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CHAPTER I

The Background:
The Contemporary Reception of Pompey the Little;
Coventry’s Life and Minor Works;
Pompey’s Literary Heritage

On February 12, 1751, the Daily Advertiser carried a notice of the publication of The History of Pompey the Little; or, the Life and Adventures of a Lap-dog. \footnote{The notice reads: This Day is publish'd, In one neat Pocket Volume, Price 3s. bound, adorn'd with a Portrait of the Hero, The History of Pompey the Little; or, The Life and Adventures of a Lap-Dog Printed for M. Cooper, in Pater-noster-Row. Viewed on film from the University of Chicago Library.} Published anonymously, the novel was the work of Francis Coventry, a clergyman who was also at the time a student at Magdalene College, Cambridge. Pompey was well-received. In 1751 alone, there were three editions. Horace Walpole thought enough of the work to inquire of Thomas Gray concerning its authorship. Gray responded that "Pompey is the hasty production of Mr Coventry (cousin of him you knew), a young clergyman: I found it out by three characters, which once made a part of a comedy that he showed me of his writing." \footnote{Letter of 3 March, 1751, in Horace Walpole's Correspondence, ed. W. S. Lewis (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948), XIV, 48. The cousin referred to is Henry Coventry, a friend of Gray at Cambridge and author of Philemon to Hydaspes for which Francis Coventry wrote an introduction in 1753.} Further, John Nichols' Literary Anecdotes records part of a letter from William Boyers
to Philip Morant, an antiquarian, which reads: "You do me much honour in ascribing 'Pompey the Little' to me. I am obliged to you; and shall be glad never to be suspected of a worse."3

Mr. Boyers was not the only contemporary openly to admit enjoying Pompey, nor was Mr. Morant the only one to attribute the work incorrectly. In a post-script to a letter of May 1, 1751, Lady Henrietta Luxborough mentioned the novel, which she had evidently enjoyed greatly, to the then ailing William Shenstone: "I fancy Pompey the Little may have served to amuse your sick-chamber!"4 In a later letter (May 27, 1751), she again writes Shenstone, who had not read the book and had obviously requested it of her, that "I would send you Pompey the Little, if I had it; but the Gentleman who lent it me, borrowed it of another Gentleman, to whom it was to be returned on a day named. It is entertaining enough for such a trifle. Fielding, you know, cannot write without humor."5

One Lady Bradshaigh also enjoyed the novel. In a letter to Samuel Richardson early in 1752 she wrote: "I was late desired, by a friend, to read the small volume, called Pompey the Little, and I began it without hoping for much entertainment, but was agreeably surprised; for, in my humble opinion, it is both well designed and well executed."6

3 (London: Nichols, Son, and Bentley, 1812), II, 202-203.
4 Letters written by the Late Right Honourable Lady Luxborough to William Shenstone, Esq. (London: J. Dodsley, 1775), p. 260. Lady Luxborough was Henrietta Knight, half-sister to Henry St. John, Lord Bolingbroke.
5 Ibid., p. 265.
6 The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson, ed. Anna L. Barbauld (London: R. Philips, 1804), VI, 159.
Cleland, whose Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure was ironically to be satirized in an addition to a later edition of Pompey (that of 1752), was more expansive in his praise. In a notice for the Monthly Review, he wrote:

There are, to the great disgust of the public, too many productions of the press, beneath giving a character of: This one is, however, so far of a different kind, that it is not easy to do justice to the merit of it. The author, whose name is not to the work, takes for his subject, a Bologna lap-dog, brought from Italy to England, where he often changes masters, by several accidents, which furnish the writer with a handle to introduce a variety of characters and situations; all painted with great humour, fancy, and wit: and, indeed, he every where displays a perfect knowledge of the world, through all its ranks, and all its follies. These he ridicules, with a fineness of edge, unknown to the sour satyrist, or the recluse philosopher. Even his negligences are pleasing. The gentleman, in short, breathes throughout the whole performance, and the vein of pleasantry, which runs through it, is everywhere upheld, from the beginning to the end. He laughs at the world, without doing it the honour to be angry with it. His lashes, however smart, carry with them rather the marks of a benevolent correction, than of the spleen of misanthropy. All his characters are natural. His language easy and genteel.

Mrs. Delany seems to be the only contemporary who went on record as being unimpressed. Writing to a Mrs. Dewes in March of 1751, she said of Pompey: "On the whole it is but an indifferent performance, has some strokes of wit and humor, but mostly trite, dull characters." Like Cleland, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu would have disagreed. In a

7 Vol. IV, 316-17 (February, 1751). Quoted by William Scott in "Francis Coventry's 'Pompey the Little,' 1751 and 1752," Notes and Queries, CCXIII (1968), 215-16, who gives a rather full history of Pompey's contemporary reputation.

letter of thanks to Lady Bute, her daughter, for a box of books recently received, she wrote that after reading *Peregrine Pickle* and *The History of Charlotte Summers*, the Fortunate Parish Girl,

Candles came, and my Eyes grown weary I took up the next Book merely because I suppos'd from the Title it would not engage me long. It was *Pompey the Little*, which has really [sic] diverted me more than any of the others, and it was impossible to go to Bed till it was finish'd. It is a real and exact representation of Life as it is now acted in London, as it was in my time, and as it will be (I do not doubt) a Hundred years hence, with some little variation of Dress, and perhaps Government. I found there many of my Acquaintance, Lady T[ownshend] and Lady O[rford] are so well painted, I fancy'd I heard them talk, and I have heard them say the very things there repeated. I also saw myselfe (as I now am) in the character of Mrs. Qualmsick.

So popular did *Pompey* prove that a fourth edition was called for in 1752 and a fifth in 1753. To these two editions Coventry added a dedication to Henry Fielding, which includes a defense of novel-writing and which closes on this conventional but telling note of humility: "As to the following little piece, sir, it pretends to a very small degree of merit. 'Tis the first essay of a young author, and perhaps may be the last. A very hasty and unfinished edition of it was published last winter, which meeting with a more favourable reception than its writer had any reason to expect, he has since been

---


10. According to the title pages of these editions, they are the third and fourth respectively. But since the third edition, which bears no edition number on its title page, is in fact a complete resetting of the novel, these are actually the fourth and fifth editions.

A French translation by M. Toussent also appeared in 1752.
tempted to revise and improve it, in hopes of rendering it a little more worthy of his readers regard."

And "revise and improve" Pompey he had. Indeed, in many respects, the editions of 1752 and 1753 are quite different from those preceding them. The novel is still the picaresque story of a lap dog from his birth in Bologna on May 25, 1735, to his death on June 2, 1749, after a violent attack of "pthisic" and a week's illness. It is still an essentially good-natured but deft satire in the manner of Fielding against the folly, pride, pretension, and hypocrisy of Pompey's numerous owners and of contemporary fashion and institutions. But Coventry added and elaborated on a number of satiric portraits while deleting others. He also added and deleted episodes and satiric targets. While some of the changes and omissions are lamentable because they make the book less entertaining, Coventry's efforts to tighten the novel's structure and improve its narrative and dramatic technique through revision, though not always successful, are evidence that he was learning his craft. They also suggest that had the "ingenious" Mr. Coventry (as Nichols refers to him) lived longer, he might have written some novels which surpassed his delightful first attempt sufficiently to become first-rate pieces of prose fiction on a par with those of Fielding and Smollett.

My purpose here is not to conjecture on the basis of slim evidence about the possible triumphs of a man who must remain a minor eighteenth-

\[11\] (1752), xi-xii.

\[12\] Literary Anecdotes, II, 203.
century novelist and fledgling man of letters. Rather, in the chapters which follow, I shall concentrate on the eminently readable, however flawed, novel that he left. In the remainder of this chapter I shall, after presenting a brief life of Coventry, discuss Coventry's minor works in order to establish the matrix of literary conventions and values, political ideas, social values, and moral concerns within which Coventry was working. I then turn to Pompey itself and describe the various fictional and novelistic elements which contribute to the making of the novel. This discussion provides a description of the eclectic nature of the novel. Finally, I take up two of these elements, Coventry's use and adaptation of the Prose Character and contemporary conventions of biography, in an attempt to fix Pompey's place in the rise of the novel.

In the chapters which make up the remainder of this dissertation, I offer, in lieu of, and in preparation for, an edition of Pompey the Little, a discussion of the printing history of the novel; I also discuss the problem of deciding on a version of the novel from which to make a modern edition. I then make a critical comparison of the five editions of the work which appeared during Coventry's lifetime. I pay particular attention to evaluating the artistic significance of the major changes which Coventry made in the last two editions of his book. The extensive changes Coventry made in the last two editions of Pompey provide an opportunity to study the evolution of a work of art by a new but growing talent at a time when the novel had just come into its own as a genre. A study of the revisions not only provides insight into Coventry's development but also offers a sharply focused
instance of how that talent was reacting to the materials and con-
ventions of a new form and their heritage in literary tradition. I
conclude my analysis of Pompey with an estimate of the aesthetic
achievement of the novel and a discussion of the imaginative vision
which unifies Coventry's episodic work.

Francis Coventry was born in 1725, the son of Thomas and Anne-
Marie Brown Coventry at Mile End in Buckinghamshire. Thomas, the
younger brother of William Coventry, fifth Earl Coventry, had been
married previously to Mary Green, who bore him two children before
her death, the eldest of whom, Thomas, a counsellor at law, became a
director of the South Sea Company and a member of Parliament for
Bridport in Dorsetshire (1762, 1768, and 1774). By his second wife,
he had, in addition to Francis, a son, George, an officer in the first
regiment of footguards, and three daughters.

13 Arthur Collins, Peerage of England, rev. Sir Egerton Brydges,
and J. A. Venn, Alumni Cantabrigienses, Part I, vol. i (Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press, 1922). I have been unable to establish
Coventry's birth date with absolute certainty. The problem is this:
Venn reports that Coventry was nineteen when he was admitted to
Magdalene College, Cambridge on December 29, 1744; thus, a birth date
of 1725 seems most likely. However, Collins says that Anne-Marie
Brown Coventry, Coventry's mother, died December 17, 1726; but she
had four children in addition to Francis, and Collins' report implies
that Francis was the first. Four children in two years or less is
highly unlikely. Only an examination of parish records can clear up
the mystery. In the meantime, I have accepted Venn and suspect either
that Francis was not the eldest or that Collins' date for the mother's
death is incorrect.


15 Ibid.
Francis attended Eton, and on December 29, 1744, at nineteen, he entered Magdalene College, Cambridge as a pensioner. He matriculated in 1745-46. In 1748 he took his B. A. as second Wrangler, and in 1752, he received his M. A. 16 While at Cambridge, he began his literary career. He not only published two, or perhaps three, editions of Pompey but also produced Penshurst, a poem which was issued anonymously in a slim quarto in 1750. And as the letter from Gray to Walpole quoted above indicates, he also wrote a comedy during his university days; however, to my knowledge, the play was never published. While at Cambridge, he was given the perpetual curacy of Edgware either by his uncle, William, fifth Earl Coventry, or by his cousin, William Henry, Sixth Earl. 17

16 Venn, Alumni Cantabrigienses, I, i; DNB; The Letters of Thomas Gray, ed. Duncan Tovey (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1900), I, 211. Generally speaking, a Wrangler is an honors graduate of Cambridge. For a discussion of the term and its relation to the tripos examinations, which were developing when Coventry graduated, see Christopher Wordsworth, Scholae Academicae: Some Accounts of the Studies at English Universities in the Eighteenth Century (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910), pp. 19-20, and Social Life at the English Universities in the Eighteenth Century (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co., 1874), pp. xxvii note 1(5), 210, and 232. It is interesting to note that in 1747-48, the year of Coventry's graduation, the names of the Wranglers were for the first time printed on the back of the tripos-verse sheets which would develop by 1824 into the Classical tripos.

17 DNB; Collins, Peerage, III, 257, gives the fifth Earl's death date as March 18, 1751; thus, he might well have conferred the curacy. But I suspect it was the sixth Earl; however, I know not for certain who provided the post or when Coventry assumed it. John Nichols, Literary Anecdotes, V, 569, states, however, that Coventry received the donative shortly before his death, which he fixes erroneously in about 1759. If Nichols is correct about the time when Coventry received the post, then the sixth Earl provided it for his relative. Coventry died in 1754 (see below, note 22).
After leaving Cambridge he continued his literary endeavors. He wrote a piece on the excesses in contemporary landscape gardening for the April 12, 1753 number of a new periodical, the World. He also wrote an introduction to and defense of Philemon to Hydaspes: or, the History of False Religion (1753, third edition) by Henry Coventry, his cousin who had died in 1752. During these years, he probably composed two poems and an inscription for the famous oaks at Penshurst, the Sidney family estate. These poems were published in Dodsley's miscellanies: the first poem, "To a Friend in Wales," appeared in the miscellany of 1755 together with a reprinting of Penshurst; the second, "Ode to the Honourable ***," first appeared in the Dodsley collection of 1758; the inscription appeared as part of a footnote by Isaac Reed in the 1782 edition of Dodsley. But these were posthumous tributes to "the late Mr. F. Coventry," who had died of small pox at Whitchurch, Middlesex on January 9, 1754.

18 Nichols, Literary Anecdotes, IV, 568-69.


and was buried in St. Lawrence's Church at Little Stanmore.\(^{22}\)

Although Francis Coventry died very young, he had in a few years established himself as a versatile, up-and-coming literary figure. He was from a good family; he was well-educated and securely placed. Quite probably he knew Henry Fielding, to whom, as we have seen, the revised novel is dedicated and whose library, when sold, contained only a few novels, one of them *Pompey the Little*.\(^{23}\) Coventry's name and work were known to both Gray and Walpole, and he most probably knew Edward Moore and Robert Dodsley, for whom the *World* was a joint venture.\(^{24}\) Thus, his literary "connections" seemed promising. He had published one poem and composed three others, and he had one novel (containing a noteworthy preface), one periodical essay, and one edition of his cousin's work in print before he died—enough to

\(^{22}\) The usual death date given is 1759. However, I became suspicious of the date because the poems by Coventry in the 1755 and 1758 editions of Dodsley's miscellany refer to "the late Mr. F. Coventry." Also, in the meticulous marginalia in the copy of Charles Henry Cooper's *Memorials of Cambridge* (Cambridge: W. Metcalfe, 1861), II, 177, in the Ohio State University Library, an unknown annotator has written in a death date of 1754. Thus, when Miss Frances Clements of the University of Wisconsin, Green Bay, was in England recently, she kindly checked the parish register at St. Lawrence's Church. The church records read:

Jan. 9th [1754] The Rev. Mr. Francis Coventree (Vicar of Edgware in the County of Middlesex) was buried in the Vault under the Communion Table on the East Side, the foot of the Coffin next the Hole that drains the Vault; upon two Oaken Trussels; Affid. rec.


classify him as a minor literary figure of the mid-eighteenth century.\(^{25}\)

With the possible exception of Coventry's *World* essay and one poem, "To a Friend in Wales," Coventry's minor works are undistinguished as works of art. By and large, they are finger exercises by a young artist-apprentice learning his craft. But for all their shortcomings, they illuminate the mind and values of the author of *Pompey* and give us an index of what to expect in the novel and how to interpret it. Rather than deal with the works for their own sake, I shall analyze what they reveal of Coventry's literary and aesthetic penchants, his political and social ideas, and his ethical sympathies. Coventry's minor works reveal a standard set of interests for a young artist and intellectual of the mid-eighteenth century; they also reveal a decidedly "conservative" stance toward the subjects they take up; finally, they evidence Coventry's skill at imitating deftly but unimaginatively. In his minor works, Coventry shows himself to be quite aware of a variety of literary conventions and intellectual stances which he uses competently in varying circumstances; but he is quite incapable, at this early age, of doing much more than flat imitation—he copies and adapts well, but he cannot create. This general view of Coventry, with some qualifications, obtains in *Pompey* as well. Although Coventry's mimetic powers reach a higher level in his novel than in his minor works, *Pompey* is still the work of a learner, an imitator, and an

---

\(^{25}\) Wilbur Cross in *The History of Henry Fielding* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1915), III, 79, suggests that Coventry also wrote "An Essay on the New Species of Writing founded by Mr. Fielding," (1751). No evidence for his conjecture is offered or has been found. Thus, I have not included the essay among Coventry's works.
adapter striving to make art from the conventions and values which he likes and has seen work. And therein, as we shall see, lies the chief limitation and the chief value of Pompey.

The forms Coventry chose to imitate in his poetry are one indicator of his conservatism. They evidence a distinct community with the great rhetorical tradition of the Renaissance as it continued into the eighteenth century rather than experimentation with the looser, more rhapsodic forms which were becoming increasingly popular in the eighteenth century. And the values expressed in these forms are also traditional rather than innovative. For instance, Coventry's longest poem, Penshurst, inscribed to William Perry and his wife Elizabeth,26 is a late example of what G. R. Hibbard has called the "country house poem" of the seventeenth century, whose practitioners include Jonson, Herrick, Elizabeth Sidney Perry (d. 1783), daughter of Thomas Sidney and niece of John Sidney, Earl of Leister, was, together with Mary Sidney Sherard, a co-heiress of the Sidney family fortune. She married William Perry (d. 1757) who matriculated at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge in 1730. He was sheriff of Bucks in 1741 and procured the King's sign-manual to adopt the name of Sidney on March 4, 1752. He and his wife fought a lawsuit (1739-45) with Mrs. Sherard to get Sidney lands. Once in possession, Perry repaired and beautified the estate, "enriching it with a good collection of pictures which he had purchased in his travels through Italy."

William and Elizabeth Perry had five daughters and a son, Algernon Perry Sidney, who died unmarried in 1768. After her husband's death, Elizabeth procured the remaining Sidney property in 1770 and in 1782 fought a lawsuit to keep her holdings. She left the estates in trust to her grandson, John Shelley, eldest son of Bisse Shelley and Elizabeth, her daughter.

Marvell, and Pope. According to Hibbard, who relies heavily on Jonson's "To Penshurst" for establishing the characteristics of the genre, this literary type is indebted to Bassi, Faustini and Horace's Beatus ille. It stresses the country house as a symbol of the right use of wealth and good human relationships. It explicitly or implicitly presents the house as the center of an organic whole made up of man and nature and contrasts it with the house as an expression of individual pride, an imposition on the community, and a powerful threat to an established way of life. It implies that the house is central to a complex web of relationships which make up the fabric of civilized living—from lord and tenant to patron and poet to host and guest to parent and child. It asserts the interdependence of parts, the harmonizing and reciprocal interplay of man and man, man and nature in the creation of a good life.27

Early in the poem, for instance, the speaker receives two welcomes to Penshurst, one from his hosts (18-22)28 and another from the river Midway (13-16). The proper relationship between host and guest illustrated by the Perrys deepens in significance because it emulates in the human sphere what has been enacted in the natural. Later in


the poem, another glimpse of the Perrys affirms the reciprocal relationship necessary between man and man, man and nature in the creation of a good life. The speaker requests the Genius of the place to bring along on their evening stroll

The Lord who rules this ample scene,
His consort too with gracious mein,
Her little offspring prattling round,
While Echo lisps their infant sound.

This family portrait is an emblem of the sound, ordered human relationships at the heart and head of the entire estate—Lord, consort, offspring: Husband-wife, parent-child exist in the same harmonious relationship as host and guest did earlier and as they do again in this scene during polite conversation. And just as in the earlier reference to the Perrys, the cooperation of man and man mirrored that of man and nature, so here, with the allusion to Echo, does the natural world give back the infant sounds as a sign of the communion between the order of family and the order of nature at Penshurst.

Coventry's treatment of the Perrys is, however, not his only means of defining the positive, traditional values which Penshurst epitomizes. The long catalogues of such contrasts in lines 25-68 between city and country, present and past, the fashionable and the enduring do likewise. In the verse paragraph on Liberty (47-69), for instance, Coventry portrays Penshurst as a noble stronghold of traditional political and social values in opposition to the false values of the modern city and court, destructive of harmonious social intercourse. Liberty, now an exile at Penshurst, presides over a community on the gothic model where vengeance and protection,
the sword and the shield, freedom and a proper heirarchical ordering of men exist side by side in a productive harmony for the benefit of all. By contrast, the world at large is bent on untuning these harmonies. Coventry, like so many of the politically conservative at the time, satirizes the nobles for forsaking their estates and thus abdicating their ancestral responsibilities to the land, landed interests, and landed values—for selling out to the fashionable, moneyed interests of the physically and spiritually polluted city. They have succumbed to the enslaving passion of pride rather than taking pride in a sense of ordered organic community built on a devotion to traditional values.

Also in keeping with the country-house tradition is the speaker's tour of the hall, library, and gallery (139-216). The discussion of the art collection, with emphasis on the Italian masters, emphasizes the house as an emblem of the proper use of wealth, of "true" magnificence in contrast to the prideful, ostentatious waste of riches. The copiously supplied portrait gallery, Greek manuscripts, and Raphael madonnas are so treated as to make them an integral part of the conception of civilized life represented by the estate throughout the poem. The works by Italian masters, which Perry added to the art collection at Penshurst, 29 are not there to boost the owner's ego. These paintings are either moral emblems illustrating the convergence of the human and divine (205-208); or they symbolize a tense relationship between art and nature, art mirroring and perfecting nature much as the civilizing power of the estate mirrors and perfects the life there (209-217).

29 Hasted, History of Kent, III, 246.
The art at Penshurst, like the life there, reflects a proper ordering and disposing of human relationships and the natural world.

The review of British kings and hence of English political history, which the speaker undertakes during the tour of the gallery, becomes a moral lesson in the uses and abuses of power by rulers and ruled. The Stuarts brought "England's worst disgrace," Richard III was "justly slain," Henry VIII was "the tyrant of his wives, / Prodigal of fairest lives," Edward and Elizabeth were ideal monarchs, the revolution was a catastrophe repaired only by Nassau (William III) and in turn Brunswick (George I). Penshurst contains all that is glorious and infamous in England's past, teaching us to shun the disastrous and cling to those better values which it fosters and sustains.

The poem which follows Penshurst in Dodsley's miscellany of 1755, "To a Friend in Wales," lacks Penshurst's association with a specific literary type (it falls, rather, into the general category of verse epistle); but it retains, with a subtle twist, the conventional attitude toward city and country, society and nature, espoused in Penshurst and preserves its ethical import. In the poem, Coventry seeks to persuade his friend to return from Wales to London. The rhetorical problem is subtle: without condemning Wales, Coventry must convince his friend to return to the city, and without praising the city, he must convince him that it is much the better place to be during the

30DNB; G. E. Cokayne, Complete Peerage, rev. Vicary Gibbs (London: The St. Catherine Press, 1932), VIII, 36. This poem appears in the 1766 edition of Dodsley's miscellany with the title "To the Hon. Wilmot Vaughan, Esq; in Wales." Coventry probably became acquainted with Vaughan (ca. 1730-1800) during their days at Eton. Vaughan later became a member of Parliament from Cardiganshire in Wales (1755-61) and Earl Lisburne (1776).
winter. To accomplish this end, he argues, with much help from deftly managed imagery, that since Wales, despite the sublimity of its rugged beauty, is such a terrible place to be in the winter, and since the city, despite its disadvantages—its false values, its vanity and folly—affords a pleasant break from study, his friend should, therefore, come to town.

_Penshurst_ and "To a Friend" also reveal Coventry's attitude toward the aesthetics of the sublime which were well-established in England when Coventry wrote these poems. Both indicate that his interest in the sublime is that of a neo-classicist rather than a pre-romantic. He prefers to view the aesthetics of the sublime in ethical terms rather than psychological terms. Coventry favors a sublimity evoked by order, unity, proportion, adherence to rules over the sublime emphasizing the turbulent, terrific, wild, and subjective.

At several points in _Penshurst_, Coventry emphasizes the place as a source of inspiration, both to the luminaries of the Sidney family and to the speaker, a fledgling poet in search of poetic ideas and ideals. In one of these passages late in the poem, Coventry looks to the vastness and immensity of natural scenery for inspiration and elevation:

> Nor wearied yet my roving feet,  
> Tho' night comes on amain retreat;  
> But still abroad I walk unseen  
> Along the star-enlighten'd green;  
> Superior joys my soul invite,  
> Lift, lift to heav'n the dazzled sight;  
> Lo, where the moon entron'd on high,  
> Sits steady empress of the sky,  
> Enticing nations to reverence,  
> And proudly vain of Pagan fear;  
> Or where thro' clouds she travels fast,
And seems on journey bent in haste,
While thousand hand-maid stars await,
Attendant on their queen of state.
'Tis now that in her high controul,
Ambitious of a foreign rule,
She stirs the ocean to rebel,
And factious waters fond to swell,
Guides to battle in her carr,
'Gainst her sister earth to war.
Thus let me muse on things sublime,
Above the flight of modern rhyme,
And call the soul of Newton down,
Where it sits high on starry throne,
Inventing laws for worlds to come,
Or teaching comets how to roam.
(246-70)

Such rhapsody suggests that Coventry attaches the inspiration aroused by Penshurst, at least in part, to the aesthetics of the sublime. Likewise in "To a Friend," Coventry's descriptions of the Welsh countryside emphasize that the immensity and savagery of the surroundings can inspire with awe and a pleasing horror, can afford delight as the eye follows the scene "'Till mix'd with clouds the landscape ends" (24), can elevate the spirit as the view from Mt. Snowden invites musings "on ancient savage liberty" (28). Coventry looks to the greatness and rugged beauty of the whole view as a source of heightened emotion, a sense of horror and awe and freedom.

In his concern for the elevation and admiration which the vastness of nature can arouse, Coventry evidences a sympathetic acquaintance with a number of critics and poets—Addison, Dennis, Akenside, Young, Thomson, Gray—who looked to wild nature as a source for new aesthetic experience and to subjectivity and associationism to explain their new, intensely emotional responses. Addison, in particular, had argued in

---

31 A Collection of Poems in Four Volumes, ed. Robert Dodsley, IV, 61-63. I shall indicate line numbers parenthetically in the text.
his famous Spectator, No. 412, that the "Great, Uncommon, or Beautiful" is one source of the "Pleasures of the imagination." He goes on to define "Greatness" as not "the Bulk of any single Object, but the Largeness of a whole view, considered as one entire Piece." Such prospects, he continues, strike the viewer

with that rude kind of Magnificence which appears in many of these stupendous Works of Nature. Our imagination loves to be filled with an Object, or to grasp at any thing that is too big for its Capacity. We are flung into a pleasing Astonishment at such unbounded views, and feel a delightful Stilness and Amazement in the Soul at the Apprehension of them. The Mind of Man naturally hates everything that looks like a Restraint upon it, and is apt to fancy it self under a sort of Confinement, when the Sight is pent up on a narrow Compass, and shortened on every side by the Neighbourhood of Walls or Mountains. On the contrary, a spacious Horizon is an Image of Liberty, where the Eye has Room to range abroad, to expati­ate amidst the Variety of Objects that offer themselves to its Observation. Such wide and undetermined Prospects are as pleasing to the Fancy, as the Speculations of Eternity or Infinitude are to the Understanding.

Samuel Monk has pointed out that the increased interest in the sublime during the eighteenth century arose in part as a reaction to what some conceived as the stifling pedantry of neo-classical rules. The aesthetics of the sublime stressed a subjective response, the passionate and enthusiastic, rather than admiring objectivity, restraint, and adherence to the traditional and established. But as

33 Ibid.
34 Ibid.
Walter J. Hippie, Jr., has argued, the aesthetics of the sublime, like most artistic theorizing of the era, attempted to fix an objective standard of taste.\textsuperscript{36} Thus, the difference between established theory and the innovation associated with the new aesthetic was a matter of degree, not of kind. From another perspective, Marjorie Nicolson has shown the connection between the sublime and physico-theology, the tendency to nominalism in the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{37} The sublime was one more way of viewing nature and of making art so that men could perceive the wisdom of God in His creation. And both Miss Nicolson and Ernest Tuveson have argued that a concern for the sublime, especially the rapture over infinite space and the vast in wild nature, constitutes a reaction to the changing conception of nature brought by the discoveries of the new science in general and the telescope in particular.\textsuperscript{38} Because the sublime imbues infinity with meaning and enables what could seem empty and merely frightening to be a symbol of divine magnitude and profundity, it fills with new, substitute significance what the new science drained of old meaning. With these latter views Coventry seems in accord.

Coventry's acquaintance with Addison's work and with that of those who followed his lead is certain from the evidence of \textit{Penshurst}

\textsuperscript{36} The Beautiful, the Sublime, and the Picturesque in Eighteenth Century British Aesthetic Theory (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1957), pp. 305, 310, passim.


\textsuperscript{38} Ibid. and Tuveson, "Space, Deity, and the 'Natural Sublime'," \textit{MLQ}, XII (1951), 36-38.
and "To a Friend." For him, the "things sublime, / Above the flight of modern rhyme" (265-66) are vast, natural scenes and the overwhelming cosmic panorama. However, even in these moments of sublime inspiration, Coventry seems restrained, especially in comparison with contemporaries like Thomson, Young, and Gray. While Coventry expresses heightened emotion at the vastness of the cosmos, he does not seem to be indulging in a contemplation of space and the mysteries of nature for the painful pleasure and pleasing terror they can bring. When he muses on "things sublime," he does so as one who has intense faith in the order and regularity of the universe as an expression of those same qualities in God, its creator and sustainer. When he speaks of the relation between the earth and the moon, for instance, he couches his comments in a commonplace metaphor which has a social moral. The moon, the ruler anointed by God in his ordered cosmic plan, is to the earth, its subject, as king is to people. The analogy by implication entices "nations to revere" their ruler just as they revere the moon because they know its superior place in the divine system of the cosmos. Even when the moon makes war on the earth, Coventry concentrates on the order, the concordia discors producing the regularity of the tides, not on the horror aroused by the immensity and force of a natural mystery. The mention of Newton confirms the checks Coventry seems compelled to place on his sublime feelings. As Miss Nicolson has pointed out, Newton "offered climactic proof that order, proportion, regularity were universal principles, comprising the harmony of the universe. More than ever before, man could turn to the cosmos for his
ethics of limitations, his aesthetics of order and proportion."\textsuperscript{39}

In "To a Friend," Coventry's treatment of the sublime is likewise tempered. Indeed, in that poem it approaches the satiric. In the context of the poem, the sublime is subordinate to the poem's larger argumentative concerns, which, by implication, urge the restraint of passions rather than the unloosing of them. The poem as a whole is more intent on teaching than on delighting, on cultivating morality than on inspiring lofty sensations; at the same time it is playful rather than profound. While poking a bit of fun at the concept of the sublime, Coventry does not, however, deny the complete validity of the fashionable aesthetic or of the power of wild nature to evoke sublime sensations. Nevertheless, to take the walks which afford opportunities for participating in the sublime is, at least during the winter, to run the risk of catching one's death of cold.

Coventry's periodical essay, World, No. 15, is also a literary statement of aesthetic principles. And again, that statement reveals an essentially conservative stance derived from the thinking of some of the best minds of the English Enlightenment. In the essay, Coventry ridicules the excesses in contemporary landscape gardening. On the one hand, he condemns the oppressive artificiality of the Dutch fashion, with its devotion to rigid symmetry and its fascination with topiary. On the other, he satirizes an over-zealous acceptance of the modern taste where all is a wilderness and irregularity beyond that of nature itself and where the serpentine "line of beauty" is worshipped mind-

\textsuperscript{39}Nicolson, Mountain Gloom and Mountain Glory, p. 272.
lessly. He views both the Dutch taste and the modern taste as examples of art based on false aesthetic principles and as emblems of moral depravity. He takes the work of William Kent as the ideal; and in his praise of Kent, he reveals his sympathy with the aesthetic views of Addison, Pope, and the Palladians. He recognizes the need for rules and believes a standard of taste possible. But he finds the rules of the arch-classicists as wrong-headed as their gardens are cloyingly restrictive. At the same time, he is indignant that the very pride and compulsion to be fashionable rather than correct, which produced Dutch topiary, so warps the sound aesthetic principles embodied in Kent's work that they are transformed, in practice, into new excesses and absurdities.

During the early decades of the eighteenth century, the landscape architecture of George London and Henry Wise and other followers of Le Nôtre, the designer of the gardens at Versailles and Fountainebleau and the parent of a taste for topiary and arch-symmetry, was losing favor. The work of Robert Bridgman, William Kent, and other reformers was gaining popularity. Under fire from advocates of Palladianism like Addison and Pope, the rational, logical, and finite, founded on ascertained and definite mathematical ratios, was giving way to a new aesthetic whose rules gave greater emphasis to wildness, freedom, extent, and surprise combined with structure, color, light, shade, and composition in the production of a landscape like that thought to have originally surrounded a classical building.

In Spectator, No. 414, Addison had condemned stiff artificiality in landscape gardening and argued vigorously in favor of gardens in
which the art which conceals art cooperates with nature to produce a thing of beauty and use. Addison's plea for reform in a time grown tired of a stiff artificiality in gardening signals a change in taste, a love of an idealized natural wildness replacing a stiff, mathematical formality and uniformity. Addison is not suggesting that landscape gardening forsake artifice completely, that men of wealth and property allow their gardens to go to seed. Rather, he argues that men forsake planting gardens in accord with rules emphasizing rigid uniformity and restraint. He urges that they take pleasure and profit from gardens planted in accord with aesthetic principles emphasizing the natural variety and intricacy which make up the larger regularity and simplicity of nature because, he suggests, that same regularity in variety, simplicity in intricacy characterizes the larger divine plan. He implies, thus, that the new emphasis will produce gardens that evoke a juster conception of higher realities and principles and in turn greater pleasure than formal, stylized gardens because each part as well as the whole partakes of them by way of the analogy that mirrors macrocosm in microcosm. Thus will the art that places too much emphasis on a reductionistic application of rules which pervert natural order and harmony give way to an art which cooperates with and reflects its rules as they express themselves in the accidents of nature. Thus, too, will men be in a better position to perceive and enjoy the infinite universe and its ultimate order in the finite evanescence of nature.

In Guardian, No. 173, and the Epistle to Burlington, Pope, the poet of the Palladians, used his brilliant satiric talents to support aesthetic principles similar to Addison's and akin to those he set down in An Essay on Criticism. Like Addison, he views the Dutch style in gardening as excessively artificial, a deviation from and a violation of nature, a triumph of art over nature to the detriment of both. But Addison the essayist focuses primarily on the aesthetic dimensions of the problem; Pope the satirist pursues the moral implications. Using the familiar analogy between aesthetic beauty and morality (given particularly forceful statement by Shaftesbury some years earlier), Pope argues that Dutch topiary and the monstrosities at Timon's villa in the Burlington essay not only result from false aesthetic principles; they also signal moral depravity because they have their source in pride and violate what may be called the "imperative of cosmic creativity."

For Pope, the natural world in its order, harmony, and plenitude is the image of those same qualities in the divine mind of its creator. Art, and for that matter, all human endeavor, should strive to imitate, insofar as humanly possible and appropriate, the order of the cosmos which is revealed in nature. To fail to do so or to do so by one's own rules rather than those of nature and nature's God, particularly as


42Moralists (1709). For further discussion, see the introduction to Margaret Jourdain's The Works of William Kent (London: Country Life, 1948), pp. 16-20.
embodied in the art of antiquity, is immoral; it indicates that the
imitator has fallen prey to the sin of pride and has made chaos out
of order rather than order out of chaos. To imitate well, however,
is ultimately to imitate the creative act of God, a moral act, the
highest function of man as man. Such an imitation restores in part
the order lost at the Fall rather than furthering the decay of the
world through false standards of taste far from the source of antique
rules. Not only is slavish devotion to rules which merely stylize
part-mongering of the first order, but it also drains the divine from
artistic creation and negates the value of the particular as an
emblem of God's immanence in His creation.43

Although Coventry wrote at a time when old aesthetic precepts
were becoming obsolete and indeed when the correspondences upon
which they rest were becoming unintelligible, his aesthetic assump­
tions are quite likely those of the Palladian reformers. Certainly
they resemble those of Pope and Addison rather than the adherents
of the neo-Gothic school. For Coventry, topiary, "dull" uniformity,
confinement, symmetry are the emblems of an arch-classicism and sterile
creativity which distort nature rather than "imitating her in the
agreeable wildness and beautiful irregularity of her plans."44 Covent­
entry relishes a garden so planted that trees grow naturally in their
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43 Poems of Pope, Twick. Edn., I, ed. E. Audra and Aubrey Williams
(London: Methuen and Co., 1961), 219-23. For a similar discussion of
the ethical and metaphysical implications of Pope's position, see A.
Lynn Altenbernd, "On Pope's 'Horticultural Romanticism'," JEGP, LIV
(October, 1955), 470-77.

44 British Essayists, ed. Alexander Chalmers (London: Longman and
Rees, 1802), XXVI, 77. I shall include page references parenthetically
in the text.
own shapes and that the viewer may enjoy a gentle prospect, where, in a microcosm of the harmony of nature at large, the wild has been made agreeable and the irregular, beautiful without masking the essential power and appeal of the naturally wild and irregular.

Likewise, his satire against the motives of those embracing the Dutch style suggests that he shares the views of the reformers concerning moral implications. He implies that the motives for accepting the Dutch style were illegitimate and morally culpable from the start. They amounted to little more than political ambition, pride, and a compulsion to be in vogue. To be sure, Coventry says nothing at this point in the essay to indicate that his grasp of moral implications even approaches the metaphysical sophistication of Pope's. But the satire does slice away at the moral foundation of the opposition: it suggests that their corrupt taste is emblematic of a fundamental moral frailty and that Coventry's own position lies close to that represented by Pope. It begins with verbal echoes of Pope's Guardian, No. 173, and the Epistle to Burlington, and proceeds to imply that those who clip shrubs into the shape of Noah's ark or bind the countryside into a monotonous regularity in the name of fashion or, worse yet, in the name of some reductionist view of neoclassical rules are morally culpable for perverting the order of the cosmos.

After disposing of the adherents to Dutch "absurdities" and lauding Kent, Coventry turns to modern excesses. His rough treatment of them fixes his aesthetic position with double certainty and lend support to the argument concerning his awareness of the moral
implications of his aesthetic sympathies.

Coventry objects particularly to the rage for the serpentine line of beauty among modern gardeners. Alluding to Hogarth's emphasis on the serpentine line in the *Analysis of Beauty*, which had not yet been published but whose argument was obviously well-known, Coventry writes:

> A great comic painter has proved, I am told, in a piece every day expected, that the line of beauty is an S: I take this to be the unanimous opinion of all our professors of horticulture, who seem to have the most idolatrous veneration for that crooked letter at the tail of the alphabet. Their land, their water, must be serpentine; and because the formality of the last age ran too much into right lines and parallels, a spirit of opposition carries the present universally into curves and mazes. (77-78)

In addition, the reductionistic misuse of the serpentine is, for Coventry, emblematic of a larger, more pervasive want of taste. By way of demonstrating his point, he concludes the essay with a portrait of Squire Mushroom, the owner of one of the "vast multitude of grotesque little villas, which grow up every summer, within a certain distance of London, and swarm more especially on the banks of the Thames" (78). Squire Mushroom's gardens as well as his library and the architecture of his house "are fatal proofs of the degeneracy of our national taste" (78). His villa is a monstrosity— an old farm house with Gothic spires, battlements, and gargoyles pasted on it. Having so remodeled it as to make it uninhabitable, the Squire added a few rooms in the Italian style. The books in his library were bought for the shelves, not the shelves made to hold the books. Into his relatively tiny two-acre
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garden he has crowded labyrinths, a hermitage, mazes, flower beds, fountains, a temple, "a yellow serpentine river, stagnating through a beautiful valley, which extends near twenty yards in length," and a bridge, "partly in the Chinese manner," under which sails a ship (80).

And Mushroom's life like his estate testifies to the immorality attendant on such degeneracy. All is pretension and pride: he sews "an edging of silver lace on his servants wastecoats" just as he plasters Gothic towers on his farm house in order to become a man of taste. And to further warrant the title, he keeps a brace of whores and consecrates the temple in his garden to Venus because he "riots [there] sometimes in vulgar love with a couple of orange-wenches, taken from the purlieus of the play-house" (80).

Just as Coventry's satire against excessive symmetry by no means rejects rules in art, so his attack on modern excesses does not condemn out of hand modern (or more precisely, "rediscovered") practices, especially the serpentine line. The serpentine line was an important part of gardens as envisioned and executed by reformers. It was also well established in the canons of Palladian aesthetics. Indeed, it was common in baroque art of most forms well before mid-eighteenth century. And in the process of "leaping the fence and discovering that all nature was a garden," William Kent had taught Englishmen that "nature abhors a straight line."46 Hogarth too made it a foundation of his theory in

46 The phrase is Horace Walpole's in On Modern Gardening, ed. W. S. Lewis (New York: Young Books, Inc., 1931), p. 54 (first published in 1771), and it reflects a most estute estimate of Kent's responsibility for popularizing Hogarth's theory.
the **Analysis of Beauty**, one of the most popular and respected aesthetic treatises of the day.\(^{47}\) The serpentine line supplied the intricacy, surprise, and psychological pleasure valued by those wary of strict formalism. In Hogarth's phrase, it "led the eye a wanton chase."\(^{48}\) At the same time, it was a linear principle dictated by nature itself, reflecting the rules of cosmic order and harmonizing with a whole intended to evoke an idealized naturalism. But intricacy without extent or without a concern for use and fitness, overall structure and composition could undercut the pleasure, naturalness, and surprise aimed at. The result was self-parody—an indecorous, rather silly wavy line calling attention to itself for its own sake and mocking divine order—a stagnating serpentine river, not the edenic idyl of a Stowe.

**Coventry** is not, therefore, rejecting the serpentine line *per se*: it was one embodiment of moral, aesthetic principles. Rather, he ridicules its indecorous use by prideful practitioners. He objects to the transgression of "that point where perfection ends, and excess and absurdity begin," to "idolatrous veneration of that crooked letter at the tail of the alphabet" (77), to "a yellow serpentine river, stagnating through a beautiful valley, which extends near twenty yards" of a two-acre plot. Devotees of the serpentine line have, he implies, attended to the letter of an essentially correct aesthetic principle, but have forgotten the spirit. They pervert, therefore,
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\(^{48}\) Ibid., p. 42.
the very rules which could, if understood and embodied properly, effect the cooperation of man, nature, and art in creating tasteful and moral creations.

And he pursues such men "of taste and pleasure" with a vengeance. In an attempt to reform their pride, pretension, and ignorance, he lumps their misuses of the serpentine line with a batch of other aesthetic and moral faults. Thus does the incorrect use of the serpentine line— and by extension, any device expressing sound neo-classical principles in gardening—become sin by association. It violates decorum just as Squire Mushroom's hodgepodge of a house does; it is ornament without use like the Squire's library; it has its source in pride and immorality just as do his hermitage (for which the Squire "expects encomiums on his taste") and his temple to Venus (where Mushroom "riots...sometimes in vulgar love with a couple of orange-wenches" [80]).

Although Coventry's World, No. 15, provides a summary of conflicting views and practices entering into contemporary debate on the theories of gardening current in the eighteenth century, it adds little to our understanding of that subject. The essay as a whole, however, confirms the view of Coventry that we have seen in his other minor works. He was an essentially conservative artist and thinker, aware of contemporary trends in aesthetics and philosophy but restrained in his acceptance of them. His ethical point of view, like his predilection for established literary form, harkens back to the established habits of mind and world view characteristic of the Renaissance and the early eighteenth century. From traditionalists like Addison and Pope he had received a deep respect for the rules of art and life, and
when he saw those rules neglected or abused, he was quick to use the arguments handed down to him to attack what he saw as destructive relativism or reductionism.

Coventry's remaining minor works, his preface to his cousin Henry Coventry's _Philemon to Hydaspes_ and the poem "Ode to the Honourable ****," confirm these conclusions. They give us insight into Coventry's views on psychology and politics respectively and on the ethical implications that Coventry, by analogy, saw in them.

Coventry devotes the major part of the preface to _Philemon to Hydaspes_ to a defense of his cousin's epistles against an attack by Dr. John Browne in _Essays on the Characteristics of Lord Shaftesbury_. Browne had argued against Shaftesbury's doctrine of a "taste in Morals" and had accused Henry Coventry of supporting Shaftesbury's idea that "the height of Virtuosoship is Virtue." Coventry firmly denies the accusation. "[N]othing was farther from the writer's [Henry Coventry's] thoughts than to set up a taste in Morals, as the guide and criterion of virtuous conduct. And if the Essay-writer will examine the second dialogue, from whence this half-sentence is falsely* quoted [The Author's own words are, Virtue alone is the truth and perfection of Virtuosoship,], he will find in it expressions as strong and emphatical, for the scheme of interested virtue, as are to be met with even in his own essay on that subject."\(^4^9\)

Coventry's defense is additional evidence of his conservatism. He is suspicious of threats to objective standards of taste and moral-

\(^4^9\)Pp. xv-xviii.
Shaftesbury's doctrine that there is a taste in morals and that the height of virtue can be viewed as upsetting traditional psychology and ethics by de-emphasizing the supremacy of reason and judgment in matters of taste and morality. In Shaftesbury's view, virtuosity, that is, sensitive appreciation based on knowledge, becomes the path to virtue instead of virtue being antecedent to proper study and right judgment. As Ernest Tuveson has argued, virtue thus becomes relative; right and wrong are not absolutes; actions and judgments begin to be seen, rather, as normal or abnormal. Coventry senses the shift, and his traditional biases come to his cousin's aid; his belief in objective standards of morality, a "scheme of interested virtue," virtue as the "truth and perfection of Virtuosoship" rises up against the hint of subjectivity and relativism.

In "Ode to the Honourable ****," Coventry puts his political views in poetic form. And those views seem perfectly compatible with the aesthetic and ethical views found elsewhere in his minor works. The scene in the poem is the reconvening of Parliament after summer recess. A long flashback recounts the struggles of Parliament just prior to the Interregnum and at about the time of the Revolution Settlement of 1689. The poem concludes with a combination of praise and persuasion urging the Honourable **** to take a vigorous part in the functions of government for the sake of the country and for his own fame.

In the flashback (13-20), Coventry refers to a number of names and events that reveal his sympathy with the rising power of Parliament and its independence from the Crown, which began in the latter half of the seventeenth century and were assured by the Revolution Settlement of 1689. John Hampden (1594-1643), John Pym (1584-1643), and Lord Kimbolton (Edward Monagu, Second Earl of Manchester, 1602-1671) were instrumental in the battle between Charles I and Parliament which led to the king's death and the Interregnum. The Interregnum gave way in its turn to the restoration of Charles II, the reign of James II, who fled England for exile and a hollow crown in France, and the invitation of William and Mary of Orange to assume the English crown. The story of these troubled years in English history has been told often, and its meaning is clear. These years saw the rise of party politics in England and the beginnings of constitutional monarchy.

None of the parliamentary leaders referred to in "Ode" was particularly adverse to monarchy; but all were behind the fight for parliamentary independence, which at the time was tantamount to supremacy. They won their fight, but in the process, a king lost his head. As if in atonement for those bloody consequences, England endured the Interregnum, the religious turmoil of James' reign, and once again, the vexation of a succession controversy. Out of these
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trials came, however, the Settlement of 1689—a Protestant king, a fairly shrewd and prudent one, was back on the throne and the independent power of Parliament was, if not assured, at least on a strong footing.

In "Ode," Coventry rejoices in the victory of Parliament over tyranny without rejecting the idea of monarchy. Monarchy, which speaks in the poem's opening lines, encourages parliamentary independence to insure English liberties and speaks of the laws as "your laws." In the lines under consideration, Charles I is a despot overthrown only by a senate, and James is a bigot who flees his "injur'd kingdom." But William, although perhaps not the anointed of God, is the chosen of men; he will carry on the tradition and prerogatives of monarchy without abusing either.

Coventry's general political position is, then, that common to most Englishmen at the time regardless of their class or their political persuasion on specific issues. Yet if it is possible to give Coventry a particular party label (and I think we can at least make a reasonable guess), we must call him an old Whig turned Tory. The evidence provided by "Ode" is inconclusive, but in concert with inferences we can draw from Penshurst, it gains strength. That Coventry sympathizes with the political tenets of the original Whigs is clear from the preceding discussion as well as from his complimentary references to Algernon Sidney in Penshurst (8-9) and his interpretation of seventeenth-century British history in that poem (see especially lines 160 and 183-92). That he was, however, unhappy with the current Whig government, descended from Robert Walpole and
in the hands of Henry Pelham when Coventry was writing, receives some support from the warmth of his address to his young M. P. friend:

Be this thy passion; greatly dare
A people's jarring wills to sway,
With curst Corruption wage eternal war,
That where thou goe'st, applauding crowds may say,
'Lo, that is he, whose spirit-ruling voice
'From her wild heights can call Ambition down,
'Can still Sedition's brutal noise,
'Or shake a tyrant's purple throne.'

Interpreted as at least in part a commentary on the particular contemporary political situation, these lines damn the Whigs. The Whigs were the party of the rising middle class, a threat to established order from a good Tory's point of view. Thus Coventry's admonition to sway "a people's jarring wills" and to "call Ambition down" is, quite possibly, a hit at the willfulness and pretensions of those classes which were, from a Tory perspective, gaining far too much governmental influence and economic power. Further his urgings to wage war with corruption and to still sedition can be interpreted as indirect accusations against the party in power.

Although we cannot find a particular party bias in every detail, we cannot deny that some are capable of such a coloration, especially when we recall that in Penshurst, Coventry's sympathy with the landed aristocracy reveals a Tory bias. And, the general conservatism of that poem and of the other works by Coventry which we have discussed suits a Tory mentality, just as a Toryism complements it. Yet, determining Coventry's political position with certainty is finally impossible. An attempt, however, does fix the temperament of the man who wrote Pompey. It also lends support to the conclusion that Coventry is a
most conservative young man whose politics match his ethics. He is aware of the ideas and the habits of mind which are drawing the eighteenth century away from its medieval and Renaissance heritage, but he resists these in the main while accepting and using them in part.

Coventry's treatment of another (and, I think, the main) concern of "Ode" lends further support to these conclusions, and, in respect to the poem as a work of art, it is more revealing of Coventry's artistic and moral temperament than is any attempt at political labeling. The "Ode" is primarily a poem about eloquence and the power of the spoken word. In the final analysis, it urges the young politician to use language not merely for personal political glory, but, on the basis of a glorious national precedent, for order and good rule in the body politic at large. Only on these terms is any fame accruing from grand political oratory legitimate. Coventry introduces the theme early.

Majesty concludes her speech

'And boldly speak in Freedom's cause,'  
Then starting from her summer rest  
Glad Eloquence unbinds her tongue.  
She feels rekindling raptures wake her breast,  
And pours her sacred energy along.  

Coventry immediately picks up the theme when he refers to "Hampden's patriot voice" and points out that "Here [in Parliament] Pym, Kimbolton fir'd [with oratory] the British soul." Thus the power of the word is the agent of political right and well-being. Likewise in his address to his friend in the second half of the poem, it is the crux of his argument, for it is the friend's "spirit-ruling voice" which will right political wrongs and keep order in the body politic. It will be the source of civic well-being and in turn of the young man's
fame.

Coventry is obviously drawing on the Ciceronian ideal of the orator in making his point. He is also employing a metaphor familiar to any student of rhetoric in the Renaissance—the likening of the words of men to the creating Word of God, as in the reference to Eloquence's "sacred energy" and the epithet "spirit-ruling." Through the proper use of language, men have created and can continue to create order in the state. At the same time they effect an imitation of God whose Word first created the cosmic order of which, according to a familiar analogy, civic order is a reflection; and just as God's word preserves that order, so the words of men ought to serve a like function for the state. Thus is the politician's calling no mean one; indeed, it can provide a basis for deserved and enduring fame. Thus, too, one's politics have ethical and aesthetic implications—the way one lives his life, is able to use language, and votes get bound up together on the basis of a world view descended from medieval and Renaissance habits of mind.

Coventry's minor works, then, reveal a young writer of conservative persuasions. He borrows conventional forms and imitates them straightforwardly but somewhat unimaginatively. His social and political sympathies are those of one who is convinced of the need for the continuation of established values and for change only within the context of those values. Aesthetically he favors adherence to the restraint and decorum of neo-classical rules. And ethically he believes in the necessity for balancing opposites in every realm of human endeavor in order to create a human harmony as in tune as possible
with divine harmony.

In Coventry's novel, to which I now turn, Coventry continues his imitation and adaptation of literary forms and conventions to his own literary ends. He also uses as the "ought to be" of Pompey the same conservative social, political, and ethical position, an essentially borrowed one, found repeatedly in his minor works. In Chapter IV I shall discuss that "ought to be" in more detail and show how it unifies Pompey. I conclude this discussion of the background of Coventry's novel with an analysis of the literary forms and conventions which Coventry freely adapted to his own artistic ends in Pompey. I do so in order to describe how the novel operates and to determine its major literary ancestors.

In addition, I shall treat Pompey's significance to literary history. The influence of the novel on the development of the genre is, I think, limited. It was too much a nine-days' wonder and too overshadowed by giants in the eighteenth century and certainly in later years for it to have any marked effect. Yet it did help to popularize an interest (happily short-lived) in the use of non-human or inanimate objects as hero or persona in a crop of minor works. Nevertheless, a knowledge of the forces of literary history on Pompey, forces bearing on the development of the genre as a whole, helps us understand what Coventry is doing and in turn of what other novelists were attempting as well. Specifically, the influence of the Prose Character, resurrected in the seventeenth century and popular well into the eighteenth, is obvious. Less obvious but no less interesting concerning a sense of Coventry's aims and methods is his use of, and commentary upon, contemporary con-
ceptions and conventions of biography and their relationship to prose fiction. I argue that in order to understand Pompey better and indirectly its place in the rise of the novel, we must investigate Coventry's use of the Prose Character for novelistic ends as well as his use and satiric abuse of the conceptions and conventions of biography current in mid-century. Thus, we can, I think, gain specific insight into the commonplace of criticism that the Prose Character is of major importance to the development of the novel by investigating its place in one early novel. Also, we shall see in the particular case of Pompey how one eighteenth-century novelist employed biographical conventions to give his work structure and satiric purpose as well as tried thereby to shape the course of both biography and its close cousin, the novel.

To describe how Pompey operates is best done negatively, because while the novel partakes of many literary traditions, it adheres to none of them in a thorough-going way. First, I argue that Pompey is not a roman à clef. Although its suspected topicality may have contributed much to its contemporary popularity, I think it profitable to take Coventry at his word when he writes: "let me admonish thee...not to be too forward in making applications, or to construe Satire into Libel. For we declare here once for all, that no Character drawn in this work is intended for any particular Person, but meant to comprehend a great Variety." 54 Yet some contemporary and latter-day

54 (Dublin, 1753), p. 24. Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations from the novel will be from this edition. I shall indicate page numbers parenthetically in the text.
readers have viewed Pompey as, in part at least, a *roman à clef*. In Lady Tempest they see Lady Townshend, who was also supposedly the model for Lady Bellaston in *Tom Jones*; and in Lady Sophister, they discern Lady Orford. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu seems to have given rise to the identification of the two characters in the letter to her daughter quoted early in this chapter. The *Dictionary of National Biography* picked up her identifications. And in 1852, a gentleman who identifies himself only as J. H. M. published a brief note in *Notes and Queries* which lends support to Lady Mary's claims. Edmund Gosse, on the other hand, suggests that Lady Tempest is Maria Gunning Coventry, wife of William, sixth Earl of Coventry, Francis Coventry's cousin. He also identifies Mr. Williams, a modish student at Cambridge who appears late in the novel, with Coventry's cousin, Henry Coventry, who, like Williams, was supposed to have been a fastidious and flamboyant dresser.

Interesting as these conjectures are, we are not, I think, justified in carrying them too far. By no means is the entire novel specific topical satire. Indeed, at a distance of over two hundred years, *Pompey* only becomes the delightful and didactic moral instrument Coventry intended it to be when we put any topical satire it may

---

55 Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, III, 4-5.

56 *DNB*, s.v. Coventry, Francis.

57 J. H. M., "'The History of Pompey the Little'," *Notes and Queries*, VI (1852), 433 and 472.

contain in its proper perspective and concentrate on the general significance of the novel's characters and situations as they "comprehend a great Variety." To be sure, Coventry is frequently intent upon tantalizing his contemporary readers with hints that this or that character has a real-life model or that he is using the names of real people. Creating a sensational best-seller was essentially the same in the eighteenth century as it is today. But Coventry also seems concerned with mocking the vice of the gossip-mongers, who assured the success of his novel. He tells them one thing (that he means no personal satire), leads them to believe another (that he is indeed using live models), and does still another (concentrates on the universality of his characters' virtues and vices, thus tantalizing his readers into seeing themselves in his satire).

Pompey is also not a bildungsroman, despite Coventry's ironic pretensions to be writing biography. Neither the hero nor any other character undergoes that fundamental change or growth which we associate with that literary kind. Pompey's circumstances change, and he develops certain characteristics (a love of luxury and high life, for instance), but he does not become a better dog for his experience, nor does he learn much except that fortune is fickle. And his various owners are all stylized, rather obvious and standard, "flat" types. Coventry catches each in the act of being what he is and passes on to a new character without telling us that each was ever very different or without hinting that any one of them would ever change his stripes.

Neither is Pompey a thorough-going picaresque novel in the tradition of Lazarillo de Tormes, Don Quixote, or the works of Le Sage,
Defoe, and Smollett. Like the traditional picaroon, Pompey is a slave to fortune. He does much traveling, and his contact with various levels of society occasions satire on these groups. Coventry has also included commentary which smacks of the conventions of the picaresque. For instance, when he is summarizing Pompey's life in the conclusion, he notes that Pompey turned out better than his background would lead one to believe; likewise, while inclined to roguery, the picaroon is typically no scoundrel. But because Coventry chooses to tell the story in the third, rather than the first person, and because he reports so little of what Pompey thought or how he reacted or what he did, we do not know enough about him to say that he adheres to the general code of the picaroon. We are not, for instance, particularly aware that he lives by his wits or that hardship teaches him cunning or that he is sympathetic to those in the same boat as he is (in fact, quite the opposite is the case, as his experiences with the beggar and the poet Rhymer indicate). Again, however, we must note that his "wit" does win him favor when, for instance, he plays tricks on the counsellor Tanturian and when hunger allows him to escape from being dissected alive. In addition, the novel in general contains a number of violent, low-life scenes reminiscent of those frequent in picaresque novels. The scene in the watchhouse or the blow-by-blow account of the alehouse-keeper's daughter's marriage to a hackney coachman or the young drunks' attack on Rhymer provide examples. But by no means do the picaresque elements constitute a consistent effort.

Moreover, we cannot place Pompey in a long line of animal fables or firmly attach it to the tradition of first-person stories told by
animals or inanimate objects which had won popular approval in con-
temporary periodicals and which, in novel form, gained great vogue in
the latter part of the eighteenth century. The point of view is quite
different in Pompey, and its effect on the tone and import of the satire
makes Coventry's novel markedly unlike Le Sage's *Le Diable Boiteaux*
(1707; trans. 1708), "The Adventures of a Shilling" in *Tatler*, No. 249,
Johnston's *Chrysal; or the Adventures of a Guinea* (1760), or Smollett's
*Adventures of an Atom* (1769). Pompey is not the persona in Coventry's
novel; his experiences are not filtered through his consciousness.
Rather, a third-person narrator tells the story. The satiric distance
is thus lengthened, and the tone is not as vicious and angry in Pompey
as in novels like *Chrysal*, with which it is often linked. Yet, Pompey's
association with stories having animal or object heroes is certain,
not only because Pompey is a dog and Coventry's novel is one of the
first to have a non-human hero but also because Coventry does at times
report Pompey's thoughts and repeatedly gives him human attributes
for satiric purposes.

Finally, Pompey is not, especially in its last two editions,
merely a loose collection of episodes and portraits which might better
be labeled a proto-novel than a novel. As I shall show later, a
number of unifying devices give it continuity and design; further, as
I shall prove in Chapter IV, a number of thematic concerns binds the
plethora of scenes and character sketches together into a satiric
and ideological whole.

Thus the question remains: how best do we describe Pompey? And
the answer is, of course, that it is a composite of a number of literary
traditions adapted to Coventry's own particular subject, mode of
expression, and organizational pattern. It is also a series of stories
and sketches bound loosely but discernibly together by a variety of
technical and thematic means. It is at once a law unto itself as
well as a picaresque novel (lacking many picaresque elements); a
series of Prose Characters much in debt to the periodical essay and
the tradition of the Theophrastan Character in the seventeenth and
eighteenth centuries, but a series bound together in narrative form
rather than presented as discrete units; a story using a non-human
subject as an obvious satiric device, but unlike its predecessors
and descendants using third-person instead of first-person narration;
and a novel particularly in debt to Fielding but without a developing
hero and inferior in artistic technique and human insight.

Historically, one of Pompey's chief claims to fame is that it
was the first popular English novel to use an animal as its central
character. Previous to it, there had been books like The Secret
History of an Old Shoe (1734), which used an inanimate object as its
central character, and numerous stories in the Adventurer and the Tatler
which used a similar device. The Tatler, for instance, used a petticoat
(No. 116), a microscope (No. 119), a lap dog (No. 121), and a shilling
(No. 249). Pompey's popularity doubtless contributed to a rash of
novels using a similar narrative technique. Beginning about 1760 and
continuing into the early nineteenth century, we find the adventures
of a black coat, a cat, a banknote, a hackney coach, a rupee, a watch,
a pin, a pin cushion, a corkscrew, a flea, a seven shilling piece, a
silver penny, a fly, a silver three-pence, an ostrich feather, and
The most famous of these are Johnston's *Chrysal* (1760-65) and Smollett's *Adventures of an Atom* (1769). These books, however, differ from *Pompey*, as we have seen, because they are first-person narratives by the animal or object which, as Ernest Baker points out, are given the "attributes akin to those postulated by the occult science of psychometry." In this respect they are closer to the early work by Le Sage, *Le Diable Boiteux* (1707; trans. 1708), than they are to *Pompey*, where the dog cannot, like Smollett's atom, for instance, penetrate the hidden motives, thoughts, and past lives of those he encounters.

F. W. Chandler has pointed out, rightly I think, that "Such works represent a decline in the picaresque genre, for the central figure can be used merely to focus the scenes satirized, and is necessarily deprived of all initiative in rascality." For this reason and others I shall suggest, the popularity of the technique was, happily, short-lived and was, for that matter, never taken up much even when it was enjoying some vogue. It became, interestingly, a method for pornography and, without the satire, for children's stories, like *The History of a Pin* (1798) and the whole flock of Disneyesque creatures popular last century and this.

---
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62 Tracking down such pornographic material is understandably
Pompey's historical interest, however, goes beyond any influence it may have had on the genre in which it is commonly placed. We have noted Coventry's heavy reliance on the Prose Character as a means of developing his novel. According to a commonplace of criticism, the Theophrastan Prose Character, revived in the seventeenth century by writers like Joseph Hall, Thomas Overbury, John Earle, and Samuel Butler, greatly influenced the development of the novel through the periodical essay, primarily, and polemical and biographical writing, secondarily. I agree, and I intend to discuss Coventry's use of the Prose Character in the novel by way of supporting and making specific the general opinion. After reviewing the argument for the influence of the Prose Character on the novel as well as stressing how the rhetorical structure of the Prose Character, less loose than generally expected, makes it particularly suitable for adaptation by the novelist, I shall examine Coventry's use of the Prose Character as a vivid instance of its influence on the novel. My point is not only that Coventry is a master of the conventions of the Prose Character but that his ability to weave the Prose Character into a story and to draw out in action and dialogue what is often only incipient in the Character reflects in a concentrated instance just how the form was adapted to

7(continued) difficult. If bibliographers bother to note it at all, they usually do not label it pornographic. However, I am aware of two such books: The Adventures of a Flea (Bison Books, no date), which is without doubt pornographic and very probably a product of the eighteenth century, and The History of the Human Heart (1749) referred to as pornographic in John Fowles' The French Lieutenant's Woman. The former, for instance, chronicles in the first person the experiences of a flea who hops from the pudenda of one host of easy virtue to another. My guess is that a great many more such books exist, drawing on the convention which Coventry used to quite different ends in Pompey.
Theophrastus, Aristotle's successor as head of the Peripetetic school in Athens, wrote the first Prose Characters. What exactly was their function is not known. But Benjamin Boyce conjectures that they were probably models for the rhetorical training of the students, their usefulness in epideictic oration being obvious; they also, he contends, owe much to Aristotle's doctrine of the mean: "Such a doctrine of morality, fixed yet actually relative, inevitably kept one's mind busy distinguishing the too little and the too much." Their form follows this pattern as outlined by Boyce: "The method in each of these pieces is first to name the moral quality or habit and then very briefly to define it...After the definition comes the main development, the list of actions and speeches that are typical of a victim of the quality under consideration. The picture is built up entirely of details of what the man does or says, usually in apparently random order, as seen or heard by an impersonal observer." As E. C. Baldwin has pointed out: "The Character bore somewhat the same relationship to the biographical sketch as the 'composite' photograph does to that of an individual. That is, it was, or aimed to be, a portrayal, which, while justly representative of every individual of a class, and hence of a class as a whole, combined at the same time so many individual details, carefully and skillfully
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grouped, as almost to trick the reader into the belief that the portrayal was after all that of an individual."\textsuperscript{65}

Casaubon's Latin version of Theophrastus' Characters first appeared in England in 1592. Soon Character-writing was much in vogue and continued to be popular well into the eighteenth century, as J. Milton French's voluminous bibliography of Character literature indicates.\textsuperscript{66} In the hands of the seventeenth-century masters of the Character, the form retained essentially the qualities given it by Theophrastus, but it also underwent a number of changes which prepared it for use by periodical essayists, polemicists, biographers, and finally novelists. Although Theophrastus does allow the reader "some opportunity to read between the lines, he refrains from explicit statement either of what the character thinks or of what Theophrastus thinks of the character...\textsuperscript{67} He also concentrates on very general types: The Old Man, the Young Man, the Greedy Man, for instance. In the seventeenth century, the Character becomes more subjective and witty than in Theophrastus' practice. An emphasis on psychology, motivation, action, and particularizing detail increases. The Characters are still of types, but they have become focused: The Flatterer, The Officious Man, The Shopkeeper, A

\textsuperscript{65}"The Relation of the Seventeenth-Century Character to the Periodical Essay," \textit{PMLA}, XIX (1904), 76.


\textsuperscript{67}Baldwin, p. 82.
Retired Housekeeper, The Cook, The Wife now a Widow. Both E. C. Baldwin and Charles W. Davis, who have studied the evolution of the Character in the seventeenth century and its influence on other literary forms, agree that Joseph Hall and others supplied the Character with greater action. Thomas Overbury, however, not only forsook Hall's ethical moralizing, his "earnest chastizing," for social satire, but also supplied more "visualizing power" than Hall. Overbury and his imitators "realized the nature of their subjects as persons, often describing manners and dress in detail, with the air of the town and the flavor of the court and sometimes with a touch of the rural scene. The writers of these Characters at times mixed in samples of speech and behavior as well as some suggestions of appearance. Dealing more with representatives of certain occupations or positions than with moral or psychological types, the Overburian Characters became the most widely imitated by later English writers." What Overbury supplied in "visualizing power," John Earle supplies in deeper psychological insight. He probes more than his predecessors the causes for behavior, stresses more the humor of incident than cleverness of phrase, and rejects overt judgment for objective statement.
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Samuel Butler preserved and perpetuated the changes wrought by Earle and others in the Character. Although written in the seventeenth century, his lively, sardonic portraits did not appear until 1759. He was for all intents and purposes the last great master of the Character as a form in itself. But the form was still around, and the changes it had undergone during its heyday were continuing, transforming it into a tool well-suited to the novelist. It was, as G. S. Gordon points out, a cramped form begging for expansion. It received that expansion in the essay, polemical literature, and biography, where it also became even more particularized and "realistic," qualities which well fit it for use by the novelist.

In biography, for instance, authors like Clarendon in The History of the Great Rebellion frequently included Characters of real men, as in the portrait of Viscount Falkland referred to in the early editions of Pompey. In these portraits, one gets a sense of a type: Falkland is, for instance, the Virtuous, Benevolent Man of Action. But they are also highly individualized—real. The details are facts put to implied moral ends. In them the particular and concrete clearly have the upper hand in creating the sense that they are about real flesh-and-blood people. We get the same sense from the characters of a novel, particularly Coventry's novel where Character-writing combines

---
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openly with characterization. The characters are not just types but people within whom a type lurks, the people delighting us or appealing to our emotions, the type teaching.

The essay likewise uses the Character in a expanded context and contributes to those qualities in it which make it suitable for use in the novel. The moral (Baconian) essay and the Character are, as Baldwin says, similar in form. To the essay in the eighteenth century, the Character gave the definiteness it lacked in the seventeenth. And without forsaking "typeness," the Character gained intense individuality as it was practiced in the essay. In Addison's Sir Roger De Coverley essays, as E. C. Baldwin has pointed out, "a collection of characteristics, epigrammatically expressed and satirically intended combines with a highly individualized literary portrait." The result is a Character and a character. And that is what we find quite obviously in Coventry's novel and less obviously in the works of Fielding, Defoe, and Smollett.

Before examining Coventry's use of the Character in detail, I wish to make one last point about the form that has been overlooked and that bears on the relation of the Character and the novel. In defining the Character, critics have emphasized the "apparently random order" of the details forming the body of the Character. To be sure, the arrange-
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ment of detail in the body of the Character often seems and is random. But one may note in many of the best Characters a definite rhetorical structure. This is not surprising in authors nursed on the great rhetorical tradition of the Renaissance. The influential rhetoricians may have been pretty general when defining figures, like descriptio, characterismos, and prosopoeia, which contribute prominently to the Character. But the spirit of their rhetorical theory is order as in, let us say, the definite arrangement of topics and places for the epideictic oration to which the Character is closely related. What is important in the rhetorical structure and arrangement in the body of many Characters is this: implicit in that structure is the action which, as the Character becomes particular and probing and is used as part of a larger whole, attends the Character as Character until finally the outline for the action in the body of the Character drops away and what is left is the moving, living, particular character we recognize as novelistic.

In one respect, then, what we have in the Character is an outline of a novelistic character. In the essay and in a novel like Pompey, both outline and character are presented. In more skillful hands than Coventry's and later in the development of the novel, the Character per se drops away almost completely under the influence of and demand for realism which was incompatible with the rather stiff rhetorical structure of the Prose Character. The spirit of the Character remains, however, in the concreteness and in the search for depth of motives. Conversely, it remains in the type we see between the lines of the particular which made the best Prose Characters and became increasingly
a part of their nature as a result of the changes they underwent in
the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

To illustrate the point, I have chosen to take a close look at
John Earle's "A Pretender to Learning." This Character not only
illustrates the typical formula of the kind but also manifests that
order in its development which makes it so close to, and yet so far
from, the novelistic character. It opens with the definition of the
type, which closes in such a way as to prepare us to meet the type
first hand: "He is trickt out in all the accoutrements of Learning,
and at first encounter none passes better." And meet him we do in
his study, surrounded by "all the accoutrements of Learning." He
answers a knock; he has on his slippers and there is a pen in his ear.
He has been asleep. A book lies open on the table and a candle is
burning. In a abbreviated way we see a very detailed scene which
characterizes as it particularizes. This section of the development
has within it what could be a whole scene from a novel—with des-
cription, action, dialogue, conflict—but will not be for some years yet
and in others' hands.

With the statement "He walkes much alone in the Posture of Medi-
tation, and has a Book still before his face in the fields," we are,
the next morning as it were, ready to follow this Pretender around as
he leaves his study to mix with other men. And follow him we do as
he walks through the fields on his way to church. After church, we
see him in a social gathering where he discourses on a number of
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subjects, tosses allusions around, eructates at dinner what he read in the morning, "winds" verses nearly appropriate to the matter at hand, and so forth. Throughout this section of the development, Earle not only tells us what the Pretender is doing and saying, but he also hints at the tone of the dialogue, the particulars of the scene, and the attitudes struck by the characters. But the Pretender's "businesse and retirement and caller away is his Study." We have come full circle, back to where we first met the man. Then after some additional general comments which have their own implied dialogue and scene, the Character closes wittily with another epigrammatic definition: "He has taken paines to be an Asse, though not to be a Scholler, and is at length discovered and laught at."

Surely we are not far in this Character from Lady Sophister or the tavern wits or Doctors Rhubarb and Killdarby of Pompey or the scores of sophists and pedants who populate eighteenth-century prose. The narrative action and dialogue, the realistic, particularized description and conflict are here in embryo form, seemingly just waiting to be brought out, to be used as means of expansion in a larger narrative context. Yet Earle's Microcosmography was published in 1628, and it would take almost one hundred years and hundreds of Characters, periodical essays, polemical portraits, and biographical sketches before what is implicit within this relatively minor form would make an important contribution to the rise of a new, major genre. And even as late as 1751, the transition was not complete as Coventry's Pompey the Little amply attests.

In that work, as we have noted repeatedly, Character-writing and
novelistic characterization exist side by side, demonstrating the debt of the novel to the Prose Character. The chapter headings frequently tell us that we are reading Characters—"The character of lady Tempest," "A long chapter of characters," "The character of a master of arts at a university," and so forth. And when we read most of the portraits in Pompey, there is no doubt of their debt to the formulae of the Prose Character—the witty definitions, the epigrammatic style, the wealth of detail suggesting but not detailing action, the probing of motives to satiric ends.

Examples are numerous, but I shall mention only a few. Early in the novel we encounter two portraits which follow the pattern of the Character very closely. Indeed they might easily be labeled "The Foppish Husband" and "A Wife of Quality." Instead, their names individualize them as Captain and Lady Betty Vincent, and that is about the extent of the individualization as far as their portraits are concerned.

Captain Vincent...was an exceeding handsome man, about thirty years old, tall and well-proportioned in his limbs; [1] but so entirely devoted to the contemplation of his own pretty person, that he never detached his thoughts one moment from the consideration of it. [2] Conscious of being a favourite of the ladies, among whom he was received always with eyes of affection, he thought the charms of his figure irresistible where-ever he came, and seemed to shew himself in all public places as an object of public admiration. You saw for ever in his looks a smile of assurance, complacency, and self-applause; he appeared always to be wondering at his own accomplishments, and especially when he made a survey now and then of his dress and limbs. 'twas as much as to say to his company, 'gentlemen and ladies, look at me if you can without admiration.' The reputation of two or three affairs which fame had given him with women of fashion, still contributed to increase his vanity, and authorized him, as he thought, to bestow more time and pains on the beautifying and adorning so successful a figure. [3] In short, after many real or pretended
amours, which made him insufferably vain, he married at last a celebrated town-beauty, a woman of quality, who was in all respects equal to, and worthy of such a husband. (47-48)

From the witty definition, [1], through development with specifics, [2], to the sardonic close, [3], the pattern is that of the Character. Some action, dialogue, and psychology are suggested in the development, but at this point at least, they are kept in a summary form reminiscent of the Character. A like pattern with an even wittier definition and more emphasis on suggested biography (a kind of progress of vanity) occurs in the Character of Lady Betty Vincent (48).

Although much longer than the character sketches of Captain and Lady Betty Vincent, the portrait of Mr. Williams of Cambridge late in the novel also exhibits an obvious debt to the Character. It opens with a crisp definition of the modish student: "If we were in a hurry to describe him it might be done in two or three words, by calling him a most egregious trifler" (167). It proceeds with a journal of his daily activities during which his chief attributes, vanity and affectation, are brought out and satirized. Details of dress, the kinds of magazines he displays in his study, his ways of wasting time and avoiding study, his pretensions to the genteel life, even the paring of his nails get some mention before Coventry makes a transition into a dramatic scene during which Williams shows some young ladies around his school. As with the portraits of Captain and Lady Betty Vincent and others in the tale, one has the sense throughout the sketch that for all the individual, specific detail, he is being given a type abstracted in time, constant in its complex of defining, determining qualities. And that is precisely the sense of the Prose Character.
Coventry has, to be sure, made extensive use of the conventions of the Prose Character in writing *Pompey*. He has, however, just as surely modified the form. Most generally in Coventry's hands the form is not a "closed," distinct entity. The edges have been blurred, or, more precisely, the form has been opened to admit particular, individualizing detail, dialogue, action, biographical background. Indeed as we shall see in Chapter III, Coventry frequently added to the revised editions of the novel detail, dialogue, and action, thereby making the set portraits more lively, individualized, and realistic than in the editions of 1751. The sense of the Character generally remains, giving the flavor of the perennial type, but by incorporating and extending the changes wrought in the Character during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, he has brought Character-writing close to novelistic characterization.

We see instances of the process in the Characters used above as examples. Coventry gives us the Prose Character of Captain and Lady Betty Vincent and Williams; he also moves from the Characters to a short scene in which these people act out their natures in ways foreign to the Character. Captain and Lady Betty Vincent, for instance, engage in a demented little battle of wits over getting rid of one of their children in order to ease the financial burden on their family. And later in Lady Betty's conversation with her mother Lady Harridan, all her pertness takes the stage as in some Restoration comedy. We see the same enlargement of the form in the presentation of Williams, Theodosia, Aurora, and her lover, as well as Count Tag, Lord Marmazet, and the Fripperys. From a clearly set off Prose Character, we move to
dialogue and action elaborating and dramatizing more fully and individually than any Prose Character can and still remain a Prose Character. The attributes given the character during the course of the Prose Character. The novelistic form of development seems but an elaboration of the Character.

In other instances, the conventions of the Prose Character are liberally mixed with less rigid and stylized ways of presenting character, or they are done away with completely in favor of straight narration, action, and dialogue as ways of presenting character. In the portraits of Lady Tempest and Lady Sophister, for instance, the sense of the Prose Character is present by bits and pieces, fits and starts. It is especially noticeable in the epigrammatic summaries which freeze those ladies in mid-action and make us see them as representatives of their kind, as for instance, when Coventry says of Lady Tempest that she "believed all the doctrines of religion, and was contented, like many others, with the trifling privilege only of disobeying all its precepts" (41), or when in comparing the two ladies by way of introducing Lady Sophister, he writes: "In many respects this Lady was in similar Circumstances with Lady Tempest; only with this Difference, that the one had been separated from her husband by his Death, the other divorced from hers by Act of Parliament; the one was famous for Wit, the other affected the Character of Wisdom" (57). For the most part, however, the portraits proceed by mixing highly individualized biographical sketch, dialogue, and action rather than suggesting these or giving representative snippets as in a Prose Character. These ladies like many other characters in Pompey are
set in a very definite time and space. As readers, we work usually to generalize from the specifics rather than as in the Prose Character to accept the generalizations handed us and work to fill out the suggested picture, scene, psychology, and the like.

At still other times in *Pompey*, any definite sense of the Prose Character disappears completely. The chapters dealing with the beggar and his son Jeremy Griskin, Poet Rhymer, the political orator, and the tavern wits have little or nothing of the Prose Character about them. Detailed action and dialogue carry the narrative almost completely with only an occasional pause to generalize wittily. And most certainly these portraits employ an organizational pattern quite foreign to that of the Prose Character. But instances like these are indeed rare in *Pompey*. Coventry's chief means of narrative development and the source of the delight of his novel is the Prose Character, modified at times, made realistic and novelistic, but there, giving the charm and punch and satiric thrust that is its special province.

Francis Coventry's conspicuous use of the Prose Character in *Pompey* makes credible and specific the influence of the form on the novel. He took the form, used it as it had come down to him or, like other writers of the period, altered it along the lines it had been developing since its revival in the seventeenth century. Those changes finally destroyed the form at the same time that they transformed it into something new and eminently useful to the novelist as he creates realistic human individuals who are types and types who are recognizable, concrete individuals.

Before concluding this discussion of background, one last point
deserves to be made in order to round out an understanding of *Pompey* in its historical context. At several points in *Pompey*, Coventry makes comments about historical writing, and repeatedly he parodies the conventions of biography when dealing with Pompey and when presenting numerous characters. His purpose in doing so seems two-fold: first, to satirize and thus improve historical writing and its brother form, biography, which were much-practiced and much-abused in the eighteenth century; second, to satirize and thus improve the novel which, as the very title of Coventry's work and those of countless others of the period suggest, was a close relative of history and biography. Before looking specifically at how Coventry accomplishes these ends, a general view of historical and biographical writing at the time is in order, as is a discussion of the parallels between history and biography on the one hand and historical writing (including biography) and the novel on the other.

In the Restoration and eighteenth century, as in the Renaissance, history was not, as it so often is for us, a social science, an attempt to determine (or at least guess at) the past with factual accuracy; it was, rather, a moral instrument designed to move men to embrace virtue and to shun vice through the example of the past. In that process, myth and fiction might be as important as fact. Further, the end of historical writing made it an art, not a science, and linked it with other art forms like epic and tragedy. Thus, Holinshed's *Chronicles* were history, but they were also the vehicle of the Tudor myth; the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were epics, but they were also the history of the Trojan war and the life stories of heroes, particularly Ulysses;
Shakespeare's history plays were history, but many, like *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra*, came close to tragedy, and those relating to English history have an epic grandeur when taken as a whole.

Examples could be multiplied, but the point is that like epic and tragedy and all literature for that matter, the object of history was to teach, delight, and move to virtuous action. As Dryden put it in his Preface to *The Life of Plutarch*: "All History is only the precepts of Moral Philosophy reduc'd into Examples."\(^80\) For Dryden, history reduces into practice our speculative notions regarding ethics and politics, the two branches of moral philosophy. It allures rather than forces us to virtue.

Dryden argues in the same Preface that biography is inferior to history,\(^81\) but he also states that biography equals and excels history in pleasure and instruction.\(^82\) He further asserts that it is commendable for its style, which is varied, and its narrative method, which is particular.\(^83\) Dryden is, of course, speaking of the lives of great men. But as the eighteenth century rose and waxed, almost everything he says about the lives of the great came to be said of the lives of common men. Gilbert Burnet, for instance, in his Preface to *The Life and Death of Sir Matthew Hale, Kt.* argues that although the
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lives of great men offer instruction and delight, they are, nevertheless, "commonly filled with accounts of the great things done by them, which do rather belong to a general than a particular History: and to rather amuse the Reader's fancy with a splendid show of greatness than offer him what is really so useful to himself." Burnet also says that the lives of princes are often faulty as a moral instrument because of designs on the part of the writer to flatter, be spiteful, disguise human error, and distort the truth. The lives of private men, on the contrary, "offer him things that are more imitable, and so present Wisdom and virtue to him not only in a fair Idea; which is often look'd on as a piece of the Invention or Fancy of the Writer, but in such plain and familiar instances as do both direct him better and persuade him more; And there are not such temptations to bias those who write them, so that we may generally depend more on the truth of such relations as are given in them." 

Samuel Johnson, writing over fifty years later in the famous Rambler, No. 60, concurs: "no species of writing seems more worthy of cultivation than biography, since none can be more delightful or more useful, none can more certainly enchain the heart by irresistible interest, or more widely diffuse instruction to every diversity of condition." Yet, Johnson argues, the lives of the great and the
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histories of great events are not necessarily best for these ends because the common sort do not identify with them. The life of a common man, however, has no such fault. "I have often thought," writes Johnson, "that there has rarely passed a life of which a judicious and faithful narrative would not be useful." Provided the trivial is avoided and the moral significance emphasized, morality and instruction can issue from an everyday life rightly treated.

My purpose in reviewing quickly the ideas of the age concerning history and biography is to point out that everything said about history and biography can be said about the novel, from the emphasis on teaching and delighting to a concern for the intimate lives of characters great and low. The parallels between the forms, in means as well as ends, did not escape the attention of early novelists, as the very titles of their works indicate: The History of Tom Jones, The History and Adventures of Joseph Andrews and His Friend Mr. Abraham Adams, The Life and Adventures of Mr. Duncan Campbell, The Life and Strange Adventures of Robinson Crusoe, The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, to name but a few. In effect what Johnson did with the real men in The Lives of the Poets or Clarendon in The History of the Great Rebellion is what Fielding does with Tom Jones and Joseph Andrews: dealing with the lives of men great and ordinary as a means of teaching, delighting, and moving to virtuous action, as only life made into its great imitator, art, can.

Nor did the abuses of history and biography as well as the
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historical-biographical element in fiction escape the attention of artists who saw the community between the forms. The uproar over Colly Cibber's autobiography is one index of how seriously intelligent men took the function of private history. Attacks on sycophantic family histories common among hacks looking for patronage is another index. Likewise, Fielding's attack on the debasement of the historical ideal of the Great Man in *Jonathan Wild* indicates the links between biography and fiction: one of his chief purposes in that book is to use the two-edged sword of satire to right the madness of a world in which the lowest vice is accepted as the highest virtue whether it be in a real "Great Man" like Walpole or in a fictional one like Wild. And his means are those of the biographer-novelist with an ironic twist—the genealogy to provide guilt by association rather than, as in straightforward works, virtue by association; a record of the hero's growth and development to stress the sources of his vice in education and environment rather than his strengths of character; and an intimate look at his everyday activities, acquaintances, and motives to substantiate his vice rather than his virtue.

In *Pompey the Little*, Coventry also satirizes the contemporary practice of biography and of the biographical elements in fiction. His aim is not to ridicule their methods—the genealogy, the emphasis on the common man, the tracing of education and development, the realistic detail drawn from private life. Rather he attacks the misuse of these tools and the ends of those works which wallowed in the sensational and titillating to the exclusion of moral teaching while praising vice and passing it off as virtue instead of using
virtue and vice as moral instruments. Such at any rate seems the import of his defense of his subject early in the novel:

[No Exception can reasonably be taken against the Dignity of my Hero, much less can I expect any will arise against the Nature of this Work, which one of my Cotemporaries declares to be an Epic Poem in Prose; and I cannot help promising myself some Encouragement, in this writing Age especially, where no character is thought too Inconsiderable to engage the public Notice, or too abandoned to be set up as a Pattern of Imitation. The lowest and most contemptible Vagrants, Parish-Girls, Chamber-Maids, Pick-Pockets, and Highwaymen, find Historians to record their Praises, and Readers to wonder at their Exploits: Star Gazers, superannuated Strumpets, quarrelling Lovers, all think themselves authorized to appeal to the Publick, and to write Apologies for their Lives.

This then being the Case, I hope the very Superiority of the Character here treated of, above the Heroes of common Romances, will procure it a favourable Reception, altho' perhaps I may fall short of my great Cotemporaries in the Elegance of Style, and Graces of Language. For when such Multitudes of Lives are daily offered to the Publick, written by the saddest Dogs, or of the saddest Dogs of the Times, it may be considered as some little Merit to have chosen a subject worthy the Dignity of History.

Likewise in the novel's final chapter, Coventry again becomes explicit about his method, and again the irony reveals his criticism of contemporary biography and the biographical elements in fiction because of their debasement of the moral end of the biographer's art and their misuse of the novelist-biographer's tools:

Having thus traced our hero to the fourteenth year of his age, which may be reckoned the threescore and ten of a lap-dog, nothing now remains, but to draw his character, for the benefit and information of posterity. In so doing we imitate the greatest and most celebrated historians, Lord Clarendon, Dr. Middleton, and others, who, when they have put a period to the life of an eminent person (and such undoubtedly was our hero) finish all with a description of his morals, his religion, and private character: Nay, many biographers go so far, as to record the colour of their hero's complexion, the shade of his hair, the height of his stature, the manner of his diet, when he went to bed at night, at what hour he rose in the morning, and other
equally important particulars; which cannot fail to convey
the greatest satisfaction and improvement to the reader.
Thus a certain painter, who obliged the world with a life
of Milton, informs us, with an air of great importance,
'that he was a short thick man,' and then recollecting
himself, informs us a second time, upon mature deliberation,
'that he was not a short thick man, but if he had been a
little shorter, and a little thicker, he would have been
a short thick man!' which prodigious exactness, in an affair
of such consequence, can never be sufficiently applauded.
(180)

At first glance, both of the above quotations seem to attack the
habits and tools of contemporary biography and novel-biographies. A
closer look, however, reveals that Coventry is attacking the abuses:
writers who use common people who are scoundrels "to record their
Praises" or to make the reader "wonder at their Exploits"; biographers
who misuse the specifics of men and their lives to write gibberish
instead of allowing the moral import of the whole to govern the pre-
sentation of detail. Indeed, since Coventry himself follows the
patterns of contemporary biography and uses its tools, we would, were
he to condemn them, have a classic instance of the pot calling the
kettle black. Thus Coventry's quarrel with some biographers and novel-
ists is with their ends and with the uses to which they put their
tools.

Indeed, Coventry's means in Pompey are essentially those of Fielding
in Jonathan Wild. Most simply and generally, just as Fielding
ridiculed the debasement of the idea of the Great Man by rendering
the life of a criminal as though he were a Great Man, so Coventry's
basic tool is to drain his Great Man and hero of all humanity and make
him a dog who is nevertheless discussed as though he were a man. Thus,
in particular, Coventry's satiric argument runs: those whose Greatness
lies in a noble background like Pompey's, whose education has made them slaves to vanity and luxury, who are fortune's fool in their licentiousness, debauchery, and irreligion, and whose chief virtue is their ability to fetch and carry and to faun on others for their selfish wants are animals. When, for instance, Coventry reports Pompey's genealogy (out of Julio and Phyllis as a result of an amour which mirrors Julio's master's with Phyllis' mistress, a courtesan) (6-8), when he comments on his training as a Dog of Quality by Lady Tempest (32-33), catalogues his amours (33-35), and concludes the tale by drawing a character of Pompey's person, education, religion, politics, and old age in imitation of "the greatest and most celebrated historians" and "for the benefit and information of posterity" (180), he establishes an equation between dog and man which ridicules not only the folly of fashionable concepts of debased greatness but also the writings about the real and fictitious men which foster a like immorality.

And what is true of Pompey is also true of others in the story like Lady Tempest, Lady Betty Vincent, Hillario, Mr. Williams, and Jeremy Griskin, who are treated with the methods of mock-biography. Coventry, for example, devotes a whole chapter entitled significantly "The history of a highwayman" to the biography of Jeremy Griskin. In it, Coventry mocks a number of biographical conventions for a double purpose: to satirize Griskin through his own words as well as to ridicule a society that would accept a Griskin into its best circles. Griskin begins his story with his conception "under a hedge near Newberry in Berkshire" (85) which he glorifies by allusions to Alexander and Romulus. He details his education as a beggar, pick-
pocket, and sharper in the terms and tone of the education of a prince or great artist. He narrates his fall from fortune and his return to her good graces as though the first were as undeserved as an innocent's and the latter a product of genius cultivated on the Grand Tour.

Griskin's methods are those common to biography and to the biographical elements in fiction. Coventry's aims, are, however, quite different from Griskin's; far from justifying and elevating him, they reconvert his immoral use of the biographer's tools to the service for which they were intended: to delight us as we laugh at vice parading as virtue and to move us to drop out of that parade for the company of truly virtuous men whose lives are an example worthy of emulation—and of biography or novel.
CHAPTER II

The Printing History of Pompey the Little
and the Problem of Establishing a Copy-Text of the Novel

Pompey the Little appeared in five editions during Coventry's lifetime. As we noted earlier, three separate editions were issued in 1751. Although the last of these does not indicate on the title-page that it is the third edition, it is a complete resetting of the novel and thus properly constitutes a separate edition. In 1752, a fourth edition appeared (the third according to the title-page), and in 1753, a fifth edition (the title-page labels it the fourth). The three editions of 1751 are radically different from the last two, and, as we shall see, the last two differ from each other in a puzzling way. In this chapter, I shall examine Pompey the Little as a physical object. First, I present the printing history of the novel in order to establish the relationship among the five editions of it to appear during Coventry's lifetime. Then I discuss the problem of establishing a copy-text of the novel, that is, the version closest to the author's intention from which to make a modern edition of the work. This problem arises and is complex because the first four chapters of the fifth edition (the last to appear before Coventry's death) revert in large part to material from the first three editions, material revised in the fourth edition, that edition representing Coventry's most extensive revision of Pompey as a whole.

-70-
I have based my conclusions concerning the printing history of the novel solely on internal evidence. I have completely collated the five editions and in Appendix B present the substantive textual variants uncovered by that collation. I have not established a copy-text, because to do so is both unnecessary for my purpose in this dissertation and impossible on the basis of internal evidence alone. I attempt, however, to indicate the problems involved in fixing on one and suggest that the fifth edition is a likely candidate.

In this chapter, I use the following sigla to identify the various editions of Pompey:

- A— the First Edition of 1751
- B— the Second Edition of 1751
- C— the Third Edition of 1751
- D— the Fourth Edition, 1752 (the third according to the title-page)
- E— the Fifth Edition, 1753 (the fourth according to the title-page)

See Appendix A for the transcription of the title-pages of these editions.

A, B, and C are essentially the same book. To be sure, B lacks an engraved frontispiece and C uses a different one from that in A. But except for minor differences in typography and a low number of accidental variants, their texts are the same. A comparison of the three books reveals that B and C were each very probably set from A. In 145 instances, A and B correspond but vary from C. In 134 instances, A and C correspond but vary from B. In only 11 instances do B and C correspond but vary from A. In only three instances do A, B, and C not correspond. The number of variants is, then, low among the early printings of Pompey. Further, even the printing-house style of A has been carried over in large measure in B and C. Thus, the conclusion that both B and C were set from A seems certain.

The relationship of D and E to each other and between them and
earlier editions is more complex than the relationship of A, B, and C. D was quite probably printed from a new manuscript. It is replete with major and minor substantive variants, and even in those parts of the novel which Coventry preserved from the earlier version, it contains numerous accidental variants. The dedication is, of course, new; and as we noted earlier and will document later, Coventry made many revisions in D. E is essentially the same novel as D with one major exception, which greatly complicates the printing history of the novel. D and E vary accidentally in numerous instances (the first four chapters excepted for the present), but all are printer's errors or variants that point to differences in the printer's style, that of D corresponding generally with A and B, that of E following C.¹ Thus, all but Chapters I-IV of E were probably printed from D, but D and E also might have been printed from the same manuscript.

Chapters I-IV of E, however, revert to earlier editions and were quite probably set from a copy of C that had been corrected in minor substantive ways to correspond with D. The problem of determining the relationship between Chapters I-IV of E and the comparable sections of earlier editions is reflected in the list of variants in Appendix B.

Chapters I-IV of E were obviously not set from A or B; even more

¹D and E contain a very few variants (four) which might be classified as substantive variants, but they are not obviously substantive and might just as easily be called accidental variants (printer's errors or printer's corrections). For instance:

\[ D 248.26 \text{amoral and gents.' } J \text{and moral gents.' } E 156.5 \]

The reading in D makes no sense, and E corrects the sense. A conscious mind has made the change, but whether it was Coventry's or the printer's is impossible to say.
obviously, they were not set from D. In twenty-three instances, all accidentals, E agrees with C but varies from A and B. In five of the twenty-three, E and C correspond with D as well. Most puzzling, in three additional instances, two of them substantive, E agrees with D but does not correspond with C:

C 4.15-17 Fashion, on whom he depended for support, took up her favorite Lap-dog one Day and attempted D 6.6-8 and E 4.15-17

C 4.26-27 we shall not want examples in our own Days and Nations, or great Men's D 6.19-20 and E 4.26-27

Further, in fourteen instances, one of them substantive, E goes its own way, corresponding with no other version:

A and B 1.6-7 and C 1.4-5 if I should set myself to collect from D 1.6-7; if I were to collect from, E 1.4-5

Nevertheless, Chapters I-IV of E follow C closely: even the layout of E (justification, number of lines per page, and the like) follows C, and except in the examples cited above where E corresponds with D, the printing style of E regarding capitalization mirrors C as well.

Thus, while Chapters I-IV of E were quite probably set from C, the copy used had to have been revised, at times to make it correspond with D, at others to make it unique.

In the absence of external evidence, it is impossible to determine for certain whether Coventry is responsible for the revisions in Chapters I-IV of E. Thus, establishing a copy-text for a modern edition, were one to be brought out, would be difficult, unless, of course, some external evidence were uncovered—a flurry over piracy or an exchange of letters between Coventry and George Faulkner, the
publisher of E, discussing the changes, for instance. But in the absence of any external evidence to the contrary, I would argue that E be accepted as a copy-text for a modern edition, first, because it seems implausible that Faulkner, the publisher of E, would have made the kinds of changes in Chapters I-IV which that material reveals, and second, because the substitution of Chapter IV for the revised Chapter IV of D has artistic merit and— it strikes me— shows a concern for details that only an author would exercise.

It seems unlikely that Faulkner of his own accord would have made changes in Chapters I-IV of C to make the material there correspond with D before including it in E. It seems equally improbable that he would alter that material to make it unique. The changes do not seem to be the kind a publisher would bother with. To be sure, Faulkner may well have begun to print E from C before he knew of D or in order to save time and money; then, discovering the existence of D or wishing to claim E as a new edition, he may have revised the first chapters of E superficially to make them agree with D or to go their own way. The argument based on economy gains credence from the fact that E begins to follow D at signature Cl, a convenient place to break off the easy job of setting type from C (Faulkner's own early edition) and to begin the more onerous job of setting type from manuscript or from a new version (D) whose printing style differs from that of E. Yet both arguments seem unlikely when we consider, first, that E came out at least one year after D. D was published early in 1752.2 Thus for E to bear a publication date of 1753 as it does, it

2Scott, "Francis Coventry's 'Pompey the Little'," p. 217.
had to have been published about a year after D. Certainly Faulkner
would not have been ignorant of D's existence for that long. When
we note, further, that before setting Chapters I-IV of E from C,
Faulkner would have had to revise a good bit of the material before
including it in E, the conjecture that he set the material from C in
order to save time and money loses ground as does the conclusion that
Faulkner is solely responsible for the changes in E. No one who
initially wanted to save time and money by setting part of a book from
a printed copy whose printing style follows that of the new edition
being set is going to turn around and expend the time and labor nec­
essary to revise that material. In short, the very fact that Chapters
I-IV of C were revised to make them correspond with D or to be unique
suggests that Coventry, not Faulkner, was responsible for the changes.

Coventry's part in the revisions of Chapters I-IV of E can also
be argued on artistic grounds. There are six major substantive variants
in Chapters I-IV between D and E. The first five of these seem largely
gratuitous; but the sixth seems based on an artistic decision, the
kind with which only an author would be concerned and the kind with
which, as we shall see later, Coventry did indeed concern himself
repeatedly as he revised his novel.

The major differences in Chapters I-IV of D and E (as well as A,
B, and C) are as follows:

1. In Chapter I, D draws a comparison between the fondness of
Grecian ladies for their dogs and that of English women for theirs:

   And that the ladies of Greece had as great a fondness for
   them [dogs] as the fair ones of our own isle, may be collected
   from the story which Lucian relates of a certain philosopher. . . .

(6)
E, like A-C before it, draws the comparison between the fondness of Grecian women, on the one hand, and Grecian men, on the other, for dogs; or, if one chooses to exploit the ambiguity of the construction, the fondness of Grecian women for dogs on the one hand and men on the other:

And that the Ladies of Greece had as great a Fondness for them [dogs] as the Men, may be collected from the Story which Lucian relates of a certain Philosopher. . . .

(4)

2. Chapter I of E contains an allusion to Fielding which is omitted from D:

And as no Exception can reasonably be taken against the Dignity of my Hero, much less can I expect any will arise against the Nature of this Work, which one of my Contemporaries declares to be an Epic Poem in Prose; and I cannot help promising some Encouragement, in this Life-writing Age especially, where no Character is thought too inconsiderable to engage the public Notice.

(E, 5)

D has simply this:

And as no exception can reasonably be taken against the dignity of my hero, much less can I expect any will arise against the nature of this work, in this life-writing age especially, when no character is thought too inconsiderable to engage the public notice.

(8)

3. Chapter I of E is more extensive in its satire on Samuel Foote, the mimic, than is D:

Thus, I am told, that illustrious Mimic, Mr. F__t, when all other Expedients fail him, and he shall no longer be able to raise a Kind of Tax, if I may so call it, from Tea, Coffee, Chocolate, and Marriages, designs, as the last Effort of his Wit, to oblige the World with an accurate History of his own Life.

(E, 5-6)

In D we read:
And I am told that illustrious mimic, Mr. F...t, when all other expedients fail him, designs, as the last effort of his wit, to oblige the world with an accurate history of his own life.

(8-9)

4. Again in Chapter I, E excludes a swipe at contemporary novelists, Smollett and Cleland in particular, which had been added to D:

Even the Prisons and Stews are ransacked to find Materials for Novels and Romances. Thus, I am told, that illustrious Mimic, Mr. F...t... (E, 5-6)

Even the prisons and stews are ransacked to find materials for novels and romances. Thus we have seen the memoirs of a lady of pleasure, and the memoirs of a lady of quality; both written with the same public-spirited aim, of initiating the unexperienced part of the female sex into the hidden mysteries of love; only that the former work has rather a greater air of chastity, if possible, than the latter. And I am told that illustrious mimic, Mr. F...t... (D, 8-9)

5. In Chapter II, E contains a brief story about Julio, Pompey's father, which D excludes:

But Julio, the Father of my Hero, being a younger Brother of a numerous Family, fell to the Share of an Italian Nobleman at Bologna; from whom I heard a Story of him redounding so much to his Credit, that it would be an Injury to his Memory not to relate it; especially as it is the Duty of an Historian to derive his Hero from honourable Ancestors, and to introduce him into the World with all the Eclat and Renown he can.

It seems, the City of Bologna being greatly overstocked with Dogs, the Inhabitants of the Place are obliged at certain Seasons of the Year to scatter poisoned Sausages up and down the Streets for their Destruction; by which Means the Multitude of them is reduced to a more tolerable Number. Now Julio having got abroad one Morning by the Carelessness of Servants into the Streets, was unwisely tempted to eat of these pernicious Cates; which immediately threw him into a violent Fit of Illness: But being seasonably relieved with Emetics, and having a good Constitution, he struggled thro' the Distemper; and ever afterwards remembering what himself had escaped, out of Pity to his Brethren, who might possibly undergo the same Fate, he was observed to employ himself during the whole Sausage-Season, in carrying these poisonous Baits away one by one in his Mouth, and
throwing them into the River that runs by the City. But to return.

The Italian Nobleman above-mentioned had an Intrigue with a celebrated Courtesan of Bologna, and little Julio often attending him. . . .

(E, 7-8)

D reads simply:

But Julio, the father of my hero, being a younger brother of a numerous family, fell to the share of an Italian nobleman at Bologna; who was about this time engaged in an intrigue with a celebrated courtesan of the place. And little Julio often attending him. . . .

(11)

6. The most noticeable difference between D and E occurs in Chapter IV. What the chapter accomplishes in the two editions is basically the same, but in D the scene and the number of characters involved are different from those in E. In E, as in A-C before it, Pompey has recently arrived in England. His current master, Hillario, a young rake who has just completed the Grand Tour and is cutting quite a fashionable figure in town, receives a lady of quality, Lady Tempest, in his apartments. Pompey runs in as they are drinking chocolate and chattering about Italian opera. Lady Tempest, who has just lost her favorite spaniel as well as her husband, admires Pompey and wants to know where Hillario got him. He makes up a story about an illicit love affair in Bologna with a married woman, boasts of a duel between himself and her husband (which Hillario, of course, won), and tells her that Pompey was a gift from the lady, something to remember her by, after her husband's death, which necessitated Hillario's flight. Lady Tempest is quite amused and asks for the dog. But Hillario hesitates. The dog, he tells her, is, because of its history, sacred to love and must be the herald of love wherever he goes. The
lady insists, and so, after much coyness between the two, Hillario strikes a bargain: he offers her the dog in exchange for permission to visit Lady Tempest in her "retirements" from time to time. They quibble for a time over just what privileges Lady Tempest will exchange for the dog, and they indulge in some conversation "too loose" for Coventry to record (but he offers a précis!), after which Hillario gives her a box of rouge, and Lady Tempest snatches up Pompey in her arms before continuing her morning visits. Pompey has a new owner; Hillario has arranged an assignation.

In D, the situation and conversation are similar to those in E, but in D, Hillario is the visitor. He is calling on a nameless lady to whom Lady Tempest is also paying a visit. Between D and E there are minor changes in the dialogue, but no extensive revision.

The change in the comparison in the first variant listed above blunts the satiric point in E. In the context, both make sense and both are ironic. In E, Coventry is saying that the story from Lucian illustrates that Greek women loved their dogs as much as their men did (or as much as their men). And the story does just that. It is about a philosopher who picked up the lap dog of his patroness to kiss it and thus flatter her. The dog urinates in the philosopher's beard, and the sage is laughed at. In D, the same story illustrates that Greek women loved their dogs as much as British women do and for the same reasons: just as Greek women were flattered by the attention paid their animals or just as they used and abused their dogs as well as their men (subservient pets in their own way) for their own amusement, so do English ladies. But throughout the section of which the
comparison is a part, not only is Coventry taking pains to demonstrate through historical example ironically treated that a dog is a worthy subject for his book, but he is also satirizing modern foibles by drawing ironic parallels between ancient and modern idiosyncrasies. Thus, the revision in D is more in keeping with the context by extending and making obvious the satiric range of the anecdote from Lucian. Reverting to the early version in E limits the satire in the context for no apparent reason.

In electing not to print in D the mildly satiric reference to Fielding found in A-C, Coventry seems to be taking care not to offend the man to whom the new edition (D) is dedicated. Putting it back in E either involves Coventry in a contradiction, if not an act of ingratitude, or is none of his doing. Both conclusions receive support from the fact that later in D (Book II, Chapter I), Coventry chooses to exclude sections from A-C which are also not found in E and which could be construed as satire on Fielding's practice of prefacing the Books of Tom Jones with theoretical discussions. On the other hand, the reference to Fielding is by no means a personal attack. Indeed, the burlesque equation between Pompey and Fielding's Epic Poem in Prose reveals Coventry's own satiric intentions clearly by hinting at the serious purpose to which he is using his tale of a dog. Nevertheless, any argument justifying the reappearance of the reference to Fielding on artistic grounds is tenuous and certainly does not justify replacing Chapters I-IV of E with earlier material.

The contracted satire on the materials of contemporary novels and the expanded satire on Samuel Foote in E are also difficult to
account for on artistic and satiric grounds. Smollett's *Peregrine Pickle*
appeared in 1751; in fact, it was published on February 25, just
shortly after *A*. It too was a popular novel. In the phrase "the
memoirs of a lady of quality," few contemporary readers would have
missed the allusion to the memoirs of Lady Vane which make up part
of *Peregrine*. Readers would likewise have seen in the phrase "the
memoirs of a lady of pleasure" a reference to John Cleland's *Memoirs
of a Woman of Pleasure* (*Fanny Hill*), published several years before
Pompey first appeared. Thus, Coventry's revision of *D*, which appeared
about one year after *A*, suggests an attack on rivals to Pompey for
popularity. Also and more important, it gets off a fine barb, a most
appropriate one in the context, at the licentiousness of contemporary
writers and readers in general. For what reason, then, should the
satiric reference be removed in *E*? None that is certain.

Reverting in *E* to the more extensive satire on Samuel Foote is
not gratuitous because its attack on egocentricity and self-display
is fitting in the context. Indeed, it could be argued that removing
it from *D* was a mistake. But the attack on Foote having been removed
from *D*, it is puzzling to find it in *E* again because, as with the
Fielding material discussed above, a similar jab at Foote occurring
elsewhere in *A-C*, was taken out of *D*, but was not put back in *E* (see
*A*, 97; cf. *D*, 103). Coventry may have taken these references out
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4 Cleland's novel appeared in two volumes in 1748-49. It was
reprinted in a single volume in 1750, less than a year before *A*
either because he thought them too obscure or because he had some personal reason for not wishing to raise Foote's ire or because he wanted to prune. Then, between the publication of D and E, he may have wished to reaffirm his condemnation of Foote, but the possibility seems hardly sufficient warrant for replacing four whole chapters of the revised edition of Pompey with the first chapters of the earlier version.

The little story about Pompey's sire, Julio, which reappears in E is an obvious satire on rakes, particularly Italian rakes, based on a pun on "dog" and on an equation between dogs and their masters. It has a certain charm and in its own humorous way does redound "much to [Julio's] Credit" as well as introduces Pompey to the world with "Éclat and Renown." Further, it is part of Coventry's pervasive satire on contemporary conceptions of biography, which we discussed in Chapter I. In particular, it is a take off on the kind of "common man" biography espoused most notably by Dr. Johnson in Rambler, No.60. But considered in either light, the satire is a bit far-fetched and heavy-handed, indeed even cute. Like the material on Foote, which is put back in E, the story seems so much fat in a novel that Coventry took obvious pains to make leaner in D than in A-C.

Turning to the last of the six major revisions, we find, I think, the surest or at least the most reasonable and artistically valid evidence that Coventry is responsible for the revisions in E. The revision in Chapter IV of D is clumsy. Given that what the chapter accomplishes is the same in earlier editions as in D, no artistic or satiric reason for the change in scene and the addition of a character
seems to exist. After all, the new character does or says nothing distinctive; indeed, Coventry has for the most part merely taken lines from Lady Tempest and put them in the new character's mouth. The scene is still Hillario's and Lady Tempest's. They do all the important talking. Their immorality is the object of satire.

On the basis of my own interpretation of the bibliographical data, I suggest that Coventry quite probably saw that he accomplished what he wanted to in Chapter IV of the earlier version (A-C) and further that he did so more economically and precisely in that version than in the revision (D). When the opportunity for a new edition arose, he decided to substitute Chapters I-IV of his earlier version for the comparable material in D in order to correct his mistake. He made a few revisions in Chapters I-IV of C, the Dublin edition of his novel, to make much of the material there correspond with D, but in the process, either for Faulkner's convenience or in haste, he overlooked some revisions in D. And Faulkner, his Dublin publisher, to whom such a plan was amenable because he could with ease set part of the new edition from his own earlier printing, brought out the final edition of Pompey to appear during Coventry's lifetime.

In the absence of external evidence, it is finally impossible to determine with certainty whether Coventry is responsible for the changes in Chapters I-IV of E. Thus, settling on a copy-text for a modern edition of the novel, were one to be made, would become difficult at this point in the investigation of the printing history of Coventry's novel. E is, however, as I have argued, a likely candidate. But for my purposes in this dissertation, establishing a copy-text is not
necessary: we can discuss the evolution of a novel, particularly the changes between A-C and D-E, without fixing a copy-text. Nevertheless, the bibliographical problem is challenging and will certainly need further investigation before a modern text of *Pompey the Little* can be prepared. Should no external evidence be found, I would argue that E be used as a copy-text but that a full list of variants between D and E be provided. I do so because while E was the last edition of *Pompey* to appear in Coventry's lifetime and while it is, in one major way at least, a better book artistically than D, no sure evidence exists for the authority of E over D, that is, for accepting E as the version representing Coventry's last intention for his novel. And since such is the case, a reader of a modern edition should have the differences between D and E fully before him so that if he wishes he may either decide, in the absence of external evidence, which version is better, or pursue further the bibliographical problem involved. Also I argue that were evidence found which established the authority of E, the copy-text should be amended from D in instances of obvious carelessness in E, which is generally not as careful a printing job as D. The reverse also would hold if evidence were found that D is authoritative because as the list of variants in Appendix B shows, E corrects a few obvious printer's errors in D.
CHAPTER III

A Summary and Evaluation of the Major Revisions in *Pompey the Little*

I have noted repeatedly that *Pompey the Little* underwent many changes between the third and fourth editions (C and D). Because these changes are many, varied, and pervasive, evaluating their impact is difficult. But an estimate is possible, and in this chapter I shall offer one. I argue that the revised version of *Pompey* (D and E) is a better work of art than the early version (A-C). The first three editions were indeed, as Coventry himself admits in the dedication to the fourth edition (D), "hasty," not because they are carelessly printed (there are few egregious printer's errors in any edition of the novel), but because they lack the stylistic polish, the unity, the imaginative appeal, and the finer artistic management of the genre which characterize the later version. Indeed, the early version tends to be a series of situations and character sketches which, although lively and entertaining, do not form a tight whole, nor is each situation and character developed as fully and humorously as Coventry later demonstrated that it could be. In the last two editions, however, Coventry has honed sentences for economy and satiric punch. More importantly, he has chopped out some situations and characters while adding and developing others, changes which prove that he can not only tell a variety of stories but can infuse them with deeper moral and
human insight than the early attempt possesses. Further, although he does not succeed completely, he has attempted to impose a more clearly discernible unity on his novel than is present in the first version of it.

Before undertaking the proof of these contentions, I pause to summarize the ten areas of major change which Coventry made in his novel:

1. The six major substantive differences in Book I, Chapters I-IV of A-C, D, and E discussed in Chapter II of this dissertation.

2. Variants in the characterization and dialogue in the conversation between Lady Tempest, her physicians, and Lady Sophister (Book I, Chapter VII of all editions). In all editions the situation is the same: Lady Tempest, while being attended by her physicians, Doctors Killdarby and Rhubarb, receives a visit from Lady Sophister, a sophisticated impious intellectual. All editions contain basically the same character sketch of the two women. During the conversation among the ladies and the physicians, Lady Sophister turns abruptly to one of the physicians and asks if he believes in the immortality of the soul. Certain details of the debate which follows are different in A-C and in D and E, and the difference transforms Dr. Killdarby from a mouthpiece for Coventry in A-C into a jabbering sycophant in D and E. In A-C, he speaks for common sense and morality in opposition to Lady Sophister's impious illogic. He argues that "Common-sense, assisted by Revelation, is capable of attaining to all the Knowledge, that is of Use and Importance for us to Know; and whatever goes beyond
this, is but a specious learned kind of trifling. . ." (A, 65). In D and E, he joins in the gibberish: he speaks of quintessentia and inflammata anima, quotes authority, and generally gives Lady Sophister tit for tat (40-41). Likewise, before his departure in A-C, he chastizes Lady Sophister (A, 67); in D and E, he all but affirms her argument with his own illogic (42). Other changes are slight: certain details of the characterization of Lady Tempest and Lady Sophister differ in the two versions; D and E contain a bit of verbal slapstick abbreviated in A-C; and A-C closes with a little sermon cut from D and E.

3. Book I, Chapters IX and X of A-C have been almost completely rewritten in order to create Chapters IX-XI of D and E. In Chapter IX of A-C, a nameless family, whom Coventry dubs merely "Pretenders to High-Life," acquires Pompey after he is separated from Lady Tempest. Coventry satirizes the modish parents of this family as well as their children's tutor, Mr. Jackson, and the kind of education he provides. In Chapter X, Pompey goes to live with the husband's sister where he encounters a philosophical cat named Mopsa who persuades him to forsake his rakish ways and embrace the contemplative life.

Chapter IX of D and E differs from that in A-C. In it we still get thoroughly unflattering character sketches of Pompey's new owners. But the father and mother now have names, Captain Vincent and Lady Betty Vincent. They are still Pretenders to High-life, but Coventry has altered and added many details. In Chapter X, Coventry also includes

1 Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations from Pompey will be from E, the fifth edition, 1753. I shall indicate page numbers parenthetically in the text.
a quarrel between the Vincents and some low comedy involving a clyster solution not present in A-C. From the Vincents, Pompey goes to live with Lady Betty's mother, Lady Harridan, whose Methodism occasions satire in Chapter XI of D and E not included in A-C.

Although there are many points of contact between the two versions (Pompey's ill-treatment at the hands of the children, the circumstances leading to his removal from Mopsa's mistress's house and Lady Harridan's, for instance), Coventry has reworked this section of Pompey considerably in the revised version of his novel.

4. In D and E (Book I, Chapters XV-XVIII), Coventry includes extensive treatment of Pompey's adventures with a blind beggar. The chapters have no counterpart in A-C, where Coventry merely concludes Book I by telling us that Pompey was given to a blind beggar, was most unhappy in his fate, traveled to Bath with the beggar, and was again made subject to chance when the beggar died unexpectedly during the return trip.

D and E do not give the details of the trip to Bath, but once Pompey and his new master arrive there, Coventry relates their adventures in detail. Indeed, he adds much narrative material to Chapter XV of D and E not present in Chapter XIV, the comparable part of A-C, as well as three new chapters relating the adventures of Pompey and the beggar at Bath. Only then does he kill off the beggar and end Book I of D and E.

In the addition, Coventry introduces the beggar's children, Bess and Jack, and has the latter relate his rogue's progress at length. Further, Coventry includes satire on the fashionable spa and relates a
tale of Jack, his father, and Miss Newcome, Jack's rich fiancée. This new material constitutes the largest single addition in the revised version of the novel and is, as I shall argue later, much the best story-telling in the whole of Pompey.

5. Book II of A-C opens with "A Dissertation upon Nothing" not printed in D and E. Coventry openly admits in this chapter that he is borrowing the practice of prefixing an introductory chapter to the Book from Fielding. The substance of the chapter spoofs the cynicism of Rochester, who in his translation of the chorus from Act II of Seneca's Troades,² treated the subject quite seriously. After introducing his subject, he gives a catalogue of modern instances of Nothing. Then citing the time-honored maxim *ex nihilo nil fieri*, Coventry asserts that "Novelty, and a modish Love of Paradox" lead him to refute it. To do so, he makes an ironic survey of what passes around us in daily life. He then concludes by recommending that "that old erroneous Maxim of *Ex nihilo nil fit*" be altered to "*Ex nihilo omnia fiunt,*" which he takes to be "more consistent with Truth and the Reality of Things (A, 132-33)."

6. In the sequence of chapters involving the virtuous sisters Theodosia and Aurora (A-C, Book II, Chapters II-IV; D and E, II-III), Coventry omits the character of an aging, degenerate fop who seeks to make Aurora his fourth wife. He also rewrites much of the material involving Count Tag (another of Aurora's suitors) and Aurora's name-

less favorite. In particular, he has revised the character sketches of these men and, because of the omission of the aged fop, rewritten the dialogue among them and the sisters. In this dialogue, he has also included references to the story of Miss Newcome and Jeremy Griskin (Jack, the beggar's son) and to Lord Marmazet, the husband of Lady Marmazet, Miss Newcome's chaperone at Bath, not present in A-C.

7. The material concerning a milliner and the Fripperys (A-C, Book II, V-VIII; D and E, IV-V) is much condensed in D and E. A-C includes a history of the milliner, Sir Thomas Frippery's attempted amours with the milliner, and the Fripperys' adventures at and on the way home from breakfast at Ruckold House. All are absent from D and E. D and E retain the character sketches of the Fripperys and of Jack Chace, Miss Frippery's fiancé. All editions also contain scenes from the Fripperys' domestic life and the description of a drum (a kind of open house) at their rooms. Coventry has revised sentence structure, minor detail, and transitions in the material he kept in D and E from A-C; otherwise it is the same in all editions.

8. Coventry extensively revises the material involving the owner who replaces the milliner (Book II, IX of A-C; Chapter VI of D and E). In A-C, he is Lord Danglecourt; in D and E, he is Lord Marmazet. In place of Lord Danglecourt's contemptuous treatment of some petitioningburghers in A-C, Coventry includes extended characterization of Lord and Lady Marmazet and an episode detailing their matrimonial high jinks. Also, the encounter between a hack poet named Rhymer and the lord, his patron, is somewhat different in the two versions. Finally, D and E
give more detail about Mrs. Caryl, the lord's mistress.

9. Book II, Chapter XI of A-C, the episode dealing with Mrs. Qualmsick and her husband, has no counterpart in D and E. In its place (Chapter IX of D and E) is a meeting of poet Rhymer's cronies at a tavern. Satire on aberrant political, intellectual, and religious types replaces satire on hypochondria.

10. The chapters relating Pompey's adventures at Cambridge (A-C, Book II, XII-XV; D and E, XI-XIII) have been much rewritten and reordered in the revised editions. Pompey gets to Cambridge by different means in A-C and in D and E. In the former editions, he goes with young Qualmsick; in the latter, after spending a night in a bagnio with his new owners, he sets out to the university with one of the gentlemen, a student there, who stole him from the poet Rhymer. D and E omit the character of an ancient Doctor of Divinity and his encounter with some visitors to Cambridge. Finally, D and E include a medical experiment involving Pompey not present in A-C: Pompey is to be dissected alive but escapes in the nick of time. All editions include the character of the owner who succeeds the poet Rhymer (young Qualmsick in A-C; the young Cantab in D and E), the story of a joke he plays on a fellow student named Williams using Pompey, a character sketch of Williams, and Williams' encounter with some ladies who visit Cambridge.

One view of these major substantive changes in Pompey is that expressed by William Scott:

Coventry modestly remarks [in the dedication to Fielding] that he has sought to 'improve' his piece, but has in fact omitted some interesting chapters and added fresh ones which are in general neither better nor worse than those they replace. Since the novel in either form is just a collection
of sketches (the influence of the periodical essay is at times strongly marked), the question of unity of design does not arise."

Scott goes on to cite the episode with Mopsa the cat as "one regrettable omission." He laments the "heavy-handed facetiousness" of the genealogy but sees elsewhere "some attractively whimsical writing."

An approach like Scott's to the revision Coventry undertook has its merits and allows us to see that some revisions are not altogether successful but that others do indeed improve the novel. But Scott's approach is, I argue, finally frustrating and inadequate for judging the changes and their aesthetic significance. It implies taking up each change separately; and, assuming as Scott does that "the question of unity of design does not arise," it also means weighing and balancing each in almost total isolation from the work as a whole.

I prefer another approach which I think potentially more fruitful, one which will do more justice to Coventry as a conscious talent and to Pompey as a work of art. I assume that Pompey is not and probably never could be a brilliant, organically unified novel, that it is, rather, a flawed but competent attempt to write and then improve upon a new species of writing by a man well aware of some of the conventions of the new form. As a result, my approach asks that we view the changes made in the novel not as isolated revisions but as attempts to improve Pompey in light of those conventions upon which it draws as well as in terms of its own internal workings. I shall attempt to show that in a great many instances, Coventry revised in light of some principle
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or toward some artistic goal that justifies the revision not merely in its own terms but in view of some internal design (however incomplete or deficient) or some external convention. By viewing the changes Coventry made in these terms, I shall show that by and large he has "improved" his novel, particularly its unity, its use of conventional fictional and novelistic techniques, and its characterization.

To do what I have set out to do, I begin not at the beginning but in the middle of *Pompey* and stress first those things which Coventry added to the novel before taking up those things he altered or replaced in the revision. By adding the story of the blind beggar and his children at Bath (Book I, Chapters XV-XVIII of D and E), not only has Coventry fulfilled the potential of the situation and related a good story in the process, but also, and more importantly, he has exploited the adventure elsewhere to give the revised version of the novel a stronger note of unity than it has in the early editions. Nowhere in any edition of *Pompey* are a character and situation introduced and then dropped so quickly and summarily as are the beggar and his journey to Bath in A-C. In the early version, we find out only that a watchman gave Pompey to a blind beggar whose dog had recently died. Pompey laments his ill-fortune in a fairly long and inflated monologue, which includes some lines from *King Lear*. Coventry then notes that the beggar was not as impoverished as he might appear, for he got about four shillings a day and could afford hot meals. After relating the story about a crippled beggar at Hyde Park Corner, a story which implies that beggars are hypocrites, Coventry briefly summarizes Pompey's life with the beggar: a trip to Bath, a journey home, and the beggar's
death. He leaves all the details to the reader's imagination or hopes he "will be contented to pass over many of the Miseries which Pompey suffered in this wretched Service; for as we have a great Regard for his Memory, we cannot be supposed to dwell with any Pleasure on his Misfortunes" (A, 122). It is as though Coventry had run out of steam, space, or time. To be sure, glossing over the beggar and the adventures at Bath is no sin: in a novel as loosely structured as Pompey, Coventry is within his rights to develop characters and situations almost at will; and certainly, he manages his dismissal of the beggar smoothly enough so that we do not sense a gross lapse in the progress of Pompey's travels.

Yet when we see what Coventry has done with the same material when he revised, we recognize that he has enriched the tale greatly by drawing out the potential of the situation. We see the beggar at work, we meet some low-life types unlike any others in the novel, we hear a miniature rogue biography which amply demonstrates that Coventry was well acquainted with the conventions of the form, we encounter Bath in all its fashionable shallowness, and we become engaged in the pathetic drama of the beggar, his son Jack, and Miss Newcome, the unsuspecting prey of Jack's designs. Coventry has seen to it that the little family of outlaws engages our interest. Their rough good humor, blatant lawlessness, and conscienceless exploitation of each other and all within reach are fascinating because they appeal to some love of immorality (or amorality) and violence in us all— as long as the violence and outlawry are kept at a safe distance. Thanks to Coventry's irony, the beggar and his family come off finally as what
they are—self-deceived leeches whose lives hover every moment on the
verge of ruin because they have not the moral will to be anything but
charming, cynical parasites. But a father who constructs an argument
proving that his "honest" means of begging a living is more taxing and
thus more worthy than that of his fashionable children has appeal just
as does a daughter who shamelessly mooches money from her beggar father
to replenish her losses at cards or a son who brags about his conquests
with those so bored with their own money and position that they seek
titillation from liaisons with a cardsharper. The characterization and
the dialogue are at once engaging and edifying because the irony and
satire are at their best.

Coventry does a particularly good job at two points in this addition
to his novel: in Jack's autobiography and in the beggar's betrayal
of Jack's designs upon Miss Newcome. Ernest Baker has said that "the
drama of the highwayman, the blind beggar's son, passing himself off
at Bath as a person of quality and all but marrying Miss Newcome, with
the candid and caustic repartee, recalls Jonathan Wild, though the
cynical tone is very different from Fielding's profound irony." The
tone is indeed different, but Jack's history proves conclusively that
Coventry could manage well the conventions of rogue biography. Into
several lively chapters, Coventry has packed a model rogue biography.
Jack's history begins in medias res. Jack is at the top of one of the
revolutions on the wheel of fortune to which the rogue is perennially
subject: he is about to marry money. Such was not always his lot. In

"The History of the English Novel, V, 54."
a flashback related in the first-person characteristic of the picaresque, Jack tells of his precarious climb to "greatness." He was conceived under a hedge in Berkshire and spent his infancy strapped to his mother's back. With the determination of many a rogue, he "kicked himself free" and began his slow rise in fortune by exercising a penchant for petty larceny. In pert language that satirizes a number of social classes and institutions as well as comments ironically on his own values, Jack relates the adventures that led him to success and then to arrest, a near swing on the gallows, and transportation. Then thanks to his own roguish wit and a little help from his friends, he slowly reacquired his fortune until he arrived at that point where we become acquainted with him. Vulgar and immoral, he is an outlaw, but he is not malicious or evil. He and his story have a roguish charm typical of their kind, not a villainish malevolence.

What distinguishes his tale is not its originality but the specific life Coventry has given the genre in a contracted space, a carefully controlled point of view that permits Coventry's satiric blade to cut two ways, and a manipulation of situation and character that lends Jack's history a dramatic tension and interest like that found only in the best rogue biographies of the time. One cannot help being amused and fascinated by the concreteness of the story Jack tells his father and sister, a concreteness that interests us in Jack as a human type, even though it is eminently predictable to those with only a passing acquaintance with the genre and despite the fact that it reveals no character development in Jack. The details of his conception, birth, and infancy provide examples of the appeals of Jack's tale as does the
vignette about the young lady who has her gem-decorated shoes stolen and kisses the thief for his trouble. We know how Jack was dressed when he lost his fortune and of the significance he sees in his outfit. We hear about how he felt on the heath before becoming a highwayman and learn of his grief and relief as he is arrested, condemned, reprieved, and transported. Such details and others like them win Jack our interest and sympathy without allowing us to condone his actions or values.

And the effect suits well the general irony of Jack's tale. We must like him enough to accept his satire on the fashionable world. But we must also be objective enough about him to see his rise to "greatness" as a parody of the aspirations of a rising middle-class citizen as well as to pass adverse judgment on the looseness of his moral values. We can, however, go further in discussing the importance of point of view to the excellence of Jack's story and the Bath episode in general. Having established our acceptance as well as qualified approbation of Jack in the first-person narrative, Coventry continues to elicit both responses in the third-person narrative relating what happened when the beggar leaked Jack's identity and ruined his son's chances to marry well. From one point of view, when Jack and Miss Newcome encounter the beggar, we despise Jack for his treatment of his father. The very realism of the psychological motivation causes readers of the novel to condemn Jack's immoral self-seeking. We curse him at the same time that we pity the beggar. We also pity Miss Newcome, whose genuine charity to the unfortunate, however undeserving, multiplies our sense of just how potentially disastrous her
involvement with Jack is. From another point of view, when we learn that the beggar was having much fun during the encounter with Jack, Miss Newcome, and Lady Marmazet and when Coventry satirizes the polite world at Bath for their treatment of Jack and Miss Newcome after it learns that Jack is not what he appears to be, our sympathy or at least interest shifts to Jack. Jack's course of action in the face of polite hypocrisy, though doomed and conceited, wins our admiration. His spunk and indecorum, however, selfish, are what the monied but morally corrupt elite deserve.

From yet another point of view, we become involved with both Jack and his father when Jack confronts the beggar for revealing Jack's secret. The beggar let out the secret with the most natural of fatherly motives: he wanted to brag a bit about his boy who "made good." He is justly hurt and chagrined when he is caught in the act and his son's chances are ruined. Further, his son's wrath is, in light of the father's understandable but disastrous indiscretion, undeserved. Yet the beggar's spiteful reaction is likewise irrational and reveals a moral shallowness in the father equal to the son's.

In sum, careful manipulation of point of view, character, and situation results in a dramatic tension and a psychological realism unique in Pompey. Types and convention go beyond mere flat imitation and gain a complexity which outgrows the calculated moral judgments generally invited by satire without abandoning them completely. The story of Jack, his father, and Miss Newcome comes closer to serious drama than anything else in Pompey. Coventry finally treats the situation moralistically (Miss Newcome escapes and Jack and the beggar
get what they deserve), but he does not do so without first involving us in compelling satiric drama.

Having done a particularly good job of writing in the sequence of episodes at Bath, Coventry does not push these events to the side but uses them in what appears to be an attempt to create a stronger note of unity (in one sense of the term at least) for his novel. And he does so in two basic and obvious ways. After closing Book I of D and E with the Bath episodes, he eliminates the "Dissertation upon Nothing" from the beginning of Book II and immediately introduces more about the beggar's death. He then puts Pompey almost immediately in the hands of Theodosia and Aurora, who are just returning from Bath. I have suggested above that choosing not to print the "Dissertation upon Nothing" probably stemmed from a desire not to offend Fielding, to whom the revised novel is dedicated. It also has the effect of binding the Bath episodes closely to what is to come. And the bond is important, not only because Theodosia and Aurora are on their way home from the spa but because to the conversation between the sisters and Count Tag, Coventry adds a reference to Lady Marmazet, Miss Newcome's chaperone, and a discussion of the episode involving Miss Newcome and Jeremy Griskin, the beggar's son. In addition, Count Tag supposedly received correspondence, not from Lord Monkeyman as in A-C but from Lord Marmazet in D and E concerning the season at Bath, and he is acquainted with Lady Marmazet. Thus, the chapters closing Book I and opening Book II are given a continuity in the revision not present in the original. More interestingly, the episodes begin to cling together in a way unique in Pompey: a community of characters and events begins
to emerge. And when Pompey leaves Theodosia and Aurora, Coventry does not ignore the germ of a community. After relating Pompey's adventures with the milliner and the Frippery family, he returns in D and E to members of the Bath community by introducing Lord and Lady Marmazet once again and by pointedly reminding his readers that these are folks we have heard about before. To make the connection, Coventry changes Lord Danglecourt to Lord Marmazet, rewrites the episodes involving him in minor ways, and adds a fresh series of encounters between him and Lady Marmazet. We had found out some things about Lord and Lady Marmazet in the Bath episode and we had heard brief mention of them in the chapters involving Theodosia, Aurora, and Count Tag. The couple is now given extended treatment. Thus, what began at Bath is carried into other parts of the novel—first, by having Lord and Lady Marmazet show up briefly in the Theodosia and Aurora episode and by having the Miss Newcome-Jeremy Griskin incident mentioned; second, by rewriting the Lord Danglecourt scenes in A-C to involve again and to develop further Lord and Lady Marmazet.

Through these revisions a kind of incipient unity begins to emerge. No longer does Pompey appear to be a loosely connected series of episodes joined ingeniously but almost haphazardly. Rather, Coventry seems to be tying episodes together so that some narrative continuity becomes apparent. To be sure, it is easy to overstate the case; and thus, we must be careful not to equate what Coventry is doing with what Fielding, for instance, does in Joseph Andrews or Tom Jones. Much of what goes on in Pompey is still, even in its revised form, what Scott calls it—"a collection of sketches." Yet, the revisions which
tie the Bath episode, the Theodosia-Aurora episode, and the Lord and
Lady Marmazet chapters together do represent one of those attempts
by Coventry, which I spoke of earlier, to revise his novel in light
of existing novelistic conventions. Coventry has, I maintain, revised
his novel in order to make its design partake, however incompletely,
of a kind of unity we recognize as novelistic in a traditional sense.
Instead of a loosely connected series of episodes, he has begun to
fashion an ongoing story in which groups of characters are acquainted
with, and comment on, each other. Such revision can be seen as a pre­
lude to fundamental thematic and ideological connections among char­
acters and events. Thus it represents if not an improvement in Pompey,
at least evidence that Coventry was learning his craft and beginning
to see, as well as manipulate, those techniques which were and would
continue to be the stock in trade for the practitioners of a new form.

What gives more force to the revisions that suggest a push toward
discernible unity is that they do not exist in isolation. They com­
plement other devices which are present in all editions of Pompey
and which point to Coventry's desire to write something besides a
series of character sketches and comic situations. The first of these
is Pompey himself, that ever-present "object" which lends a cohesion,
however superficial, to the episodes of the tale. We must note that
in the revision, Coventry personifies him less than in the original;
he treats him more as an animal and less as a creature with such
human capabilities as rational choice and judgment or thought about
his condition. The purpose and value of this will be discussed later.
For the time being, suffice it to say that despite the decreased
emphasis on Pompey as a creature capable of human reactions in the
revision, the dog in all editions acts as a minimal link between all
the episodes of the novel. Coventry may ignore him for chapters at a
time, but he never forgets him. When it is time to move on to new
characters and adventures, Pompey is always there to move us along.
Thus, without being a fully realized character like Tom Jones, he acts
as a central unifying device, much as does the central character of what
we usually consider more accomplished fiction than Pompey.

The overall structure of the novel also complements the revisions,
discussed above, which bolster unity. The novel, in effect, comes full
circle in all editions. Well born, Pompey continues in fashionable
surroundings after his arrival in England. From Hillario, he is passed
to Lady Tempest, with whom he is happiest and by whom he is best cared
for. In all editions, as Pompey suffers change upon change of fortune,
Coventry does not allow us to forget Lady Tempest. Pompey repeatedly
laments his separation from her lavish attention, wishing in his darkest
moments to be returned to her; or he compares new surroundings with
those at Lady Tempest's and evaluates them according to her standards.
Finally after eight years of being passed from owner to owner, he is
returned to Lady Tempest's home, where, like some returned Ulysses, he
lives out his last days in peace and comfort. Minimal though it is, the
pattern of the circular journey is there, imitating the pattern followed
by any number of wandering heroes in epic and novel as well as lending
a more solid structural unity to Pompey than first appears.

By discussing those changes in Pompey that tend to make it a more
unified piece of fiction in the revision than in the original, we have
gone a certain distance in seeing that Coventry's revisions "improve" the novel. We can go still further by discussing how the changes Coventry made complement the way the novel operates in and of itself and by viewing the changes in light of the literary traditions upon which Coventry drew when composing *Pompey*. Immediately, however, we encounter a basic question: how best do we describe the way *Pompey* operates and what are the literary traditions upon which Coventry drew? And the answer is, of course, the one we arrived at in Chapter I. *Pompey* is a composite of a number of literary traditions adapted to Coventry's own particular subject, mode of expression, and organizational pattern, while it is also a series of stories and sketches bound loosely but discernibly together by a variety of technical and thematic means. It is at once a law unto itself as well as a picaresque novel (minus many a picaresque element); a series of Prose Characters much in debt to the periodical essay and the tradition of the Theophrastan Character in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but a series bound together in narrative form rather than presented as small, single units; a story using a non-human subject as an obvious satiric device, but unlike its predecessors and descendents using third- instead of first-person narration; and a novel in debt particularly to Fielding but without a developing hero and inferior in artistic technique and human insight.

With this description in mind, we are now in a position to discuss how a number of revisions improve the novel as a law unto itself and how Coventry adapted his novel's antecedents to his artistic ends with greater skill and polish in the revision than in the original. Once again, rather than dealing with individual changes as they are better
or worse in themselves or as they reflect the influence of a particular
literary tradition, I wish to pursue a general argument emphasizing
the tendencies of a number of major revisions. And I propose that
given the general drift of the revisions and some of the critical com-
ments in the dedication to Fielding, Coventry indeed saw that he was
not writing a bildungsroman or a picaresque novel, that he was not
writing an animal-as-persona story on the model of Le Sage or the Tatler.
Rather, he recognized that he was a master of combining Prose Characters
with action and dialogue in narrative and should stick to and play up
and improve upon what he was best at as well as what constituted the
principal method of his story. Yet, by the very nature of the novel
Coventry had to revise, he could not eliminate, indeed would not want
to do away with the picaresque elements or those touches borrowed from
first-person animal narratives; nevertheless, he might well polish his
use of them in the revision so that they fit less awkwardly with his
design and method.

We have already seen a chief instance of what I am talking about
in the 3ath episodes added to Book I of D and E. Coventry saw an
opportunity to develop the character of the beggar, and in the process
not only gave us several nicely drawn types but worked in a model
rogue biography and some of the best dramatic writing in any edition
of the novel. He used his obvious talent for creating character and
drew upon popular and well-established literary convention to fulfill
the potential of his novel. And knowing what his book would bear, he
made the addition smoothly and unobtrusively, as well as using it in
later chapters as a unifying device. Instances of a slightly different
order occur elsewhere. They fall into three categories: first, Coventry is moralistic less often in the revision than in the original and thus gives more emphasis to the comic complexity of his material; second, he revises his characterization of Pompey so as to improve the use of the dog as a fictional and satiric device; third, he reworks characteriza-

In the dedication to Henry Fielding, which first appeared in the revised edition of 1752 (D), Coventry makes a comment which suggests that he had discovered that the sermonizing and overt didacticism occasionally found in A-C did not make for the best fiction:

To convey instruction in a pleasant manner, and mix entertainment with it, is certainly a commendable undertaking, perhaps more likely to be attended with success than graver precepts; and even where amusement is the chief thing consulted, there is some little merit in making people laugh, when it is done without giving offence to religion, or virtue, or good manners. If the laugh be not raised at the expense of innocence or decency, good humour bids us indulge it, and we cannot well laugh too often.

(D, iii-iv)

Beginning with the traditional teach-and-delight formula, Coventry, with some qualification, modifies the doctrine so that delight gets more emphasis. The shift in emphasis hints that as Coventry revised Pompey, he had discovered how to make the novelist and satirist in him triumph over the clergyman and made changes which soften the preaching as well as enhance the human complexity and subtlety of his comic materials.

Two obvious instances of this tendency occur in Book I. The first is found in the conversation between Lady Sophister and Doctors Rhubarb and Killdarby at Lady Tempest's house. In the summary of
major changes above, I noted that Dr. Killdarby comes off much better in A-C than in D and E in the argument with Lady Sophister. In the early editions, Dr. Killdarby is the voice of common sense and morality speaking for Coventry himself against the intellectual pride and irreligion of Lady Sophister. He in effect preaches to her, and his sermon explicitly establishes the norm by which we are to judge the lady and her arguments. In opposition to her argument, which is based on cultural relativism and denies the immortality of the soul, Killdarby posits the standard Anglican position which takes cultural relativity into account but argues that "the concurrent Opinions of all Mankind have ever agreed in believing the Immortality of the Soul, and there never was any Nation so barbarous in Ignorance, or so depraved by Superstition, as to be without, or doubtful of this fundamental Article of all Religion. They may have differed, perhaps, in their Notions of the nature of a Future State; but the main Article, the first Groundwork of the Question has ever been the same" (A, 65). Lady Sophister, of course, misses the point entirely and proceeds to argue against the immortality of the soul by attempting to establish the premise that a belief is true if a great number of people hold it. But her means is contradictory to the ends she desires: she seeks to get the physician to admit that because Indians believe that their dogs accompany them to heaven and because there are more Indians than Europeans, therefore dogs accompany their masters to heaven. When Lady Sophister asks Killdarby what he has to say to that, he gives up in the face of such folly: "the Reply would be easy enough; but I am sorry to hear your Ladyships talk so loosely on so serious a
Subject; tho' I confess it is not a new thing to me, for I have been present in many Companies of late, where the weakest Argument, and most wanton Raillery against Religion have been received with Applause" (A, 67).

The didacticism of Dr. Killdarby's remarks is obvious and indeed somewhat heavy-handed, as are Coventry's remarks at the conclusion of the chapter in which the exchange takes place. After a disclaimer that any ridicule of Locke and others was intended, Coventry sharply criticizes the Lady Sophisters of this world: he announces that his ridicule "was designed to expose the Folly and Impiety of modern Wits, who dare to think Religion a proper subject of Ridicule; and principally, to explode the Vanity of Women's pretending to Philosophy, when neither their Intellects, or Education qualify them for it. Beauty is no Excuse for Infidelity, and when they have so many other Arts to gain Admirers, one would think they need not be driven to dispute against the Immortality of the Soul" (A, 68).

Such overt intrusions are certainly helpful in establishing the "ought to be" of Coventry's satire and in determining his general moral position. But when we consider that elsewhere Dr. Killdarby is not so worthy a character as his sermon to Lady Sophister would lead us to believe and when we compare the original with the revision, we see that the revisions not only make the Doctor a more consistent character but also increase the satiric range of the whole argument. Before Dr. Killdarby makes his fine speech in A-C, he manifests some intellectual pride of his own. When asked by Lady Sophister if he has read Locke's controversy with the Bishop of Worcester, he fakes
erudition: "'I protest I am not sure—Mr. Locke's controversy with the bishop of Worcester! Let me see, I vow I can't recollect—My reading has been very multifarious and extensive—Yes, madam, I think I have read it, tho' I protest I can't be sure whether I have read it or no'" (A, 62). And as the Doctor leaves, Coventry emphasizes that he was not too put off by Lady Sophister's immorality to forget the fee for his quackery.

In the revision, as noted earlier, Dr. Killdarby, like his colleague Dr. Rhubarb, joins in the madness and becomes a satiric object in his own right by shoveling up great heaps of opinion on the nature of the soul. His intellectual pride is as obvious and wrong-headed as Lady Sophister's: he may hold the proper belief, but his defense demonstrates that he holds it for all the wrong reasons, indeed for no very sure reason at all, and that he is as much a slave to his own passions as Lady Sophister. Thus is the character of Killdarby made consistent with itself; thus too is the satire made more complex. To be sure, the tone is darker in the revision than in the original, but instead of a right confronting and exposing a wrong, two wrongs prey on each other with the norm lurking just at the sidelines, there for the alert reader who does not need to be beaten over the head with a moral.

Much the same is true of the commentary which closes the chapter in A-C but which Coventry removed from D and E. In the revision, Coventry allows the characters to speak for themselves, to teach by first being amusing and without heavy authorial intrusion. And yet to make sure we do not miss the point and doubtless to have some witty
fun, Coventry changed the introduction to the argument between Lady Sophister and the physicians just as he changed the conclusion. Instead of a mock apology for trying his readers' patience with yet another conversation, he confidently introduces a comparison between the conversation to come and a theatrical interlude or dramatic relief. And he leads the reader to take what is to come in just the right way by defining implicitly what he means by "interlude" in slanted terms: "Nothing is more common on the stage, than to suspend the curiosity of an audience in the most interesting scenes of a play, and relieve them (as it is called) with a dance of ghosts, or devils, or furies, or other out-landish beings" (36). His plan is to imitate this "laudable custom," and thanks to his diction and the off-color pun, we know that we are to be on our guard for "out-landish beings" who will speak nonsense and vain immorality of various kinds and degrees.

We find a distillation of satire and craft through decreased emphasis on the overt statement of a moral position similar to the above when Coventry deletes the scene involving Mopsa the cat and substitutes "A stroke at the methodists." Delightful as Pompey's adventures with Mopsa are, they repeat a joke Coventry has already used, they do not contain the yoke between episodes that Coventry effects in the revision, and they are only mildly satiric, almost cute, and overtly didactic by comparison with what replaces them. Mopsa's genealogy, upon which Coventrylavishes much attention, is ingenious and makes a hit on lint-picking scholarship, but it is essentially a repetition of the treatment Coventry gave Pompey's lineage earlier. In addition, the episode diverts attention from
Pompey's owners, the object of satire everywhere else in the novel, and places it upon animals thinly disguised as humans. In the revision, however, Coventry keeps our attention squarely on the follies of Pompey's owners; and by having Lady Betty Vincent appear in the midst of her mother's gathering of Methodists, he accomplishes a tighter transition between the episodes at the Vincents and those at Lady Harridan's. The difference between the original and the revision also allows Coventry to develop Lady Betty's character further and to add a new type in Lady Harridan, the aging convert to a fanatical sect.

Most importantly, the satire (if we can even call it that) involved in Pompey's relationship with Mopsa is mild-mannered and obviously designed to show how an advocate of the contemplative, stoic life instructs a devotee of the active, rakish life to shun the vanities of the fashionable world and to accept a life of temperance and right reason. But Pompey's reform is so short-lived that his conversion seems an episode included solely for its teaching function. The norm which offers an alternative to a life subject to the rule of fortune is there, but it is obtrusive. By comparison, the satire on dissenters is pointed and rigorous. It lends complexity and realism to the controversy between the active and contemplative life and adds a new satiric target, what Coventry as a good, conservative Anglican saw as an anti-rational, superstitious devotion to the efficacy of subjectivism in religion. Instead of teaching in simple story-book fashion that the contemplative life of reason and the restraint of passion is superior to an active life on the wheel of fortune, the revision juxtaposes Lady Harridan's active life of debauchery with her contemplative
life of rationalization and shallow spirituality. In turn, her daughter's flippant devotion to her own wickedness is set together with the hypocrisy of her mother, the other converts, and Whitefield. A norm is still there, but it is not presented by a neat, simplistic contrast. We have to work to discover a complex satiric "ought to be" which accepts no easy pronouncement regarding the relationship between activity and contemplation. And in the process we see Methodism treated with the uproarious scorn which had become commonplace among traditionalists by the time Coventry was writing. By deciding not to take the road of easy didacticism in his revision, Coventry has, in short, increased the satiric, dramatic, and substantive possibilities of his novel. By replacing mere charm with meaty satire, he has also come closer in the revision than in the original to writing sophisticated, morally complex fiction on a par with that by the best of his contemporaries, particularly his mentor, Fielding.

The elimination of the Mopsa episode also provides a chief instance of a second major kind of revision which Coventry undertook. The changes in this category have to do with Pompey as a character, and in general, they lead to the conclusion that Coventry sought to be more restrained about how he used the dog in the revision than he was in the original. On several occasions we have noted that in the revision, Coventry is less concerned with personifying Pompey overtly. These instances are not numerous and Coventry has by no means done away completely with presenting Pompey as a thinly disguised gentleman-about-town, conscious of social position and devoted to luxury. Indeed much of the wit and charm of the novel stems from just such an equation.
Thus evaluating those changes which put less emphasis on Pompey's human attributes is difficult. Yet eliminating the Mopsa episode or otherwise revising the details which personify Pompey deserves some commentary. On the one hand, decreased personification of Pompey reflects a tendency to be less cute, melodramatic, and repetitious about Pompey's character in D and E than in A-C. On the other hand, it suggests that while Coventry wanted to use Pompey as a picaroon-like satiric device, he could not present him as a persona or a developing character without writing a very different novel. We have already seen, for instance, that the Mopsa episode in its fable-like simplicity is not as effective as the satire with which Coventry replaced it. It is, indeed, unique and somewhat out of keeping with the approach Coventry uses throughout the novel. And it is inappropriate not only because Coventry employs in it the kind of writing we usually associate with children's story books but also because in it Coventry seems headed in a direction he follows nowhere else so obviously. In the Mopsa episode, he toys with making Pompey a developing character who sees the errors of his ways, forms a relationship on a moral basis, and embraces a life of reason and restraint.

Hand in hand with the exclusion of the Mopsa episode goes another change. At the end of Book I, immediately after the watchman has given Pompey to the blind beggar, Coventry records Pompey's "desponding meditation." In A-C only, Pompey concludes his cursing of the beggar and his own fortune with a reference to Mopsa which alters the entire import of the "speech":

But when the first Emotions of his Grief were a little calmed, he began to call in the Aids of Philosophy; the many
useful Lessons he had learnt from the sage Mopsa, inspired him with Resolution; and he fortified himself besides, with remembering a speech in King Lear, which he had formerly heard at Drury-Lane Playhouse.—

To be worst,
The lowest, most dejected thing of Fortune,
Stands still in esperance, lives not in Fear.
The lamentable Change is from the best,
The worst returns to Laughter. Welcome then
Thou unsubstantial Air, which I embrace;
The wretch, that thou hast blown unto the worst.
Owes nothing to thy blasts.
(A, 120)

Like the Mopsa episode, this paragraph, which recalls it, endows Pompey with rational, moral faculties. For two brief moments Pompey is what he is nowhere else in the novel—a being capable of change instead of a creature merely subject to it. The inconsistency is jarring, and I argue that Coventry quite possibly saw that it did not fit with his general use of Pompey as the occasion for satire on the "dogs" about whom we read in novels or on his various owners. Pompey is not a changing, growing hero whose development provides a humanistic model of behavior; thus those episodes dealing with him as such had best be eliminated. And eliminate them is precisely what Coventry did in the revision.

That Coventry wished to treat Pompey less seriously and more consistently in the revision than in the original gains credence when we look at a point of contact between the two versions. In A-C, Pompey is tossed out of Mopsa's mistress's house because he defecated on Baker's Chronicles while trapped in a closet. In D and E, he loses his home with Lady Harridan after "doing his occasions" on Whitefield's memoirs. But Coventry does not leave the joke there in the revision:

Whether this was done to express his contempt of the book, or merely from a incapacity of supressing his needs, is
hardly possible for us to determine; tho' we are sensible how much it would exalt him in the reader's esteem, to ascribe it to the former motive; and indeed it must be confessed, that his chusing to drop his superfluities on so particular a spot may very well countenance such a suspicion; but unless we had the talents of AEsop, to interpret the sentiments of brutes, it will for ever be impossible to come at the truth of this important affair.

By discussing Pompey's motives in the revision, Coventry adds humor to the situation; by choosing to be evasive about those motives, he not only practices a rhetorical trick familiar to readers of Fielding, but he also underscores a desire to de-emphasize Pompey as a fable-like persona whose recognition of the folly around him leads him to comment on it in a way which reflects Coventry's position. Coventry is his own persona; Pompey is not, nor could he be without much restructuring of the novel.

The other instances in the revision of decreased emphasis on Pompey's human attributes are not so easy to account for nor so interesting novelistically as the above. But they suggest that when he revised, Coventry was more aware of how he wanted to use and legitimately could use Pompey to make him an effective satiric device by allowing him to partake of the tradition of the fable without letting the fable get out of hand. Two of these revisions deny Pompey attributes which a dog could not possibly possess unless he were a character in a fable. The first concerns his love of Garrick's acting, of masquerades, and of Italian opera, which, Coventry tells us, he had some excuse for admiring because, unlike Englishmen, he could understand it: he had been born in Italy and was thus acquainted with the language (A, 52). The second has Lady Tempest assuming the
expense of having him taught to play cards. "And forward was his Genius, that in less than three Months he was able to sit down with her Ladyship to Piquet, whenever Sickness or the Vapours confined her to her Chamber" (A, 54). The changes occur close together in a section outlining how Pompey came to know "all the joys and vanities of the town." Unlike other details with which Coventry attributes human abilities and feelings to Pompey, these personify the dog excessively. Elsewhere, especially in the revision, Coventry seeks to keep the distinction between dog and man firmly intact. For instance, he frequently relies on hypothetical constructions to convey Pompey's initiation into the vanities of the beau monde—if he could have spoken, he would have used certain fashionable phrases; if he had gone to Bath or Tunbridge, he would have written back thus and such to friends. In the instances cited above, however, the distinction between Pompey as beast and Pompey as man becomes fuzzy. Thus by eliminating excessive personification of Pompey in the revision, Coventry softens what comes close to being silly and overdone in the original. At the same time, those personifications of Pompey which Coventry retains in the revision comment on human pretension without seeming indiscriminately ingenious.

In two additional instances, Coventry deletes material which hammers home Pompey's position as a play thing of fortune. The first is a bit of transitional material in A-C which introduces the episode in which Pompey is separated from Lady Tempest in St. James Park. It foreshadows Pompey's impending bad luck. The revision just begins to relate the events which will part Pompey and Lady Tempest for eight years. The second occurs in the watchhouse and consists of a short,
inflated monologue by Pompey bemoaning his fate: "How deplorable, thought he, is my Condition, and what is Fortune preparing to do with me? Have I not already gone through Scenes of Wretchedness enough, and must I again be turned adrift to the Mercy of Fate? What unrelenting Tyrant shall next be my Master? Or what future Oyster-woman shall next torture me with her Caresses? Cruel, cruel Fortune? when will my Persecution end?" (A, 112). The revision substitutes a dig at the readers, suggesting that they know how unfortunate Pompey was because they had themselves spent some time in the watchhouse. References (and there are many) to Pompey's spin on the wheel of fortune are certainly necessary. They are consistent with those picaresque elements in the novel. They also contribute to one of the novel's major themes which posits as a satiric "ought to be" a moral position denying the necessity of change and offering a life governed by reason and will in its stead. But Coventry seems to have had the good sense not to overdo a good and necessary thing. In the first instance, he has allowed the novel to do the work that his transition does, to dramatize theme through Pompey's adventures rather than attempting to set up a dog as a blatantly allegorical type. In the second, he substitutes a subtle parallel between the reader's immoral life in the thrall of fickle fate for melodramatic exclamations by a will-less creature caught in a bad situation through no fault of his own.

Admittedly, we cannot press Coventry's revisions in Pompey's characterization too far. But we can affirm, I think, that in the revision, Coventry was more studious than in the original to tread a
thin line between attempting to use his hero with satiric effectiveness and artistic control and giving in to the temptation of cute ingenuity or making him bear a weight he could not appropriately assume. We need not, however, be as cautious about another major area of revision. Repeatedly, Coventry revised the major concern of his novel, the gallery of characters who are finally his subject. These revisions improve on an already sound job. Some are slight, others extensive; but all point to a desire to provide his characters with greater vividness and economy in the revision than in the original and thereby distill their satiric power.

So numerous are these changes that I cannot hope to deal with them all. Rather, I have selected several major changes and a few minor ones to illustrate the general patterns followed. Before doing so, however, I wish to look again at Coventry's dedication to Fielding, where we find a statement of theory relevant to the kinds of revisions under discussion.

In the dedication, Coventry defends Fielding as superior to Marivaux. The terms of the defense plainly show that Coventry saw characterization as the core of good fiction. He writes that Marivaux's "characters fall infinitely short of those we find in the performances of his English cotemporary [sic] [Fielding]. They are neither so original, so ludicrous [sic], so well distinguished, nor so happily contrasted as your own: and as the characters of a novel principally determine its merit, I must be allowed to esteem my countryman the greater author" (D, x). We see, as Coventry doubtless did, that the characterization in Pompey is different in important ways from
Fielding's: put simply, Fielding creates characters which develop and/or grow out of the narrative; Coventry by and large writes Characters, static, "humorous" types which he then exemplifies in dialogue and action. Yet Coventry sees the importance of character; he knows that characterization must be "original," "ludicrous," "well distinguished," and "happily contrasted." A goodly number of changes in Pompey were made so that the characters fulfill these criteria more successfully in the revision than in the original.

One such is the extensive revision which produced Captain and Lady Betty Vincent and Lady Betty's mother, Lady Harridan. In the original, these are nameless types given little or no dramatic life through dialogue and action. Captain Vincent is merely the son of a wealthy city trader who gives in to the social-climbing impulses of his rather stupid wife; they are types of the rising middle class who made pretensions to position and class with but money to back them up. We hear nothing from the husband and witness only one instance of the wife's mental vacuity, her interview of her son concerning his syntax. Likewise, Lady Harridan is, in the original, not Lady Betty's mother and the occasion for satire on Methodism, but the nameless husband's sister, a kindly woman who appears only to remove Pompey to live with her when she sees how badly he is treated by her brother's children. In the revision, all three characters become distinct, vivid types, thoroughly characterized through description and dramatization. Captain and Lady Vincent are still pretenders to high life, but not because they are members of the new rich. Rather, they are a part of the old gentry, living beyond their
means. Captain Vincent, having married for money, has proceeded
to make the most of it by becoming a conceited dandy, a ladies' man,
and a coffee house habitué. Lady Betty is a coquette who married to
spite her family when her charms began to fade.

Coventry not only presents the portraits of this not so loving
couple but also characterizes them first through their servants (the
episode involving Lady Betty's servant, Mrs. Abigail Minikin, and the
clyster basin), then through their quarrel concerning their daughter's
removal to Lady Harridan's, and finally through Lady Betty's encounter
with Lady Harridan and her Methodist friends. What began in the origi-
nal as a delightful outline of a modish young couple with some satire
on private education thrown in becomes, in the revision, a full
domestic drama which takes in the vanity of a young couple, the
brattiness of their children, the self-seeking cruelty of the parents,
their unhappy marriage, crude comedy in the servants' quarters, and
an attack on hypocritical dissenters. The revision fleshes out the
original after changing the actors somewhat. We see the characters
move and hear them damn themselves with their own words. What began
as rather stock types become "realistic" characters whose actions
and words multiply the range of their folly and satiric meaning. They
become more the focus of attention in their own right than devices
for moving Pompey from owner to owner or vehicles conveying us to
the relationship between Pompey and Mopsa. In the process, the
satire becomes more pointed, effective, humorous, and vivid. The
stage of the mind is alive with mincing, prancing, affected people
involved in an on-going drama, not one filled with motionless char-
acters spotlighted for description and occasionally enacting a brief tableau.

Later in the novel, Coventry again does an extended job of revision which effects characterization. In this instance, however, the description has been elaborated, but slightly, while many episodes have been eliminated. The characters in question are the milliner and the Fripperys. The chapters and adventures involving them are more numerous in the original than in the revision.  

A-C contains a history of the milliner not present in D and E as well as the adventures of Sir Thomas Frippery in his attempts to seduce the milliner and a low comic scene of the Frippery family at Ruckolt House.  

D and E, on the other hand, add an hilarious plot summary of Othello the whore of Venus, a more extensive description of Sir and Lady Frippery in their morning attire, and a squabble between Sir Thomas and his daughter. The versions share characterization of the Fripperys and Mr. Chace (Miss Frippery's gentleman friend) in somewhat different terms in A-C and in D and E as well as the description of a drum at the Fripperys which is identical in all editions.

It is difficult to praise Coventry's deletion of the milliner's history in the revision. It is a fast-moving story rich in detail and obviously indebted to the many female-rogue biographies, like Moll Flanders, popular at the time. Perhaps Coventry reasoned that it came too close on the heels of the rogue's progress related by Jack the beggar's son. Or perhaps he thought it too straightforward for inclusion in his gallery of satirized types. Then, again, perhaps since he had no plans for the milliner in the story proper, he
reasoned that to present her history, regardless of how well-written, was gratuitous, and he chose rather to give her a brief role instead of extensive treatment before moving on quickly to the Fripperys. Yet what makes the omission puzzling is that he replaced it with the milliner's paraphrase of *Othello*. The bit is humorous and effectively satirizes the century's penchant to turn high tragedy into soap-opera melodrama. For example, in the milliner's hands, *Othello* becomes the story of a rich heiress who runs away with Othello and is married privately at the Fleet. Desdemona dies because she lost a handkerchief and could not find it. Yet the scene is no better than, or perhaps not as good as, what it replaces. In addition, when we recall that in the original, one of the milliner's great ambitions was to be an actress, we see that her paraphrase of *Othello* is the logical extension of her theatrical interest and could have been used to complement certain details of her history. That history was, nevertheless, omitted in the revision, and omitted for no clear reason.

No such problem arises concerning Coventry's decision to omit the story of Sir Thomas's attempted amours with the milliner and the adventures at Ruckolt House. Both are broadly comic in the spirit of Restoration comedy and are doubtless justified by Coventry's introduction to them: "And now that we have drawn the Characters of so many people, let us look a little into their Actions; for Characters alone afford a very barren Entertainment to the Reader" (A, 183). But when we couple these episodes with the characterization of the Fripperys and the description of the drum held at their rooms (which is a fine blend of comic dialogue and slapstick), they con-
tribute to a sense in the original that a little of the Fripperys
goes a long way and as much of them as Coventry has presented grows
tiring. We are entertained quite sufficiently by one well-done drama-
tization of the family's folly. Furthermore, the omission of Sir
Thomas's attempted amours with the milliner and references to his
flatulence at Ruckolt House removes emphasis from one member of the
family and places it squarely on all as they behave as a family.
Instead of singling Sir Thomas out for special treatment, Coventry
relates a family quarrel in which the members' personalities con-
flict and contrast.

Finally, the revisions regarding the Frippery family make for
more fluid, less static movement in the revision than in the original.
In A-C, we receive a block of characterization, then a block of
dramatization. In the revision, characterization and dramatization
alternate repeatedly. We meet the Fripperys and see them in action
before we receive a character of Mr. Chace. The story moves easily
to the description of the drum at the Fripperys. The change re-
flects Coventry's increased ability to mix static characterization
and action fluently rather than presenting neatly demarcated sections
of characterization and dramatization. In the revision, then,
Coventry has in general improved his handling of the Fripperys by
making the characterization of the family more vivid, by murdering
some of his brain children and thus concentrating on the family
as a whole and on the most telling dramatization of their pretension,
and finally, by reworking the organization of their adventures so
that static description and action mesh more neatly in the revision
than in the original.

Another extensive revision of characterization occurs at a crucial point in the novel, the chapters dealing with Theodosia, Aurora, and Aurora's suitors. This section of the novel is crucial because the characterization of Dr. Killdarby having been changed in the revision and the Mopsa episode eliminated, it offers the only positive characters in the whole of the revised novel. Thus the clarity and precision with which a norm is set up gain an importance in the revision which they did not have in the original. And I argue that through attention to characterization, Coventry has indeed bettered his presentation of the positive "ought to be" of his satire. From the section, Coventry deleted Aurora's aging suitor, both his character and his part in the conversation. He rewrote the character of Count Tag and the sisters, introducing the talk of Miss Newcome and Jeremy Griskin discussed above. Finally, he worked an exchange among Count Tag, Aurora, and her lover into the revision.

At first glance, eliminating Aurora's aged suitor may appear gratuitous. He is a distinct, well-drawn type whose history makes for interesting reading and whose immorality provides a marked contrast to the virtue of Theodosia, Aurora, and her beau. Another look, however, reveals that he is one of the most sinister characters, if not the most sinister character in all of Pompey. He is not only foolish in his immorality but downright evil. He is at once a debauched lecher who marries for money and a murderer by omission if not commission. Count Tag has many imperfections, but none comes even close to those of the aging admirer of Aurora, whose very presence
in Aurora's drawing room stains her character, especially since his evil is never even taken to task, let alone exposed by the sisters or Aurora's beloved.

Count Tag, on the other hand, is seen as an annoying but relatively innocent fool whose pretensions hurt no one but himself. Indeed, in the revision, his character is rewritten so that his folly, a pretense to title and membership in the best social circles, receives greater emphasis than in the original. Thus, too, is a clear contrast between Count Tag and Aurora's favorite, a nobleman with a noble character, firmly established without the distraction of a thoroughly execrable suitor who is evil rather than just mean. This contrast is emphasized further by the addition to the revision of a verbal showdown between Count Tag and the virtuous noble. Thus does Coventry not only show the nobleman's virtue in action, rather than merely speaking of the politeness and decorum of his conversation as in the original; he also demonstrates that the nobleman's genuine magnificence and humane good sense triumph over snobbery and bigotry disguised as nobility. In short, Coventry's work with character in this section provides us with more vividly drawn, thoroughly dramatized types in the revision than in the original. More importantly, it clarifies the forces in opposition to each other and allows us to see virtue victorious over vice. Coventry's own moral position is thus made clearer because we see it in action, not merely hear it sketched in general terms.

Two major revisions in characterization remain which are not easily accounted for. In fact, establishing a rationale for them let
alone evaluating them is tenuous at best. The first is the substitution of Poet Rhymer's visit to the tavern for the Lady Qualmsick episode. The second is the reordering in the revision of Pompey's adventures at Cambridge together with the omission of an encounter with the ancient Doctor of Divinity and the addition of the medical experiment involving Pompey. The first is perhaps justified on the ground that it substitutes a number of satiric objects for a single one—aberrations in politics, religion, learning, art for a hypochondriac and her hen-pecked husband. And quite possibly Coventry saw the change as a chance to include satire on prominent social disorders rather than sticking with a single private personality type. But both versions are well-written and combine character sketches skillfully with action and dialogue.

The second is likewise difficult to judge. Much in the revision is the same as that in the original. Those parts that are alike differ only in their arrangement, which in the revision tends to mix static characterization with action instead of blocking out the two elements. In this respect, the reworking here resembles that in the Frippery episode and reflects a more artful management of materials in the revision than in the original. But why Coventry substituted the medical experiment for the portrait of the aged Divine is mysterious. Both are adequately done; neither is outstanding. My only guess is that Coventry thought the medical experiment more foolish and thus a better satiric target than the Doctor of Divinity, who is a definite type but harmless.

Despite our inability to account for and judge every revision
involving characterization, we can conclude, I think, that in general, Coventry's revisions in this category "improve" his work. They evidence a marked improvement in narrative skill. They expand upon material which begs for development and condense where ingenuity has gotten the upper hand over economy and incisiveness. And in the process, unity, vividness, and satiric point have been strengthened. For all that, however, Coventry has not written a first-rate novel. Pompey is humorous and delightful, at times a bit cynical and bawdy, at times morally potent. But its characters, situations, and "message" never reach deep into the core of human experience and behavior. We encounter no personalities as memorable or as fascinating as Tom Jones, Squire Western, Jonathan Wild, Mistress Slipslop, or Parson Adams (to choose only those of a novelist Coventry obviously admired). Nor do we find an ongoing narrative which holds our interest and has a steady sense of progression. And we have no sure sense that behind the Prose Characters and adventures of Pompey stands a moral mentor whose intelligence and whose insight into the ethical complexity of human experience offers us laughter as a means of grace. Perhaps Coventry's youth, his want of experience and lack of skill, his imperfect understanding of what Fielding and others were doing, or his choice of subject shift the balance, but shifted it is. Nevertheless, we cannot dismiss Pompey easily because for all its shortcomings, it is still a good bit better than many a minor novel written at the time or since. In addition, it is, as we saw in Chapter I, an important document in our understanding of the development of the novel.
CHAPTER IV

A Critical Discussion of Pompey the Little

Because Pompey the Little is an obviously minor work by a little-known author, its excellence is difficult to estimate. Its inferiority to Fielding's work and to that of the best eighteenth-century novelists is unquestionable. Yet Pompey is a lively work, inventive, ingenious, and fun to read; it deserves more critical interest than it has received. In this chapter I shall essay a critical discussion of the novel in order to get at the source of the artistic merit it does possess.

The artistic inadequacies of Pompey are, I think, fairly obvious; and I do not wish to dwell upon them. But some analysis of them is in order before going on to discuss the successful art in the novel. First, we must conclude that although clever, Coventry's use of a dog as "hero" is finally unwise. It allows him to satirize contemporary values by thinly disguising Pompey as a fop whose life of luxury and immorality reveal the superficiality and animalism of his human counterparts. Pompey's treatment by his various owners also reveals their foolishness. In audition, as we have seen, Coventry uses the dog to comment on the values and conventions of contemporary "historical" writing. But the device is quite transparent, and once we see through it, there is little left to attract us to the dog as hero. Pompey cannot in the end appeal to us as a human being can—even the
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most static picaro. We cannot, or more specifically, Coventry does not allow us to, become totally and consistently involved with him and see his dilemma, his shifting fortune, his pretensions and virtues as our own. Certainly, when we make the equation between a dog's life and the human condition, Pompey is charming and instructive; but when the equation dissolves, he is but a rather mechanical device used to keep the episodes coming. And he is a mechanism that moves into the background far more than he is a "hero" who can sustain interest. He is, finally, a necessary convenience who nevertheless gives his name to the story and about whose growth and development the novel promises to be—but is not, except in a perfunctory way.

I am not suggesting that Pompey would be a better book were Coventry to make some adjustment regarding the dog. As we saw in Chapter III, Coventry did precisely that when revising the novel without making much difference in the overall effect. Rather, I am suggesting that despite the satiric points Coventry scores with Pompey's aid, the choice of dog as hero—given the overall purposes of his book—was a bad one, which no amount of revision could correct. It in large measure is responsible for the cleverness of the novel, but it is also a chief cause for the work's minor standing among novels of the period.

Pompey also suffers from a certain monotony stemming from a pattern too often repeated and from pacing that is more often than not mechanically regular over too long a course. The pattern Coventry relies on repeatedly is easily identified: Coventry introduces Pompey's new owner, he details in a character sketch that
type's follies or virtues, then he dramatizes that character's traits in dialogue and action, and finally he manufactures some circumstances whereby Pompey is separated from one owner and taken on by a new one, whom Coventry treats essentially as he did his predecessor. Furthermore, Coventry devotes about the same amount of time to each owner—one chapter, two at the most. To be sure, there are notable exceptions to these generalizations, and significantly they are among the best parts of the book: the protracted concern, for instance, with Lady Tempest—her affair with Hillario, the confrontation between her physicians and Lady Sophister, detail about Pompey's growth and development under Lady Tempest's care, her efforts to find him, her reintroduction in the final chapters; the chapters at the end of Book I concerning the blind beggar and his son Jack; Coventry's concern at the beginning and end of the novel to concentrate on Pompey as a parody of the "Great Man" and his tendency to interrupt occasionally the pattern of the episodes with commentary on the dog's changes of fortune. But these instances are few when compared to the many instances when Coventry uses over and over, essentially unchanged, the pattern outlined above: with the Vincents, for example, Lady Harridan, Counsellor Tanturian, Theodosia and Aurora, the Fripperys, Lord and Lady Marmazet, Poet Rhymer, Williams of Cambridge, and so forth. Even in the Lady Tempest sequence and in that involving the beggar and his children, one sees the pattern in the characterization of Lady Tempest and Lady Sophister, the beggar and his daughter Bess. But it is not so noticeable as elsewhere because of the relative complexity and density of the narrative in these sections.
I am not objecting to Coventry's use of pattern. Pattern, after all, is imperative in art and one source of its delight. But when that pattern becomes obtrusive and overpowering in its monotonous, essentially unchanged repetition, it annoys like a dripping faucet or bores like an overly long ride on a merry-go-round. And in Pompey the pattern is repeated unchanged too often, is interrupted and varied too infrequently. It becomes obtrusive and a little dull, a good idea overworked.

The final fault in Pompey that I want to discuss is closely allied to the highest virtue wrought by revision. In Chapter III, we saw that several of the major changes Coventry made in his novel seem directed at producing a kind of unity which the original did not have. In addition to reintroducing Lady Tempest at the end of all editions of the novel to bring the narrative full circle, Coventry, in the last two editions of Pompey, wove the episodes involving the beggar's son Jeremy Griskin and Miss Newcome, Theodosia and Aurora, and Lord and Lady Marmazet loosely together to form a community of characters which constitutes a more recognizable unity than that usually offered by his episodic work and clearly akin to that causal unity and unity of character in the best novels. He does much the same with the episodes involving the Vincents and Lady Harridan. I noted in the discussion of these revisions that Coventry could probably not have carried this unifying method out unless he completely rewrote the novel. Yet for all the evidence these revisions give of Coventry's growing sense of his craft, they create a certain bifurcation of vision. We see what he is doing; we applaud
it and enjoy it. And then he leaves off to resume his episodic approach. To be sure, he combines his modes of unity easily. He carries off the switches smoothly. I cannot, however, help but think that Pompey would be a better work had he in the beginning or in revision been consistent in creating a community of characters which conveyed his themes by reacting with each other as they do in an incipient way in the final editions of the novel.

But the novel is not a complete failure. Nor does the absence of a thorough-going narrative unity or an easily discernible unity of plot, character, and hero in Pompey mean that it is disunified, a pastiche of characters and satiric episodes better classified as a "proto-novel" than as a novel. To the germ of standard kinds of novelistic unity and to the book's obvious kinship with the picaresque novel discussed in Chapter III we must add that organic, thematic unity of stance and vision which pervades the world Coventry has created. A moral vision stands behind the novel's seeming collection of characters and episodes giving the work a wholeness and informing it with thematic coherence. I cannot maintain that the moral vision which gives the novel unity is particularly subtle; nor does it exhibit the sense of humanity and the complexity of (say) Fielding's in *Tom Jones*. Although it lacks the power to move us with a bitter-sweet sense of the "human comedy," it is, nevertheless, there, pulling together the episodes of Pompey into a whole greater than the sum of its parts. As we would expect from the young author of *Penshurst* and *World, No. 15*, the satiric "ought to be" of Pompey and its chief means of unity is a borrowed position more deeply
felt than closely reasoned, more engaging in its dramatic presentation than profound. It is a moral position recognizable to anyone familiar with the art and thought of the "conservative" spokesmen of the Restoration and early eighteenth century. Most simply stated, it is a belief in "right reason" as a viable alternative and corrective to human folly and vice. It assumes that human beings are capable of effecting a concordia discors in themselves which will lead them away from the self-indulgence, pride, and brutality of wantonness, factionalism, materialism, and ignorance to a life of restraint, benevolence, and order. When that personal order fails, which is most often the case, so do the political, religious, artistic, and intellectual lives and endeavors of men. When it succeeds, as it seldom does, men imitate, insofar as fallen men are capable, a kind of divine order where contraries are held in beatific tension.

As in much eighteenth-century satire (indeed as in most satire), seeing and carefully defining this thematic thread in the fabric of Pompey is difficult because Coventry takes up much of his work with applying his principles to fops, fools, and degenerates in order to expose them and to make them his moral instruments by negative example rather than dramatizing his "ought to be" in virtuous types. But Pompey does contain positive embodiments of Coventry's ideals, characters who serve as foils for the sins painted elsewhere in the novel. Chief among them are Theodosia, Aurora, and her noble lover, who are models of decorum in private life. Coventry's description of them and the short scene they play in the novel clearly label them as people who have, each in his own way, reconciled the
contraries in their natures to become models of virtue and restraint.

Theodosia, the older of the two sisters at forty, has a charm which renders her agreeable despite her fading beauty. Everything about her is muted by restraint as befits her age. She is, for instance, affable and easy without falsehood, cheerful without levity. "Nature had given her a good temper, and education had made it an agreeable one" (110). Her education had likewise improved her understanding without giving her pretensions to wit or science. A social creature, she lived in the world but was not of it. In her the active and contemplative ideals seem nicely mixed with just a dash more of the contemplative, as suits her age.

Aurora is very different from her sister Theodosia, but her virtue issues from a like source: a harmony of the dissident qualities in her character as befits her age and position. At twenty-four, she is a paragon of physical beauty with all the charms and accomplishments of a beauty and none of the affectation and insolence. As befits a young woman, she is "lively and a little romantic in company" (111), ready to play, dance, and sing as well as flirt discreetly with her beloved. Yet she is as modest as she is willing in her entertainment and no slave to the freedom she exercises. In private she shows good sense and an understanding of serious matters.

Aurora's lover is the archetypal bonhomme whose benevolence and prudence reflect a nice balance of all human qualities. He is "blest with every personal accomplishment that would render him agreeable, and every good quality that would make him beloved" (115).
His excellent understanding has been improved by reading, his integrity is joined with candor and sensibility, and he is passionately devoted to truth. "He had the most agreeable manner of address, improved but not corrupted by the civilities of the world; a uniform, unaffected, natural gentility, which put mere politeness out of countenance, and left artificial complaisance at a distance. In a word, he had the most cordial warmth of heart, the greatest generosity of sentiment, and the truest aequanimity of temper upon all occasions in life" (115).

These three characters are surely a bit difficult to believe: they seem too good to be true (or even very interesting) until we see them in action against Count Tag. Then they become human, credible, possible. The principle and ideal couched in the nicely balanced phrases of the character sketches cease to be mere abstractions and confront the difficulty of discerning and taking appropriate action against foolish immorality. The women have no trouble seeing the Count for what he is and politely argue against his pompous talk about "people one knows," that is, titled folks. Their approach is to charm and laugh him out of his folly. The nobleman is more direct. He pointedly tells the Count that he is not of his opinion that when "no-body one knows, none of us [is] in a public place, all the rest are to be considered in the light of porters and oyster-women" (120). In fact, he calls such talk "contemptible jargon," and after asking the Count if indeed he believes that only people of note are those who "frize their hair in the newest fashion, and have their cloaths made in Paris" (121).
he launches into the Count with a speech which not only upbraids
the Count's pretensions to nobility but clearly holds to a humane
aristocratic position without any attempt to exploit it for selfish
reasons:

'I can readily allow that People of quality must in general
live with one another; the customs of the world in good
measure require it; but surely our station gives us no right
to behave with insolence to people below us, because they
have not their cloaths from Paris, or do not frize their
hair in the newest fashion. And I am sure if people of
quality have no such right, it much less becomes the fops
and coxcombs in fashion, who are but the retainers on
people of quality, who are themselves only in public by
permission, and can pretend to no merit, but what they
derive from an acquaintance with their betters. This
surely is the most contemptible of all modern follies.
For instance, because a man is permitted to whisper non-
sense in a lady Betty's or a lady Mary's ear, in the
side-box at a play-house, shall he therefore fancy him-
self privileged to behave with impertinence to people
infinitely his superiors in merit, who perhaps have not
thought it worth their while to ruffle themselves into a
great acquaintance!'

(121)

The sense of confidence in just, carefully reasoned principle
expressed in this speech makes the young noble the living embodiment
of a personal ethic with far-reaching implications. For the Count's
benefit, the young man clearly distinguishes between real nobles
and sycophants. He further makes clear that a noble title may be
inherited and carry with it certain habits of behavior, but that
the merit which makes for true nobility cannot be inherited. It
must be earned. Only after earning it can one hold himself superior
to those below him on the social ladder. Egalitarian his position
is not; rather, he argues for an aristocracy which is so in substance
as well as name. And he demonstrates that he himself is such by
speaking out against the Count and dramatizing the virtue attributed
to him in his character sketch. The ladies do likewise in their own, more muted way. And the method of all three is first to establish order in themselves and then communicate that order to the world about them rather than, like the Count, to accept the principles of a corrupt, prideful, fallen world created by chaotic souls and perpetuate that disorder.

We need not look far to see that the virtue in action which overcomes vice in this instance is precisely the virtue wanting in a score of other characters in *Pompey*. In instance after instance, we encounter souls, running the gamut from fool to knave, who have succumbed to a corrupt world of pride, vanity, and vice and who proceed to make the world more perfectly in their own image. They are the objects of Coventry’s satire because they have not learned to create an order within themselves which allows them to govern their own lives by an ethic of balance and restraint and in turn to impart harmony and wholeness to the worlds they touch. That they have not learned to do so makes for a work almost claustrophobic in its sense of folly. Yet therein lies the singular power of *Pompey* and its chief means of unity. The common source and end of the folly despite the variety of its manifestations gives us a novel unified in its vision and moral stance.

To analyze every satirized character in light of the above generalizations is impossible here. Selected examples will, however, prove the point and make the design of Coventry’s novel clear.

Hillario, for instance, is a fop of the first rank because with his many bottles of claret he has imbibed the corrupt values of the
beau monde. Those values are the only ones he seems to know, and so his only virtue is his fancy clothes, flashy chariot, and many amorous conquests. The emptiness garbed in satin and lace that he is does not, however, stop with him. His own behavior makes its contribution to the further corruption of the world, particularly its educational ideals and its art, two very important means in the eighteenth century for fostering and communicating personal moral order. When we meet Hillario, he is on the Grand Tour, that imitation of the epic hero's journey to wisdom which he will thereafter put into virtuous, prudent action based on the order within himself. Hillario, however, returns from his Grand Tour with "nothing but a solo in his head" after whoring all over Europe. No reconciliation of opposites took place in him. The world in its pride taught him only that clothes make the man and that virtue resides in a set of pretentious phrases about art. Hillario in his vanity now aims to teach the world the same. And in the process what order and possibility that there is left in the world is diminished.

Two characters who appear later in the novel, Williams of Cambridge and Poet Rhymer, do in their own way for education and art respectively what Hillario by himself does for them. And the reasons are the same. Williams in his ungovernable will makes a mockery of what is possible in a university education by taking advantage of what is worst. Under the tutelage of self-seeking dons, he follows his own imagination to become a flashily dressed dandy whose "great deal of dangling good-nature" (161) goes over so well with the ladies that his stay at the university trains him to be little more than a
breeder of the vice he learned there.

Poet Rhymer is perhaps more to be pitied than scorned. Nevertheless, he is a self-indulgent man who profanes the moral, order-making potential of art. He has learned all the clichés about art: "Poetry...like virtue," he says, "is its own reward" (152). For him it is the "noblest science in the universe." He tells his pregnant, impoverished wife that she has an "illiberal attachment to money" as opposed to "listening to the divine rhapsodies of the Heliconian maids" (152). Ironically, he is willing to rhyme for hire, as his visit to the degenerate Lord Marmaze indicates, and the very disposition of his works in the garret reveals that they are so much material: "There were now lying upon it [a table] the first act of a comedy, a pair of yellow stays, two political pamphlets, a plate of bread-and-butter, three dirty night-caps, and a volume of miscellany poems" (150). Rhymer has reduced the ability of art to make order in the world and to communicate the order that is within the artist to the perpetuation of his own folly and the immorality of others.

Lady Tempest, like her lover Hillario, is a person of quality without the merit of the station. She has been completely consumed by the vanity and pride of the fashionable world and is bent on perpetuating the same. A celebrated coquette, she profaned the institution of marriage by wedding for the most "practical"of reasons--"a Title and a Coach and Six" (25). When her husband's death released her from a situation made intolerable largely by her own vanity and self-seeking, she again became the darling of the beau monde "without the Fears of Virginity to check her" (28). The want
of balance and restraint in her inner world not only leads her to indulge her every lust but has created chaos around her in a pack of spoiled dogs and pert, insubordinate servants. Unlike Theodosia and Aurora whose spiritual decorum manifests itself in a tasteful, well-run, modest household, Lady Tempest is the mistress of a little world, her home, which borders on anarchy.

Much the same is true of Lord Marmazet, Lady Tempest's male counterpart in numerous ways. In the eyes of the world, he is a "Great Man," the eighteenth-century's equivalent to the philosopher-king or the Renaissance gentleman. Statesman, patron, lover, and wit he is, but only in a way that reflects his own depravity and undermines the ideals of the age just as the corruptness of those ideals has attributed to him a merit he does not deserve. He does lord it over the scribbler Rhymer with the cynicism of one who knows his own unworthiness and is comfortable in its rewards. But he can control neither his own wantonness nor his wife. So much for the ruler of men and the patron. As a lover he drives his mistress to suicide, and as a wit he thrives on exchanging pointless jokes with his loveless wife.

Lady Tempest's companion in coquettishness past its prime, Lady Sophister, also projects the empty pretentiousness of her mind into a world already befuddled by the cant and sophistry that passes for learning. And from pseudo-learning she proceeds to the defamation of religion. Lady Tempest "believed all the doctrines of religion, and was contented, like many others, with the trifling privilege only of disobeying all its precepts" (41). Lady Sophister neither
practices those precepts nor believes them. And her justification is the intellectual arrogance given her through pseudo-learning. Her arguments against Doctors Killdarby and Rhubarb are sophistic in the extreme and reveal a confusion of mind which perpetuates more confusion in a realm already in chaos with respect to fundamental matters.

Lady Harridan and her Methodist friends are also agents of confusion in religion. But whereas Lady Sophister's vehicle was her own pseudo-learning, theirs is the absence of reason and intellect as handmaidens of faith. Worn out by vanity and jaded by pleasure, they turned to a religion of what Coventry considered superstition and sentimentalism predicated on their own inner-light. Subjectivism is certainly no crime in itself; indeed, without it, one could not argue for the creation of order in the self as one way of making order in the world. But when there is no order in the self, only a self-centered attempt to rid oneself of guilt easily and substitute one form of self-indulgence for another, no order can be imparted to the world by a chief means of ordering, religion. And for Lady Harridan and the Methodists, the religion of ecstasy and long-faced austerity has become little more than a self-serving substitute for failed worldliness.

Beginning, then, with personal chaos fostered by a fallen world, we pass, in character after character, to the propagation of that personal disorder in education, art, philosophy, and religion. Nor are politics exempt and that type of the body politic, the family. During a debate in a coffee house early in the novel, we get a taste of the political implications of personal anarchy. An orator argues
to the effect that the late rebellion "was prompted by the ministry for some private ends of their own" (66) and that "old Walpole is behind the curtain still, notwithstanding his resignation, and the old game is playing over again, whatever they pretend. There was correspondence between Walpole and Fleury, to my knowledge, and they projected between them all the evils that have since happened to the nation" (67). The orator is referring to the Scottish Rebellion of Prince Charles Edward in 1745-46. English troops had to be called home from the War of the Austrian Succession to put it down. During his administration, Walpole had tried to avoid wars like the Austrian one. He and Cardinal Fleury of France were attempting to keep the Austrian-Spanish Alliance from causing another war like the War of the Spanish Succession early in the century, but after the War of the Polish Succession (1731), during which England remained neutral, Fleury turned against England and tried to limit British influence on the Continent. He succeeded fairly well, and his success was hard on England's commercial influence. After Walpole's resignation in 1742, there was talk that he was still acting behind the scenes to prevent war with France, a war which did indeed come with the Seven Years' War beginning in 1756.¹ But of course at the time Pompey was written, that war had not yet begun, and the orator's solution to England's continental difficulties is to get it started a few years early by burning the French fleet.

A nameless champion of political sanity responds that the orator

is talking irresponsibly. When the orator takes offense and sees
the man's objections as an infringement of his freedom of speech, the
gentleman notes that it is not his speaking per se that he objects to,
but the licentiousness of it on so serious a subject. Unconvinced,
the orator continues to rant against the repressiveness of the
government. Finally, the gentleman can take no more:

'Sir, undoubtedly you may speak your mind freely; but
the laws of your country oblige you not to speak treason,
and the laws of good-manners should dispose you to speak
with decency and respect of your governors. You say,
sir, we are come to that pass, that we dare not talk—
I protest, that is very extraordinary; and if I was called
upon to answer this declaration, I would rather say we
are come to that pass now-a-days, that we talk with more
virulence and ill-language than ever—we talk upon sub­
jects, which it is impossible we should understand, and
advance assertions, which we know to be false. Bold
affirmations against the government are believed merely
from the dint of assurance with which they are spoken,
and the idlest jargon often passes for the soundest
reasoning. Give me leave to say, you, sir, are a living
example of the lenity of that government, which you are
abusing for want of lenity, and your own practice in the
strongest manner confutes your own assertions.'

(68-69)

The orator leaves in a huff, and he who was such a champion of liberty
at the coffee house proceeds to damn himself by being the tyrant
with his family.

In terms of political ideals, the scene is not, as the gentle­
man's remarks make clear, political polemic, an attempt to refute
the charges made by the orator. Rather, it is a satire against
political irresponsibility on the part of an increasingly power­
ful middle class and a plea for stability in the recently democratized
politics of English parliamentary government. The gentleman, obviously
speaking for Coventry, is asking for little more than a loyal
opposition that will keep England peaceful, protestant, and parliamentary. In the orator's ranting, he obviously sees danger to the stability of a state, a danger borne out by the tyranny which rules the man's home and heart, the analogues of the body politic.

The implications of this political discussion are important in this respect: they represent a political analogue to the ethical vision central to most of the episodes in the novel, a vision which sustains the work through its episodic course. Just as Coventry argues that the personal lives and wills of a score of characters in Pompey are a shambles because they have failed to exercise the restraint that produces peace and harmony, so in the political realm, a want of restraint produces the chaos of war and tyranny, a society in the bondage of turmoil rather than free within the boundaries of law and loyalty.

The personal chaos of the orator, which makes for tyranny in his family and threatens the same in society at large, has its parallel in numerous instances in Pompey. Indeed, it is a fact easily overlooked that the novel is concerned largely with marital and family relationships, relationships which are far from what they ought to be and are so because the people involved in them are fools who impart their folly to their marriages and family life, that basic

---

2 Coventry as a man of Tory sympathies was anxious that the Peace of Utrecht, which closed the hotly disputed War of the Spanish Succession and was, ironically, being administered by the Whig Walpole, keep the peace instead of ruining England as its opponents, mostly Whigs, predicted. Also a man strongly in favor of the increase in parliamentary power as evidenced by his poetry, he was interested in seeing it work rather than watching it split by factionalism. The orator's remarks implicitly oppose both the success of the Peace of Utrecht and the avoidance of factionalism in parliamentary government.
social unit. These lamentable familial relationships run the social gamut from the violent encounter between the daughter of the tavern-keeper and her husband, the hackney coachman, to the cool, sophisticated hostility of Lord and Lady Marmazet. In between we have, among others, Rhymer and his wife, the Fripperys, Captain and Lady Betty Vincent. This heavy emphasis on marriage and the family not only places *Pompey* among the numerous works of "domestic" literature in the Restoration and eighteenth century but strengthens the unity of the work.

The violent quarrel between the hackney coachman and his wife occurs, we recall, when the wife returns late from the theatre. Vanity and passion in this instance produce actual physical chaos in the relationship. But what can we expect of iron, if gold rust? And rust it does in the marriage of Lord and Lady Marmazet. This couple of quality has a marriage as chaotic in its way as that of the hackney coachman and his wife. But it is ever so fashionable. They can barely endure one another, yet they live on together in simmering hostility. The Lord has his mistresses; the Lady, as her conduct at Bath reveals, indulges her sexual fantasies vicariously by encouraging Miss Newcome with Griskin because she herself is attracted to him. Interior disorder, much in debt to the folly of the world at large, once again fosters chaos beyond itself, this time in the basic unity of civilization on the "gothic" model dear to the heart of those who looked to the past for their cultural ideals.

The Rhymers, the Fripperys, and the Vincents are also family
units in chaos because of the personal disorder of the members who further the decay of that basic institution, that little society of humans with analogues in every gathering together of human beings. The Rhymers' life is squalid and violent largely because of the delusions and pride of the scribbler, whose art does indeed mirror his life. The Fripperys are concerned with nothing but show, to the exclusion of substance. Although incompetent, the father seeks a place at court. The mother mocks the fashion of the drum, thinking that the surface show of the fashionable world somehow supplies the substance as well. The daughter is such a lump of vanity that her face is distorted, and her marriage to Jack Chace promises to produce a union as unsuccessful as her parents'. They squabble endlessly among themselves, ostensibly in the name of principle but in fact because they seek the gratification of their own pride. The Vincents are two vain young people whose pride has led them to the brink of financial disaster. They married out of a head-strong spite, and when they "took to breeding," they produced a brood of brats. The little societies we see in these marriages, whether it be the couples themselves, their children, their social gatherings, mirror the chaos in the lives of the individuals involved and by analogy the larger social unit of which they are a part, by which they pattern their lives, and to which they impart their share of disorder.

Coventry's position in "Pompey the Little" is in sum essentially Pope's at the close of "An Essay on Man:"
God loves from Whole to Parts: but human soul
Must rise from Individual to the Whole.
Self-love but serves the virtuous mind to wake.
As the small pebble stirs the peaceful lake;
The centre mov'd, a circle straight succeeds,
Another still, and still another spreads,
Friend, parent, neighbour, first it will embrace;
His country next; and next all human race;
Wide and more wide, th' o'reflowings of the mind
Take ev'ry Creature in, of every kind;
Earth smiles around, with boundless bounty blest,
And heav'n beholds its image in his breast.

But in Pompey it is personalized and concretized in a series of satiric portraits as befits the "realistic" demands of the novel. Further, the belief sustains and unifies the work and through the unrelenting satire asks us to replace the fallen world which creates chaos in us and to which in turn we impart chaos with another world, beginning in us, harmonized and redeemed, made in imitation of the divine, because we have ourselves effected an imitatio dei.

Francis Coventry's Pompey the Little is not, then, merely the episodic work it appears at first glance to be. In addition to the structural unity which Coventry sought to strengthen through revision, the novel exhibits a firmly sustained unity of vision. But like so much else we have seen in Coventry's work—his use of the country-house tradition in Penshurst, his arguments about the sublime and the aesthetics of landscape architecture, his models for Pompey, and his adaptation in his novel of the Prose Character and the conventions of biography—that vision is a largely borrowed one, one taken from the great conservative minds of the early English Enlightenment. And

finally that is what we must say of Coventry as an artist: he was an imitator; his was a derivative talent. But his ability to imitate and adapt did not go beyond itself, except in brief flashes, to the creation of art which transcends its antecedents to become a recognizable imitation of the grandly traditional in form and thought and a unique and original work. It is not one of those monuments that is yet somehow alive, influencing the art and life far beyond its time and place. Perhaps had Coventry not died a very young man, he would have gone on to create such art. His Pompey suggests that he might have. For all its faults, it is a charming first novel, as good as or better than many a first novel written before it and since. It shows a firm and strengthened grasp of the materials and conventions out of which some truly great novels were made. And for all its derivativeness (indeed, because of it), it is a work of interest in the development of the form. In it, as in the fascinating models in a natural history museum, we see, with a certain sense of wonder at a mystery, how something evolved in itself and as one of its kind, how it is something past and was something becoming.
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I have used the capital letters at the head of each bibliographical description as sigla. In transcribing different sizes of capitals, I have followed these principles: the differences noted apply only to single words and not to the whole line of which that word is a part; triple underlining denotes a large capital, double underlining, a smaller capital. Thus, M. COOPER indicates that "M" and "C" are the same size and both are large capitals; "COOPER" is in smaller capitals.

A The First Edition


Contents: [Frontispiece signed Boitard: an engraving of Pompey, the lap dog, seated on a cushion]; p. [i], title; p. [ii], blank; pp. iii-viii, table of contents; pp. [1]-272, text.

Location: Ohio State University Library, James Thurber Reading Room. PR 3369/C7 H5/1751.
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Note: The allusions are to Aeneid, 8.462, and Satire, 1.1.70, respectively. According to Edmund Gosse (Gossip in the Library [New York, 1891], p. 204), Louis Boitard was a fashionable engraver-designer whose print of Ranelagh Rotunda was much in demand at the time.

B The Second Edition


LONDON: / Printed for M. COOPER, at the Globe / in Paternoster-Row.

MDCCCLI.


Contents: p. [i], title; p. [ii], blank; pp. iii-viii, table of contents; pp. [i]-272, text.


C The Third Edition

THE / HISTORY / OF / Pompey the Little: / OR, THE / LIFE and


12mo: [A4], B-H12, I4: pp. viii / 176.
Contents: [Frontispiece unsigned: an engraving of Pompey, the lap dog, seated on a cushion]; p. [i], title; p. [ii], blank; pp. iii-vii, table of contents; p. [viii], blank; pp. 1-176, text.


Note: This edition is bound with a translation from the French: Letters of a Peruvian Princess (Dublin, 1748), which follows the text of Pompey.

The engraving used as a frontispiece in this edition presents the same aspect of Pompey as in A, but a close examination reveals that it is a copy, and not a very good one, of Boitard's work. The lines on the oval which frames the image of Pompey are, for instance, closer together in C than in A, the expression on Pompey's face is more gentle in A than in C, and no period follows the "little" in the inscription on the pedestal in C.

The Fourth Edition (the third according to the title page)

THE / HISTORY / OF / Pompey the Little; / OR, THE / LIFE and
ADVENTURES / OF A / LAP-DOG. / [rule] / gressumque Canes comitantur

herilem. / VIR. AEn. / mutato nomine de te / Fabula narratur. HOR. / [rule] / The THIRD EDITION. / [double rule] / LONDON: / Printed

for M. COOPER, at the Globe / in Paternoster-Row. MDCLII.

12mo: [A1], A2-A10, B-N12, 02: pp. xx + 291 + [1]

Contents: [Frontispiece signed Boitard: an engraving of Pompey, the lap dog, seated on a cushion]; p. [i], title; p. [ii], blank; pp. iii-xii, dedication to Henry Fielding; pp. xiii-xix, table of contents; p. [xx], blank; pp. [1]-291, text.

Location: University of Chicago Library, PR 3369/C8 H7/1752. Examined in a xerox reproduction.

Note: The engraving used as a frontispiece is the same as the one in A.
The Fifth Edition (the fourth according to the title page)

THE HISTORY OF Pompey the Little OR, THE LIFE and ADVENTURES OF A LAP-DOG — gressumque Canes comitantur

herilem VIR. AEn. — mutato nomine de te Fabula narratur. HOR.

The FOURTH EDITION. / DUBLIN: / Printed by GEORGE FAULKNER, in Essex-street. / MDCCLIII.

12mo: [A1], A2-A5, B-H12, I7: pp. x / 182.

Contents: [Frontispiece unsigned: an engraving of Pompey, the lap dog, seated on a cushion]; p. [i], title; p. [ii], blank; pp. iii-vii, dedication to Henry Fielding; pp. viii-x, table of contents; pp. 1-182, text.


Note: The engraving used as a frontispiece is the same as the one in C.
APPENDIX B

I have included only substantive variants between D and E and those accidental ones necessary for comparison of all five editions. Other accidental variants between D and S are too numerous to record here. But I have included all variants among A, B, C, and E. I have not recorded obvious printer's errors. Unless otherwise indicated, subsequent editions agree with A.

A 1.1 Dogs, ] ~; B 1.1; dogs, D 1.1
A 1.6-7 if I should set myself to collect, from ] were I to collect, D 1.6-7; if I were to collect from, E 1.4-5
A 2.12 undertaking it. ] undertaking. D 2.12
A 3.2 They ] they C and E 2.18; D 3.2
A 3.20 Lincoln-Inn-Fields ] Lincoln-Inns Field E 2.32
A 4.1-2 Lincoln-Inn-Fields ] Lincoln-Inns Field E 3.2
A 4.15 dropped ] dropp'd C and E 3.13; threw D 4.15
A 5.2 Hounds, ] hounds, D 5.2; Hounds; E 3.26
A 5.12 lips ] Lips B 5.12
A 5.13-14 from whence the Tyrians first took the Hint ] from whence the hint was taken D 5.14-15
A 5.17 scarlet ] Scarlet B 5.17
A 6.2-3 as the Men, ] as the fair ones of our own isle, D 6.2-3
A 6.6-8 Fashion, on whom he depended for support, took up her favorite Lap-dog one Day, and attempted ] fashion, took up her favorite Lap-dog one day, attempting D 6.6-8 and E 4.15-17
A 6.19-20 we shall not want Examples in our own Days and Nations, of great Men's ] neither there shall we want examples of great mens D 6.19-20 and E 4.26-27
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A 7.9 Voice, ] Voice C 5.2; voice, D 7.9; Voice E 5.2
A 7.10 and the Duke of [_____] ] and colonel Churchill.' D 7.10;
and the Duke of H E 5.3
A 7.18-19 when Treason and Conspiracies ] when conspiracies D 7.18-19
A 7.24-25 if any should, ] if any such critic should be found, D 7.24-25
A 8.4-8 Work, which one of my Contemporaries declares to be an Epic
Poem in Prose; and I cannot help promising some Encouragement,
in this Life-writing Age especially, where ] work, in this
life-writing age especially, when D 8.5-6
A 8.22-23 Romances. Thus I am told ] romances. Thus we have seen the
memoirs, . . only that the former work has rather a greater air
of chastity, if possible, than the latter. And I am told D 8.19-28
A 8.25-28 him, and he shall be no longer able to raise a Kind of Tax,
if I may so call it, from Tea, Coffee, Chocolate, and Marriages,
designs ] him, designs D 9.2
A 9.23-25 Biographers, and chosen a subject worthy the Attention of
polite and classical Readers. ] biographers, and ventured to
snatch a laurel, Unde prius nulli velarunt tempora musae. D 9.27-
10.2
A 10.4 Phyllis ] Phyllis E 6.31
A 10.23-12.5 Bologna; from whom. . . and little Julio ] Bologna; who
was about that time engaged in an intrigue with a celebrated
courtesan of the place. And little Julio D 11.6-9
A 11.13 means ] Means C and E 7.24 (nothing comparable in D)
A 11.15 Julio having ] , ~ B 11.15 (nothing comparable in D)
A 12.10-11 Phyllis ] Phyllis E 8.9
A 12.16 length in ] , ~ C and E 8.14
A 12.18 Phyllis ] Phyllis E 8.16
A 13.2-3 in some former ones; ] in former ones: C and E 8.26
A 13.6 if ] If B 13.6
A 13.9 May N.S. ] , ~ C and E 8.32
A 14.4 him ] , C and E 9.16; D 13.7
A 14.22 Trade, not ] ~ C and E 9.31; trade, not D 13.26
A 16.5 and to reconcile ] and reconcile D 15.9
A 16.8 Dinner, ] dinner, D 15.12; Dinner E 10.31
A 17.5 Door, ] door, D 16.10; Door E 11.17
A 17.10 Side, ] ~ C and E 11.20; side, D 16.15
A 17.20 Kisses ] kisses C and E 11.29; D 16.26
A 17.21 Affection ] affection D 16.27 and E 11.30
A 18.2 whence looking ] ∼, ∼ C 12.1 and E 11.38
A 18.22 Charmer stood ] ∼, ∼ E 12.27
A 19.4 Hillario after ] ∼, ∼ C 12.27 and E 12.26
A 20.7 part ] Part C and E 13.9
A 20.13 Applications, ] ∼ E 13.15
A 20.17 landed, ] ∼ E 13.18
A 21.21 accordingly ] Accordingly E 14.6
A 21.26 Inscriptions ] inscriptions D 20.26
A 22.1 made, whenever ] ∼ E 14.14
A 22.12 ill-preserved, ] ∼ ; C and E 14.23
A 22.27-29 Confusion, yet all... Nor did ] confusion. Nor did D 21.26
A 25.5 Coxcomb: ] ∼ C and E 16.11; coxcomb: D 24.2
A 25.23 No body ] No-body C and E 16.26; no-body D 24.20
A 26.8 Shoulder-knots ] Shoulder knots C and E 16.38; shoulder-knots D 25.5
A 26.13 Coach-horses; ] ∼ , C and E 17.4; coach-horses; D 25.10
A 26.16 answered ] answered C and E 17.6
A 27.23 Cleanthe could ] Cleanthe, not withstanding the indifference she had hitherto expressed towards him, could D 26.25-27
A 29.3-8 If the foregoing Dialogue... He was ] Our hero was D 27.12
A 29.10 pretty well ] ∼, ∼ E 18.21
A 29.15-16 beyond the Anti-chamber of Hillario's Lodgings; ] beyond Hillario's lodgings; D 27.18-19
A 30.1-8 Among the many visitors... Conversation on ] Hillario and his little dog... told, on D 28.6-12
A 30.13 (for that was her Name) ] (that was the name of the lady last arrived) D 28.16-17
A 30.15 Hillario ] his master D 28.19
A 30.17 Devil ] devil C and E 19.16; D 28.21
A 30.18 That ] This D 28.22
A 30.20 That ] This D 28.24
A 30.21 Nobleman's Wife ] woman of the first fashion D 28.25
A 30.22 Creature that ] creature, I think, that D 28.26-27
A 30.23-24 Air—O quelle mine! quelle delicatesse! Then air.
Then D 28.28
A 30.26 of on D 28.29
A 30.27 Lady Tempest's Curiosity the ladies curiosity D 29.2-3
A 30.27 her them D 29.3
A 30.29 her Ladyship them D 29.5
A 31.19 and sent and, pox take him, sent D 29.24
A 32.10 Fellow fellow C 20.21 and D 30.16
A 32.21 in short, not in short—ha! ha! I shall never forget how
he looked—in short, not D 30.26-27
A 32.22 Ladyship ladyships D 30.28
A 32.23-24 Lady Tempest Both the ladies D 31.1
A 32.26-27 herself themselves D 31.4
A 32.27-28 it, said it, one of them said D 31.5
A 32.30 pardon ~ ~ E 20.37
A 33.15 Love love D 31.23 and E 21.11
A 33.21-23 and after spending an Hour in the bitterest Lamentations,
when and spent an hour with her in the greatest rapture,
till D 31.29-30
A 33.24-25 longer, we longer, O mon cour! then D 32.1-2
A 33.27-29 --O how I cursed Fortune for separating us! but at
length I was obliged to decamp, and D'mn'd malicious fate tore
me at length from her arms, and D 32.5-6
A 34.7 Lady ladies D 32.14
A 34.8 she lady Tempest D 33.4-5
A 34.25-26 but if you did, it does not signify; but look'e make no
preambles, D 33.4-5
A 35.3 him it D 33.12
A 35.17 faith, upon ~ ~ E 35.17; C and E 22.23
A 36.13-19 Pleasures. They laughed at Constancy...serious, virtuous
and religious. From pleasures. From D 34.22
A 37.22 Pompey ~ ~ C 24.1
A 37.27 produced; ~ C and E 24.5
A 38.2-5 Little Pompey cast up a wishful Eye at the Window above; but
the Chairmen were now in Motion, and with Thus our hero, with
D 36.6-7
A 38.6 Equipage, he set equipage, set D 36.8
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