>lash'd</u> so long, like Tops, are <u>lash'd asleep</u>.
<u>False Steps</u> but help them to renew the Race,
As after <u>Stumbling</u>, Jades will <u>mend</u> their Pace.

(11. 600-603)

Dull writers are first compared to "Tops," with the idea being that just as tops can be lashed until they finally appear to stand still, to "sleep," so dull writers become more and more inured to critical abuse as they receive
increasing amounts of it. Then poor writers are likened to nags, since both are known only to exert fresh efforts after making "False Steps," although one would expect their frequent errors to discourage them.

The other technical device whose repeated use lends continuity to the poem, the juxtaposition of unlike passages, is also operative in the relationship between this paragraph and the one preceding it. Pope has just finished admonishing critics to give advice to authors freely (ll. 578-83). That paragraph is totally comprised of statement, containing no figurative language whatsoever. As such, it fits Sanders' criteria for passages exemplifying "judgment." In the paragraph quoted above, though, Pope's imagination is given free play. Comparisons are numerous, and one concludes that the operation of "wit" is in full force. Thus a passage exemplifying "judgment" gives way here, as often during the Essay, to one comprised of "wit."

The devices which promote continuity work simultaneously with those that produce delight in the paragraph quoted above. The surface of the passage is all witty conversation, as Pope deftly ridicules choleric and stupid writers. But the devices which afford continuity are also
present in the paragraph; and although they do not call attention to themselves, they do operate very efficiently to provide an undercurrent of connections among this passage and the ones preceding and following it.

One sees, then, that the total effect of the simultaneous operation of humor, fluidity, and elements conducing to continuity is one of delight and control. The humor and fluidity produce a witty, conversational tone which allows Pope to fulfill his own dictum that "Men must be taught as if you taught them not" (l. 574). But while one side of Pope's Essay is delighting us with its humor and fluidity, another side is carefully working out connections among the various stages of the argument presented. These connections are established by means of thematic unity, lexical repetition, and the recurrent use of such technical devices as antithetical imagery and the juxtaposition of unlike passages. I believe that the subtle combination of delight and control, of witty conversation and continuity of argument, that Pope's Essay achieves is one of the most important qualities distinguishing it from most other poetical essays in criticism written during the Restoration and early eighteenth century. As we shall see in the next part of this chapter, no other of
Pope's English predecessors besides Granville came even remotely near to effecting the combination found in Pope's Essay.

In order to show the differences between Pope's Essay and the pieces of English neoclassical poetical criticism other than Granville's which preceded it, I shall examine the frequency with which the elements in Pope's work that I have discussed—humor, fluidity, and continuity—appear in the other poems. The humorous tone that one finds in Pope's Essay had previously been employed only rarely in English verse essays in criticism. Indeed, most writers approached their task of setting down critical rules with almost unremitting gravity. Roscommon's An Essay on Translated Verse (1684), for example, scarcely contains one humorous line. When humor does appear in one of these poems, it is usually confined to one or two passages. Mulgrave's An Essay upon Poetry (1682), to cite another instance, while it has one paragraph devoted exclusively to a comical treatment of the absurd plots and conventions of modern plays, elsewhere is completely sober in tone.

Two English neoclassical poetical critics besides Granville do anticipate Pope in the frequent use of humor.
Samuel Butler's "Upon Critics Who Judge of Modern Plays Precisely by the Rules of the Antients" (1678) is consistently comical. Butler is reacting to carping critics who will condemn a modern play outright if it fails to satisfy completely the requirements of a drama that have been derived from the study of ancient playwrights. In the following passage, he cleverly questions whether a knowledge of ancient rules should not disqualify a critic from judging a modern work:

An English Poet should be tryd b' his Peres
And not by Pedants & Philosophers,
Incompetent to Judge Poetique Fury,
As Butchers are forbid to b' of a Jury.

(II, 280)

Sir Richard Blackmore's A Satyr against Wit (1700) also anticipates the frequent appearance of a humorous tone in Pope's Essay. Blackmore is concerned with exposing false wit, or the abuse of true wit. The characteristics and effects of false wit, many of which appear in literature, are lewdness and vice, affected dress, contempt for learning and religion, the lack of common sense, the writing of scurrilous lampoons, and the dissipation of the arts and higher education (III, 325-28). Blackmore's strictures against false wit are often delivered in a
humorous manner. For example, he likens false wit to a disease with which every coxcomb in town is actively trying to become infected:

\begin{verbatim}
Craper runs madly midst the sickest Crowd,
And fain would be infected, if he cou'd.
Under the Means he lies, frequents the Stage,
Is very leud, and does at Learning rage.
Pity that so much Labour should be lost
By such a healthful Constitution crost.
\end{verbatim}

(III, 326)

Butler and Blackmore, then, do anticipate Pope by often employing a humorous method of presenting their precepts and examples.

No other piece of English neoclassical poetical criticism except, as we shall see, Granville's Essay, exhibits the fluid movement between precept and example and from one topic to the next which is characteristic of An Essay on Criticism. Most writers follow a rigid precept-to-example formula that lends the atmosphere of the lecture hall to their poems. Mulgrave, for instance, delivers his advice on the proper use of soliloquy in the following manner:

\begin{verbatim}
First then, Soliloquies had need be few,
Extreamly short, and spoke in passion too.
Our Lovers talking to themselves, for want
Of others, make the Pit their Confidant;
Nor is the matter mended much, if thus
\end{verbatim}
They trust a friend only to tell it us. They occasion should as naturally fall, As when Bellario confesses all. (II, 291)

All of Mulgrave's statement is precept except the last two lines, where an example creeps in by way of an allusion to Philaster. One does not feel that Mulgrave is moving easily or conversationally through his argument, but rather that he is formally stating a precept, supporting it with an appropriate example, and then passing to the next sequence of precept-example.

Several of Pope's predecessors attempted, usually unsuccessfully, to promote a more conversational, less formal effect by manipulating the arrangement or relationship of precept and example. One of the hazards of trying to achieve a fluid structure without establishing a correspondingly smooth progression in one's argument is revealed by the following passage in Blackmore's A Satyr against Wit:

Those who by Satyr would reform the Town Should have some little Merit of their own, And not be Rakes themselves below Lampoon. For all their Libels Panegyrick's are, They're still read backward like a Witch's Pray'r. Elliot?t's Reproof's who does not make his Sport? Who'll e'er repent that S[malwoo]d does exhort? Therefore let Satyr-Writers be suppress, Or be reform'd by cautious D[or]set's Test.
Blackmore begins by warning satirists that they must themselves be moral if they hope to make any headway in correcting the morals of others. He then provides the example of two satirists who are so base that their very libels of others are taken as certain indications of virtue in the persons lampooned. Next Blackmore says "Therefore let Satyr-Writers be supprest," since most of them lack the judgment necessary to insure that they will attack only those who are deserving of ridicule or censure. The problem with this passage resides in the fact that the lines following "Therefore" lack the implied connection with the lines preceding it. In his comments preceding the word "Therefore," Blackmore has offered no evidence to support his imperative that "Satyr-Writers" must be suppressed. Yet "Therefore" suggests that Blackmore's judgment about satirists proceeds naturally from the earlier part of the passage. The structural movement in this passage is from precept to example to new precept, with each stage of the argument presumably flowing naturally into the next. But the meaning does not accompany the structure; for in terms of meaning, the argument moves from precept to example and
then to a new precept that is totally unrelated to the example preceding it. Thus instead of achieving fluidity, Blackmore jolts the reader with a logical inconsistency that is if anything worse than the dull but logical habit of moving repeatedly from precept to example.

Samuel Cobb offers an interesting but finally unsatisfactory alternative to the rigid patterning of the movement between precept and example found in most pieces of English neoclassical poetical criticism written prior to Pope’s Essay. In Of Poetry (1707) Cobb eliminates the direct presentation of precepts and excludes examples altogether. His work is a critical history of poetry, and one must infer his precepts from the judgments he makes about various authors. In discussing Oldham, for example, he states:

His careless Lines plain Nature’s Rules obey,  
Like Satyrs Rough, but not Deform’d as they.  
His Sense undrest, like Adam, free from Blame,  
Without his Cloathing, and without his Shame.  
True Wit requires no Ornaments of skill,  
A Beauty naked, is a Beauty still.²³

The implied precept here is that ingenuous geniuses are not to be utterly condemned for their failure to follow the rules of correct writing. No example of what Cobb means by "careless Lines," "Rough," or "Sense undrest" is given.
What emerges, of course, when this same procedure is followed in Cobb's treatment of every poet included, is a series of unsupported generalizations which makes for rather uninformative criticism.

Roscommon was the only writer prior to Pope except Granville to employ even a slightly successful variation of the precept-to-example pattern. In An Essay on Translated Verse, Roscommon occasionally makes use of the relatively simple device of inverting the usual order of precept and example. He begins one passage, for example, by stating that such poets as Horace and Virgil were wise enough to confine their literary activities to areas in which they were talented. He then goes on to advise translators to do the same, and to select a poet for translation whose temperament and interests are similar to their own (II, 299-300). Roscommon's technique does not approach the complex interrelationships of precepts and examples that one finds in Pope's Essay. But by occasionally beginning a paragraph with an example and moving from example to precept, Roscommon does achieve a somewhat more conversational tone than most other English poetical critics of the Restoration and early eighteenth century, since the technique allows him to avoid introducing
each paragraph of his work with a command.

None of Pope's English predecessors except Granville, then, discovers more than the hint of a solution to the problem of rigid precept-to-example patterning that besets writers of poetical criticism. I do not mean to suggest that every writer in this sub-genre was aware of the problem. Such authors as Mulgrave and Wesley may well have noted this patterning in their poems without being at all disturbed by it. But I do believe that the failure of these writers to employ a workable alternative method of arranging their presentation of precepts and examples, a method that would have allowed for less rigidity and more fluidity, and thus for less haranguing and more conversing, has been partially responsible for the almost total eclipse of their works by An Essay on Criticism.

Granville was also, as we shall see, the only English neoclassical poetical critic to anticipate Pope's achievement of a fluid movement from one topic to the next in An Essay on Criticism. Fenner has noted that writers of verse essays in criticism have always been hard pressed for effective methods of making transitions among different paragraphs. The subject of one passage may be essentially unrelated to that of the next, he says, since
there is no inherent continuity among the various issues that a poetical critic is likely to treat. Fenner states further:

In this difficulty poets very often seized upon two simple formal patterns which had been in vogue for critical treatises throughout classical and medieval times: a history, usually of poetry, and a catalogue, usually of tropes or literary genres. Each of these supplied a frame on which the poet could hang a great load of precept and observation, with an obvious—if somewhat artificial—show of continuity and structure.

(pp. 227-28)

Several neoclassical poetical critics employ either the catalogue or the history in working out their argument. None of those who do, however, is able to effect fluid transitions from one topic to the next. In An Essay upon Poetry, Mulgrave, who presents a catalogue of literary genres, is often annoyingly obvious in making his transitions between genres. For example, after he has concluded his discussion of satire, he says before moving on to deal with drama:

Here rest, my Muse, suspend thy cares awhile,  
A greater Enterprize attends thy toil.  
(II, 290)

When Mulgrave is ready to begin his treatment of epic, he
states:

By painfull steps we are at last got up
Pernassus hill, upon whose Airy top
The Epick Poets so divinely show,
And with just pride behold the rest below. 25

Writers besides Pope and Granville who do not employ
the catalogue or the history 26 fare no better in their
transitions between topics than those who do. Roscommon
often moves to a new subject without providing any indica-
tion that he is about to do so. 27 For example, he turns
abruptly from his injunction to translators to choose a
kindred spirit as the author whom they translate to a con-
sideration of the necessity of proper moral training of
the aspiring translator. 28 Thus each English neoclassical
poetical critic of the Restoration and early eighteenth
century except Granville and Pope failed to achieve fluid
transitions from one topic to the next, either because he
insistently called attention to the fact that a transition
was in progress or because he ignored transitions altogeth-
er. 29

We have seen, then, that most of Pope's predecessors
besides Granville who wrote poetical criticism in England
during the Restoration and early eighteenth century failed
to anticipate Pope's use in An Essay on Criticism of humor
and fluidity. A few poems, such as Butler's and Blackmore's, do display a humorous tone; and Roscommon's *An Essay on Translated Verse* contains some traces of fluidity. But in no work except Granville's and Pope's do both of the qualities exist together.

In turning to an examination of elements promoting continuity in the poetical essays in criticism of Pope's English predecessors, one finds that surprisingly few of them exhibit thematic unity and that almost none of them display Pope's kind of lexical repetition or the recurrent use of technical devices. Such works as Cowley's "Of Wit" and Butler's "Upon Critics," which are brief and limited to one subject, pose no problems regarding their thematic unity. Granville's own *Essay*, in fact, is similar to these works in its brevity and its somewhat narrow scope, although I hope to show later that Granville's argument contains enough stages to allow for a more complex thematic unity than one finds in Cowley or Butler. Samuel Cobb's *Of Poetry*, which is comparable in length to Pope's *Essay*, is also generally consistent in its thematic development, as Cobb seldom strays from his announced purpose of presenting a history of poetry. The poetical essays in criticism of Mulgrave, Roscommon, and Samuel Wesley, on the other hand, do contain actual or
apparent lapses in thematic consistency. Although Mulgrave's Essay is thematically unified, his treatment of drama, the fifth item in his catalogue of poetic genres, is so disproportionately long that when he at last moves on to the next topic one is startled. Mulgrave's discussion of drama, including his introduction to the subject, takes up approximately one-half of the poem, and thus adversely affects the apparent unity of the work. 

Roscommon's An Essay on Translated Verse lacks thematic unity. Roscommon interrupts his precepts to translators with an anecdote about a quack that has only the thinnest and most unconvincing of connections with the rest of the work. And his concluding section, in which he urges modern English writers to return to blank verse as one means of fostering a poetical renaissance (II, 308-309), seems to be aimed more at original poets than at translators. Samuel Wesley's An Epistle to a Friend Concerning Poetry is also thematically fragmented. Wesley's avowed intention is to teach his friend "how to gain a Poet's sacred Name." Midway through the poem, though, he seems to lose sight of his purpose, as he embarks on a digression of almost two hundred lines (II. 579-762) in which he considers the merits and faults of several modern poets. His "friend" is completely forgotten
Every poem discussed in this chapter displays some type of lexical repetition, although only Granville's anticipates the use of key words found in Pope's Essay. The repetition of key words by all of Pope's English predecessors except Granville is usually unaccompanied by shifts in the connotations of those words. Mulgrave, for example, employs the word "wit" quite frequently in An Essay upon Poetry, but almost every time the word appears it refers either to skilled and sensible writing or to intelligence in the poet.35 "Wit" is also a key word in Blackmore's A Satyr against Wit, but there again the word is confined to two sets of connotations. Throughout most of the poem, Blackmore argues that wit is a moral disease which fosters the corruption of learning, religion, and manners. "Wits," he implies, are those infected with that disease. Finally, though, Blackmore indicates that he has been referring to false wit and false wits all alone; and he proceeds to state that true wit, as it is promoted by true wits, is directly opposite in its nature and effects to the false wit he has been discussing.36

"Wit" is not, of course, the only possible key word in a piece of poetical criticism. Wesley repeats "Wit" several...
times, but just as often he employs such words as "truth," "judgment," "nature," and "reason." Roscommon, who conceives of great poetry and brilliant poets as being divinely inspired, repeats many words with religious significance, such as "deity," "God," and "sacred." Samuel Cobb, who also has an elevated conception of the worth of poetry, uses "king" and "majestic" many times in connection with poets. Finally, Samuel Butler employs and repeats a great many legal terms throughout his argument that "An English Poet should be tryd b' his Peres." In none of these poems, however, does the meaning of a key word change with the word's repetition. The repetition itself does provide a certain sense of continuity to the poems. But the difference between these poems and the works by Granville and Pope resides in the fact that here the continuity derived from lexical repetition is strictly verbal. In other words, the sense of continuity stems simply from the repetition of one or more important words, not from what shifting connotations of those words might tell us about the relationship among various stages of the poem's argument. Pope's "wit," and, as I hope to prove later, Granville's "flights," do act as indexes to the developing argument and thus help afford to Pope's Essay and
Granville's work a complex lexical continuity, one which involves both the repetition of an important word and the indication of progression in each poem's argument.

A number of Pope's predecessors besides Granville at least partially anticipate his achievement of technical continuity through the repeated use of certain technical devices. I am, of course, concerned here only with the devices which I have noted in Pope's Essay—the use of antithetical imagery and the recurrent juxtaposition of unlike passages. Antithetical images abound in the poems of Cowley, Mulgrave, Roscommon, Blackmore, Wesley, and Cobb. Some of these poets, such as Wesley and Cobb, rely on antithetical images more heavily than others, but all of them include a substantial number of such images in their verse essays in criticism. On the other hand, the juxtaposition of passages exemplifying "wit" with those illustrating "judgment" occurs only in Granville's Essay. The other works present no discernible variation in the amount of imaginative concepts and figurative language appearing in different passages. Roscommon, for example, employs five figures in a paragraph of thirty-five lines where he is giving sober advice to translators about their use of language and verse (II, 303-304). In the next
paragraph, where he delivers an almost humorous anecdote of thirty-two lines about "A Quack, too scandalously mean to Name" (II, 304-305), he uses only six pieces of figurative language. Thus while the different topics of the two passages might suggest that the language of "judgment" could be used in one (to give sober advice) and the language of "wit" in the other (to ridicule a quack), no such shift in style is observable.

None of Pope's predecessors discussed above, then, anticipated his combination in An Essay on Criticism of a witty, conversational tone with an undercurrent of continuity. Several of these poets employed one or more of the devices and approaches that Pope was later to use to such advantage, but none of them produced a work with the overall mixture of liveliness and control so noticeable in Pope's Essay. Only Granville, as I now hope to prove, anticipated Pope in that interaction of humor, fluidity, and continuity which helped make An Essay on Criticism the great poem it is.

The humor in Granville's Essay Upon unnatural Flights in Poetry, like that in Pope's Essay, does not appear everywhere but is in operation frequently enough to influence...
the poem's general tone. Granville most often employs humor as a means of exemplifying an "unnatural flight."

For example, when he wishes to illustrate the abuse of figurative language in any given genre of poetry, he translates a passage from whatever foreign poet he thinks is guilty of the most outlandish violation of artistic standards in that genre. Corneille is Granville's victim during his discussion of love poetry:

```
Beauty's the Theme; some Nymph divinely fair
Excites the Muse: Let Truth be even there:
As Painters flatter, so may Poets too,
But to Resemblance must be ever true.
"The Day that she was born, the Cyprian Queen
  Had like t'have dy'd thro' Envy and thro' Spleen;
"The Graces in a hurry left the Skies
  To have the Honour to attend her Eyes;
"And Love, despairing in her Heart a Place,
  Would needs take up his Lodging in her Face.
Tho' wrote by great Corneille, such Lines as these,
Such civil Nonsense sure could never please."31
```

Besides choosing an effectively ridiculous example, Granville makes certain that the lines will sound as ludicrous as possible by employing such amusingly colloquial expressions as "Had like 't'have dy'd" and "Would needs take up his Lodging" to describe the actions of graces and gods. The humor in this passage and others like it radiates throughout the entire work and helps Granville achieve the
same witty, conversational tone that we have seen in Pope's Essay. 42

Another factor which contributes to the conversational tone of Granville's Essay, as it does to Pope's, is a fluid movement between precept and example. The following passage exhibits something of the fluidity in Granville's poem:

Thus Poetry has ample Space to soar,
Nor needs forbidden Regions to explore:
Such Vaunts as his, who can with Patience read,
Who thus describes his Hero slain and dead:
"Kill'd as he was, insensible of Death,
"He still fights on, and scorns to yield his Breath.
"The noisy Culverin o'ercharg'd, lets fly,
"And burst unaiming in the rended Sky:
Such frantick Flights are like a Mad-man's Dream,
And Nature suffers in the wild Extreme.
The captive Canibal weigh'd down with Chains,
Yet braves his Foes, reviles, provokes, disdains,
Of Nature fierce, untameable, and proud,
He grins Defiance at the gaping Crowd,
And spent at last, and speechless as he lies,
With Looks still threatening, mocks their Rage, and dies.
This is the utmost Stretch that Nature can,
And all beyond is fulsom, false, and vain.
(I, 119-120)

Granville moves here from the precept regarding hyperbole to an example of undue exaggeration. Then without offering a new precept, he turns at once to an illustration of the proper use of hyperbole, which brings him back to a restatement, in the final two lines, of his original
precept. Thus the movement is from precept-1 to example-1 to example-2 and finally back to precept-1. This fluidity contributes to the conversational tone of Granville's Essay, as it allows him to proceed in such a manner that each section of his paragraphs seems to suggest the next. When the passage above is viewed in terms of its conversational effect, one sees that after Granville delivers some general maxims regarding the application of hyperbole, he then exemplifies the abuse of the device. The example of the misuse of hyperbole flows naturally into another example by means of which Granville indicates the proper application of hyperbole. Satisfied with his examples, he briefly restates the precept that has given rise to them. The fluidity between precept and example in Granville's Essay, by allowing him to escape the rigid precept-to-example patterning, helps place him in the drawing room with Pope instead of in the lecture hall with most of Pope's other English predecessors.

Granville also anticipates Pope in effecting a fluid movement from one topic to the next. For example, Granville begins the Essay by stating that the poet must always try to achieve truth to nature in his works (I, 117-118). Anything that appears false, Granville says, will fail to interest the
poet's audience. At this point (I, 118) Granville represents one of his listeners as interrupting him with the following objection:

"But Poetry in Fiction takes delight, "And mounting in bold Figures out of sight, "Leaves Truth behind, in her audacious Flight: "Fables and Metaphors that always lye, "And rash Hyperboles that soar so high, "And every Ornament of Verse must die.

This passage is directly related to the paragraph preceding it, in which Granville has been discussing truth in poetry. The speaker here argues that fiction is essential to poetry, and he gives Granville occasion to explain in the paragraph following this one (I, 118) that the use of fiction is quite acceptable as long as the fiction resembles truth. Moreover, the speaker's mention in this passage of fables, metaphors, and hyperboles leads Granville to discuss, in the following paragraphs (I, 118-119), the proper use of these three elements in poetry. Thus the lines quoted above represent a smooth, fluid transition from a general discussion of the necessity for truth in poetry to a specific application of that doctrine to the use of fables, metaphors, and hyperboles.
Granville, then, anticipates Pope in the employment of a humorous tone and a fluid movement both between precept and example and from one topic to the next. These elements help promote a witty, conversational atmosphere which allows poetical criticism to afford delight as well as instruction. Granville also employs the same devices that Pope later uses to effect an undercurrent of continuity—thematic unity, lexical repetition, and the recurrent use of antithetical imagery and the juxtaposition of unlike passages.

Arthur Fenner, Jr. has commented on the thematic unity in Granville's Essay. He says that "Lansdowne's catalogue of the three 'parts' of poetry where extravagance is to be avoided—metaphors, hyperboles, and fables—and his little history of the improvement of poetry in this regard, comprise all of his poem except the general introduction and the conclusion (p. 229). I think that Fenner's statement, while it does indicate one important component of the unity in Granville's Essay, fails to do justice to the complexity of the poem's unity. It is true that Granville begins with a general introduction in which he warns against extravagant language and sentiments which may destroy a poem's truth to nature (I, 117-118). Then, as Fenner says,
he goes on to apply the doctrine of truth to nature to three procedures in which truth is often distorted—the use of fable, metaphor, and hyperbole (I, 118-119). After that, however, Granville successively examines deviations from truth in heroic poetry (I, 119-120), love poetry (I, 120-121), poetry dealing with religion (I, 121-122), and drama (I, 122). In other words, his emphasis shifts from a discussion of the proper application of specific techniques or procedures to a treatment of the suitable restraint on figurative language in several different genres of poetry. He then ends the poem with a general conclusion (I, 122-123) which includes the "little history of the improvement of poetry" noted by Fenner. Granville's Essay, then, develops unity by moving from a general introductory precept to a specific application of that precept, first to the use of technical devices and then to the language of several different kinds of poetry.

In regard to lexical repetition, Granville's use of "flight" corresponds to that of "wit" in Pope's Essay. The connotations of each word consistently change with the developing argument of the poem in which the word frequently appears. The first appearance of "flight" in Granville's Essay is during the passage quoted above in which one of
Granville's listeners is represented as objecting to Granville's insistence on truth in poetry:

"But Poetry in Fiction takes delight,
"And mounting in bold Figures out of sight,
"Leaves Truth behind, in her audacious Flight."

The speaker here is laboring under what Granville regards as the mistaken assumption that poetry, in its "audacious Flight," must not be encumbered by any kind of truth. Granville's auditor believes that a reliance on truth by an author hampers his poetical imagination by suppressing the "bold Figures" that it produces. "Flight," then, as the speaker employs it here, refers to the poetical imagination operating independently of fact.

Two paragraphs later, when Granville is explaining his auditor's error, he states the following:

Hyperboles, so daring and so bold,
Disdaining Bounds, are yet by Rules control'd;
Above the Clouds, but still within our Sight,
They mount with Truth, and make a tow'ring Flight.

(I, 119)

Granville agrees with his auditor that a poetical flight is indeed splendid. But he argues that a true "Flight," instead of being the unbridled action of the poetical imagination,
is actually the product of the combined operation of truth and the creations of fiction. Even the imagery of the two passages reinforces the shift in meaning. The auditor has said that the "bold Figures" of poetry soar "out of sight," while Granville states that fictional devices that are properly controlled produce poetical flights which remain "still within our Sight." Granville, then, is correcting his listener's error by pointing out that truth combined with fiction produces the genuine poetical "Flight."

The next appearance of the word "flight" occurs just after Granville has finished giving an example of the extravagant use of hyperbole:

"Kill'd as he was, insensible of Death, "He still fights on, and scorns to yield his Breath. "The noisy Culverin o'ercharg'd, lets fly, "And burst unaiming in the rended Sky: Such frantick Flights are like a Mad-man's Dream, And Nature suffers in the wild Extreme. (I, 119-120)

Here Granville is using "Flights" with much the same denotation that his auditor attaches to it in its first appearance in the poem—the poetical imagination operating independently of fact. The connotations, however, are radically altered. Granville seems to be pointing out what really happens when poetry "Leaves Truth behind, in her audacious Flight." The
"Flights" to which Granville refers here are the "unnatural flights" mentioned in the title of the poem. Flights not tempered by truth, he says, are nonsensical and ineffective.

Another use of the word appears near the end of the poem:

First Mulgrave rose, Roscommon next, like Light,  
To clear our Darkness, and to guide our Flight.  
(I, 122)

Once again we find that the meaning of "Flight" is different from any other that we have seen attached to it in the poem. Here Granville is arguing that Mulgrave and Roscommon are the lawgivers to English poets, and that one needs only to follow their rules if one wishes to avoid extremes in poetry. "Flight" now has a much more general meaning than it had earlier in the poem. Since Mulgrave and Roscommon, in An Essay upon Poetry and An Essay on Translated Verse, laid down many general rules regarding correct poetical composition, Granville's use of "Flight" in connection with these poets would seem to refer simply to the writing of poetry. Thus Granville's repetition of "flight," like Pope's recurrent use of "wit," affords his Essay a complex lexical continuity which involves both the repetition of an
important word and the indication of progress in the poem's argument.

In turning to Granville's use of technical devices to promote an undertone of continuity in his Essay, one finds that he anticipates Pope's use of antithetical imagery as well as his practice of frequently juxtaposing unlike passages. Granville's Essay begins with a lengthy antithetical image which involves a comparison of poetry and painting. Granville states that just as a painter may receive praise for producing a "Just Resemblance" of his subject, so a poet, whose task is "To copy out Ideas in the Mind," is applauded for presenting an equally just resemblance of his own subject (I, 117-118). But, Granville continues, if either poet or painter lets his imagination run wild, forgets to keep an eye to his model, and produces "Gigantick Forms" and "monstrous Births" (I, 118), then he deserves nothing but disdain. Other antithetical images appear throughout every stage of Granville's argument. For example, he says that a poet's attempt to magnify one of his characters often results in his erroneously presenting the character in such a manner as to make him seem unnatural in his superiority to other men. Such a distortion, Granville
states, may actually destroy the character while a solid
treatment of the character based firmly on the principle of
truth to nature will always serve the poet's purpose (I,
121-122). Granville stresses his point by employing the
antithetical image of castles built in the air and castles
built on a rock. An unrealistic presentation of a
character, like a castle constructed in the air by magic,
does not hold up under close scrutiny; both "vanish at
Approach" (I, 121). Characterization based on truth, though,
like a castle built upon a rock, "shall for Ages stand"
(I, 122).

Granville's procedural method almost dictates that he
repeatedly juxtapose a passage exemplifying "wit" with one
illustrating "judgment." As I have already stated, several
times during the Essay Granville translates a passage from
a foreign author which he thinks affords a ludicrous example
of the abuse of figurative language. After presenting the
translation, Granville then either offers a contrasting
example written by himself or alludes to another author who
he thinks has been able to handle figurative language skill-
fully. The latter passage in each instance exhibits those
qualities of restraint usually associated with "judgment,"
while the former displays the free reign of the imagination typical of unbridled "wit." One sees this process in operation in Granville's treatment of love poetry:

Beauty's the Theme; some Nymph divinely fair
Excites the Muse: Let Truth be even there:
As Painters flatter, so may Poets too,
But to Resemblance must be ever true.
"The Day that she was born, the Cyprian Queen
"Had like t'have dy'd thro' Envy and thro' Spleen;
"The Graces in a hurry left the Skies
"To have the Honour to attend her Eyes;
"And Love, despairing in her Heart a Place,
"Would needs take up his Lodging in her Face.
Tho' wrote by great Corneille, such Lines as these,
Such civil Nonsense sure could never please.
Waller, the best of all th'inspir'd Train,
To melt the Fair, instructs the dying Swain.
(I, 120-121)

The last four lines of this passage, which contain no developed instance of figurative language but which are instead comprised almost totally of statement, act as a corrective on the quoted lines preceding them. The last lines, that is, which are somewhat analytical and restrained, may be said to represent "judgment" while the quoted lines illustrate runaway "wit." Granville's technique is not exactly the same as Pope's, since Pope's passages exemplifying "wit" seldom contain abuses of wit but are, on the contrary, often among the finest sections in his poem. But Granville does frequently juxtapose unlike passages, one of
which illustrates "wit" and the other "judgment," and he is the only one of Pope's English predecessors who wrote neoclassical poetical criticism to do so.

I have now shown that Granville anticipated Pope in the use of all the devices and approaches that conduce to the combination of a witty, conversational tone with an undercurrent of continuity in An Essay on Criticism. I shall now attempt to demonstrate the simultaneous action of all these elements in a passage that I have quoted before from Granville's Essay Upon unnatural Flights in Poetry:

Thus Poetry has ample Space to soar,
Nor needs forbidden Regions to explore:
Such Vaunts as his, who can with Patience read,
Who thus describes his Hero slain and dead:
"Kill'd as he was, insensible of Death,
"He still fights on, and scorns to yield his Breath,
"The noisy Culverin o'ercharg'd, lets fly,
"And burst unaiming in the rended Sky:
Such frantick Flights are like a Mad-man's Dream,
And Nature suffers in the wild Extreme.
The captive Canibal weigh'd down with Chains,
Yet braves his Foes, reviles, provokes, disdains,
Of Nature fierce, untameable, and proud,
He grins Defiance at the gaping Croud,
And spent at last, and speechless as he lies,
With Looks still threatening, mocks their Rage, and dies.
This is the utmost Stretch that Nature can,
And all beyond is fulsom, false, and vain.
(I, 119-120)

In considering the devices in this passage which promote a
witty, conversational tone, one notices that humor is afforded both by the translation itself and by Granville's statement that "Such frantick Flights are like a Mad-man's Dream." I have already discussed the fluid movement between precept and example that occurs here. The paragraph also represents part of a fluid movement from one topic to another. Granville has just been treating the specific ways in which poets often erroneously desert the presentation of truth—through the misapplication of fable and the abuse of metaphor and hyperbole (I, 118-119). He will next consider the proper use of figurative language in four different kinds of poetry (I, 120-122). The transitional nature of the passage quoted above consists in the fact that it both exemplifies the abuses of hyperbole (and thus relates back to the passage preceding it) and examines the proper use of figurative language in heroic poetry, the first of the four genres that Granville is to discuss. The transition is smooth, almost unnoticeable, and yet effective. As such it resembles many of the transitions afforded by paragraphs in Pope's Essay.

Devices which promote continuity are also active in the passage cited above. The paragraph is thematically related
to the rest of the work, since it applies the doctrine of truth to nature to heroic poetry, one of the four genres that Granville treats in the poem. One instance of the lexical repetition that runs throughout the poem also occurs in the passage, as "Flights" appears with a meaning tailored to fit the argument of the paragraph. No instance of antithetical imagery occurs except in the quote, but the paragraph does contain what is perhaps the poem's finest example of the juxtaposition of unlike passages. Granville's corrective example involving the "captive Canibal" is clearly meant to exemplify "wit" tempered with "judgment," while the lines Granville translates are obviously intended to represent "One glaring Chaos and wild Heap of Wit."47

Thematic unity, lexical repetition, and the recurrent use of antithetical imagery and the juxtaposition of unlike passages act in this passage and in all of Granville's poem as they do in Pope's Essay. The thematically unified whole, the frequent repetition of the key word "flight" with its connotations altered to suit the argument at each point where it appears, and the repeated occurrence throughout the poem of the same technical devices, work to relate each stage of the poem's argument to those that precede and
follow it. When "flight" appears in a new context with different connotations, one remembers the meanings that the word has had at other points in the argument. And when antithetical imagery is used to work out part of a new stage of the poem's argument, one also remembers when the same device was employed to develop another stage. The resulting undercurrent of continuity strikes a balance with the lighter, less continuous or predictable elements of humor and fluidity that appear in the poem.

In the passage quoted above, then, Granville combines humor and fluidity with an undercurrent of devices that promote continuity. This combination operates in the paragraph to produce a witty, conversational atmosphere and at the same time to insure that the argument of the passage will be linked with the stages in the poem's argument that precede and follow it.

Granville was the only one of Pope's English predecessors who wrote neoclassical poetical criticism to effect the same simultaneous operation of humor, fluidity, and continuity, and thus of delight and control, that is so noticeable in An Essay on Criticism. I cannot prove that Pope's Essay was in any way influenced by Granville's Essay Upon unnatural Flights in Poetry. Still it is arresting to note that
Granville did anticipate Pope to such a great extent in the very combination of elements that seems to contribute so largely to the distinctive edge in popularity that Pope's Essay holds over all other pieces of English poetical criticism. One can at least claim that Granville's Essay deserves to be reevaluated in light of its striking similarities with the most highly respected poetical essay in criticism ever written in the English language.
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CONCLUSION

The quality of Granville's literary achievement is, I think, considerably higher than his critics have thus far judged it to be. No matter what genre or sub-genre Granville tried his hand at, he always succeeded, in some cases with distinction. His revision of The Merchant of Venice was one of the most popular adaptations of a Shakespearian comedy written during the entire Restoration and eighteenth century, and I have argued that the play's popularity stemmed in part from Granville's constructing the work with a definite artistic goal in mind. His political poems, few in number though they were, are certainly admirable in their complex and persuasive fusion of praise and admonition. Granville's love poetry reveals not only his acute perception of Waller's new type of lyric, but also his anticipation of the later direction taken by writers of the ambiguous lyric. Finally, Granville's Essay Upon unnatural Flights in Poetry is, in my considered opinion, far and away the finest piece of English neoclassical poetical criticism written prior to Pope's An Essay on Criticism. Granville's brilliant anticipation of Pope in the combination of a witty, conversational tone with a solid undercurrent of
continuity merits great admiration.

If this study accomplishes its purpose, perhaps we shall soon see the elimination of a few disturbing problems relating to Granville. At present no easily obtainable edition of his works exists. I believe that this dissertation has proved his writings to be of enough importance to warrant their being made available to all students of eighteenth-century literature. Furthermore, I think that one could assert without being either snide or unduly harsh that the greater part of all criticism thus far addressed to Granville's works has been superficial. Too many writers seem to assume that Granville's poetry is not worth intensive study because it has never been studied intensively. And one fears that the same sort of critical laxity has been responsible for the unquestioning perpetuation of the adverse judgment of Granville's Shakespearian adaptation. If this study of Granville's writings does nothing besides foster a more careful examination of them by students who, for one reason or another, find themselves obligated to evaluate Granville's achievements, then it will have accomplished its objective.
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