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The relationships between rhetorical analysis and literary criticism can best be described as strained. Part of this estrangement may be caused by the medium of literature. Words and language are primarily a means of communication. Unlike other artistic forms which use means that are generally set off from everyday life, (painting, sculpture, music), literature uses the same means to create an artistic or poetic or literary "object" that is used for more common and pedestrian activities. Since rhetoric concerns itself with the practical use of language, perhaps it is this fact of practicality that leads many critics to deny its value to the artistic use of language.

Another source of this estrangement results from the attitude of some modern critics that literature should be viewed as an object with an existence of its own that is dependent neither upon the factors that brought about its creation nor the effects that it may produce. The consideration of a literary work as an instrument for producing a desired effect is particularly scorned since this mode of criticism involves also a consideration of the audience.
The term "means of persuasion" as a definition of rhetoric presupposes an audience to be persuaded and a writer who wishes to persuade, and while many critics limit a discussion of rhetoric to the relationships between the work and the audience, this paper will not consider only this relationship but will also examine the relationship between the poet's purpose, subject, and audience and the choice of means he uses in arranging and presenting his work so that it will develop and achieve the desired response. While the response of an audience cannot be objectively and definitely determined, still, the lack of certainty about the response does not negate the propriety of attempting to elicit and to direct a desired response on the basis of knowledge of the general reactions of audiences to emotion-filled situations, logical reasoning, moral concepts or whatever other circumstances the subject of the work suggests.

As the response of the audience cannot be precisely determined, neither can its character. The audience of any work which has a purpose, while it is a real audience, has its character in the writer's conception of his audience; therefore, it is his conception of the audience that determines the rhetorical form of his work. The audience is therefore important, not to the
criticism of the work as a work, but as one factor on which to base a judgment of the writer's skill in the adaptation of his work to his purpose. Finally, then, the effectiveness of rhetoric lies in the poet's skill; not only his skill in the use of rhetoric itself, but also his skill in understanding and judging the character of the audience he deals with and his skill in determining the most effective means of persuading them.

This paper is an examination of the use of rhetoric in Alexander Pope's *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot*. Rhetoric is here viewed as a practical art but one which is artistically used in order to achieve the poet's purpose of defending himself against the charges of his enemies. The judgments on the use of rhetoric are made in terms of the poet's ability to adapt his "means of persuasion" to his subject, his purpose and his audience.
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INTRODUCTION

The use by Alexander Pope of rhetorical devices in his poetry reflects the learning of his day. Pope, however, because of his Catholic religion, was denied educational advantages enjoyed by young men of his time. The question, therefore, is by what means he learned the details of rhetoric which are so skillfully used in his writings. Apparently Pope gave little thought to the question, because while a goodly amount of information may be found dealing with his education generally, little is available on this point specifically. An examination of the known facts of his education may lead to some probable conclusions.

Alexander Pope was born in London on May 21st in 1688. His father, a well-to-do linen merchant, apparently retired from business that year, and there is very little information about the family for the next few years. Pope's mother's unmarried sister, Elizabeth, evidently lived with the family, and it was she who taught her nephew to read.¹

¹The Correspondence of Alexander Pope, ed. George Sherburn (Oxford, 1956), I, 33-34.
Owen Ruffhead, in *The Life of Alexander Pope*, gives helpful information about Pope's early education. Noting that Pope had learned to read at an early age and took great delight in it, Ruffhead tells us that Pope, at the age of eight, went to the first of the three private schools he attended. At this school, he encountered translations of Homer and Ovid which he spoke of with pleasure in later years. After a short time, Pope left this school, and was sent to another one, and at the age of ten, he was sent to still a third. At this school, run by Mr. Thomas Deane, he was allowed to attend the playhouses, and he undertook to imitate the dramatic productions he saw with efforts of his own at putting the main portions of the *Iliad* into a play.  

How long Pope spent at Deane's school is unknown, because in accord with the various oppressive laws directed against the Catholics during this period, the Pope family moved to a small farm at Binfield in Windsor Forest about 1700. Here the second phase of Alexander Pope's education began.

---

Pope was at this time twelve years old. He continued his education for a time under the instruction of a priest, probably the Reverend William Mannock, but soon struck out on his own. Ruffhead describes Pope's method of study as "the reading of the classic writers, more especially of the poets, to whom he applied with great eagerness and enthusiasm." In addition to a self-imposed program of study, Pope also benefited from his father's interest, encouragement, and guidance. His father would urge the boy to write verses, insisting that they be corrected time and again. When satisfied with his son's efforts, he is reported to have said, "These are good 'rhymes'." Still another source of stimulus and guidance was Sir William Trumbull. Pope told Spence that Sir William "loved very much to read and talk of the classics in his retirement. We used to take a ride out together, three or four days in the week, and at last, almost every day." As Sherburn points out, in The Early Career of Alexander

---

4 Ruffhead, p. 11.
5 Ibid., p. 12.
6 Sherburn, Correspondence . . ., footnote, p. 10.
Pope, "Sir William . . . may be thought of as Pope's tutor in the classics," and "it is quite possible that Sir William's guidance through something like a decade might well have replaced the formal training of the university."

Probably as a result of the inspiration and encouragement of Trumbull, Pope set himself the task of acquiring knowledge in languages. Formerly his reading had been primarily confined to translations of the classic writers, but at this point, as Father Mannock told Spence, Pope

set to learning Latin and Greek by himself, about twelve; and when he was about fifteen he resolved that he would go up to London and learn French and Italian. . . . He stuck to it; went thither; and mastered both those languages with a surprising dispatch. Almost every thing of this kind was of his own acquiring. He had had masters indeed, but they were very indifferent ones; and what he got was almost wholly owing to his own unassisted industry.

While Pope was studying, he was also polishing his talent as a poet. Ruffhead tells us that Pope developed

7 Ibid.
8 Sherburn, The Early Career . . ., p. 42.
his poetic skills through imitation of the best writers, "and thus he became a poet . . . by copying from the antients; and he frequently copied the best moderns likewise." Among "the best moderns" who provided Pope with sources for inspiration were Waller, Spenser, and Dryden, but it was Dryden who was to become Pope's literary hero. Dryden's works were more than a source of imitation for the poet; according to Ruffhead, Pope "even adopted the very turns of his periods; . . . In short, from Dryden principally our bard learnt all the magic of his versification." Ruffhead probably was carried away when he credits Dryden with all the magic of Pope's versification, for the young poet was also familiar with other great men of literature. When he was about thirteen, he wrote an epic, whose purpose was
to collect all the beauties of the great epic writers into one piece: there was Milton's style in one part, and Cowley's in another; here the style of Spenser imitated, and there of Statius; here Homer and Virgil, and there Ovid and Claudian.


\[11\] Ibid., pp. 17-18.

\[12\] Spence, pp. 276-78, quoted in Sherburn, Career, p. 83.
No doubt the imitations of the style of these writers would have provided Pope with many examples of the use of rhetoric, and these examples, coupled with his skill in poetry and his industrious application to his verses, very likely provided him with a basic education in rhetoric, however unaware of this fact he may have been himself.

Pope did not confine his practice of verses to the epic, for he also composed a tragedy and a comedy, and began work on his Pastorals, written when he was fifteen. Sherburn notes the wide range of Pope's earliest works, remarking that it is "apparent that the young poet began experimenting early with attempts in the noblest genres." ¹³

While it is true that Pope's method of self-education was such as to cast doubt on the extent and solidity of his learning, he still seems to have been well-educated. His early acquaintance with the Greek and Roman writers was through translations, but Pope soon moved on to the original languages. Austin Warren, in his book, Alexander Pope as Critic and Humanist, shows that "it was in his adolescence that Pope made

his translations from the *Metamorphoses* and the *Heroides*. At about the same time, Ruffhead tells us, "he made a translation of Tully, *De Senectute*, a copy of which ... is preserved in Lord Oxford's library." Furthermore, Warren adds, "The chief extant specimen of Pope's scholarship in Latin is his early translation of the First Book of Statius' *Thebiad*," which had made Dr. Johnson think Pope must have been proficient in the language.

Proficient or not, Pope developed a wide knowledge of the Roman writers. In his early letters he quoted such a variety of writers as Virgil, Petronius, Persius, Ovid, Catullus, Horace, Juvenal, Lucretius, Martial, Tibullus, Seneca, Cicero, Pliny, Tacitus, Aulus Gellius, and Macrobius. Ovid, Horace, and Virgil are quoted most often, but Cicero is the most often cited of the prose writers. As Warren points

---

15 Ruffhead, p. 13.
16 Warren, p. 186.
18 Sherburn, *Correspondence* ... , passim.
out, "the passages from Cicero quoted . . . are drawn from a considerable number of the writings—De Legibus, De Oratoribus, the Tusculan Disputations, the Orations, De Natura Deorum, the Rhetoric."\textsuperscript{19} Such a broad knowledge of the works of Cicero must have led to familiarity with the rhetorical principles of this writer.

Few people challenged Pope's knowledge of Latin, but this was not the case with his knowledge of Greek. His translation of Homer's Iliad and Odyssey first brought charges of incompetence in the language, and while Pope admits a lack of scholarly skill in a letter to Bridges in 1708,\textsuperscript{20} still a letter to Cromwell in 1710, indicates that he knew enough of the Greek tongue to be aware of fine nuances of meaning.\textsuperscript{21}

Pope did not limit his study to the classical writers; he also developed an extensive knowledge of French and Italian authors. Of the Italians, he was

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{19}Warren, p. 201.
\item \textsuperscript{20}Sherburn, Correspondence . . ., p. 44.
\item \textsuperscript{21}Ibid., p. 96.
\end{itemize}
familiar with Ariosto and Tasso and quoted extensively from Tasso in his *Observations on the Iliad.*

There is no evidence that he knew Dante, but Pope was familiar, as Warren shows, with "the now too nearly forgotten Italian poets of the Renaissance 'Qui Latine scripsisse,'" to the extent that he brought out in a two-volume edition the Latin poems of Italian poets. This work: *Seleeta Poemata Italorum. Qui Latine Scripsisse.* Cura cujusdam anonymi anno 1684 congesta, iterum in lucem data, una cum aliorum Italorum operibus, Accurante A. Pope. London, J. F. Knapton, 1740. This was a re-issue of an older collection. . . . The edition is still the standard . . . collection of the poets represented; and it still appears in modern bibliographies--chiefly as the source of citations from Vida.

Pope's knowledge of the French language, as well as the Greek, has often come under attack. Pope himself said modestly, in his critique of Voltaire's *Henriade,* "I cannot pretend to judge with any exactness of the beauties of a foreign language which I understand but imperfectly," but Warren insists

22 Warren, p. 205.
23 Ibid., p. 206.
24 Ibid., pp. 206-207.
that Pope must have read the language well in the
collection that the poet's fluency "is evident from the
extensive use which he made of Madame Dacier's labors
on the Iliad."\textsuperscript{26} Pope's reading among the French
writers was broad, covering authors such as Rabelais,
Montaigne, Boileau, Pascal, La Rochefoucauld, Charron,
La Bruyère, Voiture, and Voltaire.\textsuperscript{27}

Pope did not neglect, in the course of his edu-
cation, the writers of his own land. According to
R. D. Havens, in \textit{The Influence of Milton in English
Poetry}, Pope "appears to have been more widely
acquainted with the complete body of Milton's poems
than any other man of his time."\textsuperscript{28} Dryden and
Spenser have already been mentioned, but Pope knew
and used many other writers. The sources used for
the Dunciad provide a kind of check-list of Pope's
reading. In addition to Greek, Latin, and French
writers, material was taken from Milton, Dryden, Ad-
dison, Waller, Denham, Spenser, Butler, Jonson, Gay,
Parnell, Sheffield, and Young.\textsuperscript{29} As Warren points

\textsuperscript{26}Warren, p. 209.

\textsuperscript{27}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 209-217.

\textsuperscript{28}R. D. Havens, \textit{The Influence of Milton in English
Poetry} (Cambridge, 1922), p. 15.

\textsuperscript{29}Warren, p. 172.
out, "whatever else these lists suggest, they evi-
dence acquaintance with and assimilation of a con- siderable body of ancient and modern literature."³⁰

While a fair amount of attention has been given
to Pope's knowledge of literature, relatively little work has been done on his knowledge of rhetoric.
Certainly he was acquainted with the rhetoricians Quintilian and Cicero, for he wrote in a letter to Walsh:

I know some people will think these Obser-
vations trivial, and therefore I am glad to corroborate them by some great Authori-
ties, which I have met with in Tully and Quintilian. In the fourth Book of Rhetoric
to Herennius, are these words: Fugiemus crebras Vocalium concursiones, quae vastam
atque hiantem reddunt orationem; ut hoc est, Baccae aeneae amoennisimae impendebant.
And Quintilian I. 9. cap. 4. Vocalium concursus cum accidit, hiat & intersistit,
at quasi laborat oratio. Pessimi longe quae easdem inter se literas committunt, sona-
bunt: Praecipuus tamen erit hiatus sarum quae cavo aut patulo ore efferuntur. E
plenior litera est, I angustior. But he goes on to reprove the excess on the other
and of being too sollicitious [sic] in this matter, and says admirably, Nescio an
negligentia in hoc, aut sollicitudo sit peior. So likewise Tully (Orator ad Brut.)
Theopompum reprehendunt, quod eas literas tanto opere fugerit, etsi idem magister
ejus Isocrates: which last Author, as

³⁰Ibid.
Turnebus on Quintilian observes, has hardly one Hiatus in all his works. Quintilian tells us that Tully and Demosthenes did not much observe this Nicety, tho' Tully himself says in his Orator, Crebra ista Vocum concursio, quam magna ex parte vitiosam, fugit Demosthenes.51

The Essay on Criticism indicates his familiarity with Longinus and Aristotle, and Peri Bathous shows clear knowledge of the critic's work. As Warren comments, "While no close parallel to 'Longinus' is attempted, there is a general similarity, particularly in the emphasis laid in each upon the formal figures of rhetoric. . . . "32 It seems doubtful that Pope learned the intricacies of rhetoric in his early schooling, for Ruffhead reports,

His passion for poetry, however, being predominant, he was eager to explore all the treasures of Parnassus; and between this [the stay in London to learn French and Italian] and his twentieth year, he devoted himself entirely to the reading of the most considerable poets and critics in the Greek, Latin, French, Italian, and English languages. . . . In all this time, he has been heard to declare that he never read any treatise on the art of logic or rhetoric.33

31 Sherburn, Correspondence . . ., p. 25.
32 Warren, p. 163.
33 Ruffhead, p. 13.
If Pope's comment is true and correctly reported by Ruffhead, then the conclusion must be that he learned the niceties of rhetoric from imitation of the many ancient and modern writers at first, although possibly his knowledge was further developed in his program of learning and study which he undertook between the ages of twenty and twenty-seven. A suggestion of this is found in Ruffhead's telling of Pope's final brushing-up on learning, commenting that "he penetrated into the general ground and reasons of speech; he learned to distinguish the several species of style." 

In spite of the fact that Pope denied having read any texts on rhetoric, he obviously gained knowledge of and proficiency in the field from some source. Although he may have been unaware of any specific training except from his family priest, who, as he told Spence, "taught me the figures, accidence and the first part of grammar," the training of

---

34 Ibid., p. 15.
35 Ibid.
36 Spence, p. 283.
both his father and his various masters in rhetoric was probably passed on to the pupil.

Rhetoric was a basic part of the grammar-school training in the middle of the seventeenth century and continued to be taught well into the eighteenth century. Foster Watson, in his book The Old Grammar Schools, describes the curriculum. The third form devoted about one quarter of a year to the study of the figures of rhetoric, and this learning was constantly reviewed. In the fifth form, the making of themes was introduced. The writing of themes involved the exploration of the topics of argument and the entering of those topics suitable to the theme assigned in "commonplace-note-books." Students also learned how to

prosecute the severall parts of a Theme . . . so as to bring their matter into handsome and plain order, and to flourish

---

37 Martin L. Clarke, Classical Education in Britain (Cambridge, 1959), p. 50.
39 Clarke, p. 39.
and adorne it neatly with Rhetorical Tropes and Figures.⁴⁰

Nor was the concern with rhetoric confined to the grammar schools. At Oxford, lectures in grammar and rhetoric were required of all first-year students based on the words of Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian.⁴¹ Cambridge insisted on rhetorically-oriented theme writing in the last half of the seventeenth century, advising students that their work "should be suitably arranged, adorned with similes, illustrated by appropriate examples, . . . embellished by metaphors."⁴² The rhetorical training of his masters, as well as the place of rhetoric in the grammar-school course of studies, indicates that it was very likely that Pope received a fairly comprehensive training in the use of rhetoric.

Pope's early hero-worship of Dryden, which he carried, according to Ruffhead, to the extent of

---

⁴⁰ Charles Hoole, *New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching School* (London, 1660), pp. 183-185. Clarke (Classical Education in Britain, pp. 224-225) gives examples of the kinds of themes that were written during the mid-seventeenth century. These themes show the divisions of propositio, confirmatio and conclusio and the use of proofs such as similitudo, exemplum and testimonium.

⁴¹ Clarke, p. 61.

⁴² Ibid., p. 63.
copying "the very turns of his periods," also must have taught the young poet a great deal about the use of rhetoric. His penchant for imitation of both ancient and modern writers and his devoted study of their styles probably aided the development of his rhetorical skills as well as his poetic talents.

Familiarity with the writings of Quintilian and Cicero, and particularly the frequent and wide-spread quotations from the latter, tend to refute Pope's disclaimer of having read any rhetoric texts. Probably his knowledge of Longinus came later, during the last phase of his program of self-education when he undertook a detailed study of speech, style and language. Whatever the truth of the matter may be, Pope, mainly through his own efforts, attained a degree of education equal to that of university-trained men, and developed a skill in the use of rhetoric equal to the best writers of his time.
CHAPTER I

THE RHETORICAL ARRANGEMENT OF POPE'S ARBUTHNOT

Arrangement in the rhetorical sense refers not only to the various parts which make up a speech or piece of writing but also to the presentation of these parts in the order most effective in terms of the purpose of the work. Classical rhetoricians established sections or divisions which made up the whole discourse, ranging from Aristotle's essential two, statement of the issue and the supporting arguments, to later rhetoricians' seven. The seven parts that were generally recognized as separate and useful portions were: exordium or proem, narratio, expositio, propos- itio, confirmatio, refutatio, and peroratio.

The exordium or proem, as Aristotle called it, was used to introduce the subject to be discussed and to gain the receptive attention of the audience. Aristotle suggested that if the material was plain and simple, no introduction was necessary, but he conceded that the need to make an audience receptive and provide an appropriate image or ethical appeal always demanded one.
The narratio and expositio were sometimes combined, since their functions depended basically on the type of speech being made. The narratio provided the background for the discussion, giving the facts and events leading up to the occasion of the discourse and explaining the reasons why the subject had come up for consideration. The expositio established the speaker's view of the matter under discussion and what he understood to be the point at issue and its significance. This portion was also used to define terms, if such definition was required by the nature of the discourse.

The propositio was to be a brief and explicit statement of the point to be considered and was usually the shortest part of the speech. While the subject had been introduced in the exordium, a precise statement was useful at this point for two reasons. First, the audience could more clearly understand the proposition if it followed the background information supplied by the narratio. Second, the audience might not yet have given its full attention to the speaker as early in the speech as the introduction, and for such an important point, attention by the audience had to be assured. In addition to these reasons, a third was also sometimes involved; if a blunt statement of the point of
discussion might arouse antagonism in the audience, it would be wiser to delay the statement until the audience had been moulded into the desired attitude.

The **confirmatio** was the longest part of a speech, presenting the arguments supporting or undermining the proposal and providing the proof of the **propositio**. Often the **refutatio**, the answers to opposing arguments, was inserted into the **confirmatio**, instead of being set up as a separate division. The **peroratio** or conclusion provided a summary of the arguments and usually involved also an appeal to the emotions of the audience and a reinforcement of the ethical appeal.

The order of these parts provided a convenient blueprint for the arrangement of a speech, but it was not necessary that this order be followed rigidly. The **refutatio**, for example, might well come before the **confirmatio**, and it was not unusual to find the **expositio**, **narratio**, and **propositio** sections either omitted or combined with other parts. Whatever use was made of these divisions was always determined in regard to the purpose of the work.

The arrangement of Pope's *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot* followed the classical rhetorical pattern closely, as can be seen by an examination of the various divisions
of the poem, which is organized as follows:

I. Proem— the prose Advertisement.

II. Narratio— Lines 1-108 of the poem.

III. Confirmatio and refutatio— Lines 109-333.

IV. Peroratio— Lines 334-419.

Pope did not set up a separate division for the expositio, the portion giving the point at issue and its importance. He did not, however, neglect the part, for its functions may be found both in the proem and the section which includes the propositions. Perhaps the poetic form made it difficult for the proposition to be stated simply and briefly in one short passage; in any case the statements are scattered. Still, his proposition comes through clearly; he is forced to speak out and tell the truth about fools who do not recognize their own folly and of all the fools, flatterers are the worst of the tribe. The designation of the prose Advertisement as the proem fits the classical concept of the functions of an introduction, but the first six sections of the poem may be considered a combination of proem and narratio. The use of refutation before the presentation of his own arguments was necessary in this case in order to dispel the possible charge of cruelty which might have antagonized his audience. How well
Pope adapted the various functions of the portions of his poem to his forensic aim of self-defense will be shown by an examination of the divisions.

The Advertisement to An Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot serves the purpose of a classical proem for forensic rhetoric. It introduces the material, gives a hint of what will be discussed, and shows how justice and injustice are involved; as Aristotle suggests, in his Rhetoric, it makes clear "the end and object" of the work.

Pope describes his poem as a "sort of bill of complaint" which will answer the attacks made upon him and will provide "to those who know me not, a truer information." This description informs his audience that he

---

1 Alexander Pope, Imitations of Horace, Volume IV of The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope, ed. John Butt (New York, 1942). All quotations from An Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot in this paper are taken from this edition; however, in the interest of ease in reading, the spelling has been modernized and capitalization has been dropped, except as it accords with modern usage. Elisions likewise have been eliminated except where the meter of the verse would be affected. The Advertisement to the Epistle is not available in many editions; therefore it has been reproduced in the appendix.

2 Aristotle, Rhetoric, in The Rhetoric of Aristotle, trans. Lane Cooper (New York, 1932), III, xiv, p. 223. All subsequent references to the Rhetoric will refer to this edition and will be indicated in parentheses in the text.
is about to undertake an apology or defense. The injustice of the attacks he has suffered is brought out when he concedes that while it is fair to criticize his works, it is very unfair to extend the same criticism to himself and to his family. The justice of his action in rebuking his detractors is supported by the contentions that the author serves only truth and honor and that his writings cannot possibly injure anyone.

Aristotle urges the use of a proem to make the audience receptive and to "give an impression of ... a good and just man" (III, xiv, p. 224). One of the necessary points to consider in making an audience receptive is that of removing any prejudice that may be present. Concerning this point, Aristotle explains:

Those [arguments] that concern the speaker or his opponent have to do with removing or exciting prejudice. But here we note a difference between one who is defending a position and one who is attacking it. The defendant will deal with prejudice at the beginning; the accuser will reserve such effort for the close of the speech. (III, xiv, p. 223)

Pope does precisely this by affirming again and again in the Advertisement his stand as a moderate, patient, long-suffering person; emphasis on these points serves to make the audience receptive to the presentation of his side of the question. When he designates his poem
as "a sort of bill of complaint," the qualifying phrase, a sort of, subtly modifies the somewhat belligerent and quarrelsome tone of the bare words, bill of complaint. Elder Olson, in his article, "Rhetoric and the Appreciation of Pope," notes an additional function of this phrase. As he points out,

there is much rhetorical force in that the answer to Pope's enemies would have been drawn up, not as the response of a defendant, but as Pope himself says, as a "sort of bill of complaint." To have answered as defendant would have been to indicate the charges as worthy of serious consideration, and the defense would have been much more difficult; to file a bill of complaint, on the other hand, is to propose one's self as the wronged person and to lay the burden of disproof upon the opposition. 3

The poet's patience and long-suffering, supporting the image of him as a good man, are noted by Pope's explanation of the background of the work—"begun many years hence, and drawn up by snatches as the several occasions offered." The point that he has been attacked on many occasions and over a long period of time dispels any impression of headstrong or precipitous action; the next statement points out that it is only the cumulative effect of many attacks that has finally driven

him to take action: "I had no thoughts of publishing it, till it pleased some persons of rank and fortune to attack..." In these instances, Pope establishes himself as a reasonable, restrained and moderate man as well as a writer about to undertake a case of self-defense, a defense which will be recognized as just by all other reasonable and moderate men. By constant stress upon his reasonableness in the face of adversities, the poet identifies himself with virtuous and reasonable men. This method of developing a common bond with his audience is mentioned by Aristotle in regard to epideictic speeches:

... we should make the hearer feel that our note of praise includes him, and applies either to himself, or his family, or his manner of life—or somehow touches him. (III, xiv, p. 225)

And Olson points out Pope's use of it to dispose the audience to listen to his case. Olson describes the audience as "those who are or who think themselves virtuous" and goes on to explain:

As the matter stands, virtue is the solitary characteristic of the audience; hence Pope needs only to reassure his audience that he is a man of virtue.

---

5 Ibid.
In order to support his contention that he is a man of virtue, Pope proceeds to develop a contrast between himself and those who have attacked him. Stating that his critics have been pleased "to attack in a very extraordinary manner" his writings, his family, and himself, he very reasonably concedes their right to comment on his writings, "of which being public, the public judge." However, he will not concede the same right in regard to any attack on his "person, morals, and family." He does not call these comments lies, but in a calm and restrained manner, states simply that "whereof to those who know me not, a truer information may be requisite." To emphasize the difference between his own attitude and that of his critics, he carefully creates a picture of their malice. Describing the latest attack as being made by persons of "rank and fortune," Pope makes the attack seem more vicious. That persons of worldly goods and honor should attack one who has neither makes the "crime" appear to be worse, and conveys the idea of power, influence, and importance directed toward the destruction of one who has none of the resources of "rank and fortune." This underdog concept is a very pointed emotional appeal which is almost certain to gain sympathy.
Much of the impression of virtue developed at this point comes from the contrast with vice and viciousness. Pope has pointed out that he and his family are not fair objects of attack and that the positions of his attackers are not consistent with what would be expected of them. Finally, he describes the attack itself as "very extraordinary"—he implies that it was not ordinary criticism, but unusual, disproportionate, and vicious.

The Advertisement likewise makes a bid for indulgence. On this point, Aristotle says that in the proem of a speech, a speaker "may appeal to the hearers for indulgence if his subject shall seem strange, or difficult, or hackneyed" (III, xiv, p. 223). It is not difficult to believe that this is the point Pope had in mind when he wrote;

Being divided between the necessity to say something of myself, and my own laziness to undertake so awkward a task, I thought it the shortest way to put the last hand to the epistle.

His designation of his task as awkward indicates his awareness of the touchiness of his position of self-defense, and arouses the audience to a sympathetic attention. The comment that he will use "the shortest way" implies that there are many arguments which he might use. The blend of reluctant defense in a
difficult position with the proposal to wind the matter up in the briefest way possible with the materials most readily available develops into a sympathetic portrait of beleaguered virtue and noble moderation desirous only of quickly and quietly retiring from the fray.

However, having decided to undertake his apologia, Pope becomes firmer. Virtue is emphasized in his description of the contents of the poem. His aim is to please by means of truth, of which he is "most desirous"; if the poem contains anything offensive, it will be only to those who are "vicious and ungenerous" and in regard to these persons, he is "least sorry."
The reference to vicious and ungenerous is balanced by the suggestion that these persons are his opposites, that he is virtuous and generous. Even the comment that he is "least sorry" to offend them contributes to his ethical appeal as a virtuous man. It would be expected that he would not be at all sorry about the effect his writings might have on them, but that is not the case. He is sorry, but very naturally not as sorry as if the people offended were undeserving. Stressing his dedication to truth, he avers that "not a circumstance but what is true" has been written, and returns to the concept of his generosity by noting that he has
left out names, so that his enemies need not be shamed or ridiculed— they "may escape being laughed at, if they please."

Pope finds it appropriate at this point to indicate that his generosity to his enemies in not naming them is due in large part to the intercession of his friend. Having built up the concept of a patient, generous person pushed by malicious enemies to the brink of revenge, this comment hints at the threat of future revelation of names and facts. Pope does not dwell on this point, since it is inconsistent with the impressions of virtue which have been established; instead, he moves on to contrast his writings with those of his enemies. His works cannot hurt anyone except those to whom they are directed, and only then if the facts are such to make identification easy, "since a nameless character can never be found out, but by its truth and likeness."

One of the major methods of establishing himself as a virtuous man is closely related to what Aristotle had to say in regard to epideictic oratory. Much of Pope's writing involves praise of himself and condemnation of his enemies, and in this regard, Aristotle comments:
Since we praise men for what they have done, and since the mark of a virtuous person is that he acts after deliberate moral choice, our speaker must try to show that the subject of his praise is a man who does so act. To this end, one will find it helpful to make it appear that the man has often acted with a moral purpose. (I, ix, p. 52)

Pope seeks to establish that he is acting on the basis of a deliberate moral choice by citing the long delay in publishing the work and the omission of the names of those who have attacked him. Conversely, he suggests the same deliberate moral choice, but in a pejorative manner, towards his detractors; they have made free use of his name, injuring him and his family. In addition, he stresses his good intent as well as his critics' malice, saying:

> I shall have this advantage, and honour, on my side, that whereas by their proceeding, any abuse may be directed at any man, no injury can possibly be done by mine. . . .

This passage relates to Aristotle's advice on dealing with prejudice, that the speaker should emphasize that even though the act was harmful, "at all events it was honorable; or that, if it caused pain, nevertheless it did good" (III, xiv, p. 226). These lines also fulfill one of the uses of the expositio, that of pointing out the significance of the matter under discussion.
Pope here is referring to the need for restraint in writing, lest it should lead to unbridled abuse.

Throughout the Advertisement, Pope has concentrated his effort on the development of the impression of himself as a man of honor, generosity, and reason, dedicated to the ideals of truth. The importance of the ethical appeal cannot be over-emphasized, for his readers are not only spectators but also judges, and Pope's defense depends heavily on the impressions of justice and virtue which he develops. Pope uses the ethical appeal as one of the major points in his defense, returning to it time and again in the course of the Epistle.

The opening of the Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot is basically a narratio, giving the background of the case and citing events leading up to the proposed self-defense. It also serves the purpose of contributing to the ethos of the writer, and if the poem is considered independently of the Advertisement, the first six sections serve also as an introduction. This introduction is markedly different from the Advertisement, however, since it does not give any explanation of what the work will be about. One reason for this omission might be Pope's recognition of the
fact that his reputation as a none-too-gentle satirist would arouse antagonism toward any defense of his life and works. In any case, he uses a series of humorous anecdotes to arouse the interest of his audience and make them receptive to his later discussion.

As a narratio, Pope is following the advice of Aristotle, that the orator should use it to state "the action that gives rise to the speech" (III, xvi, p. 228), and to

make a selection from the facts—from some of your hero's deeds to show that he is brave, from others that he is wise and just . . . narrate whatever tends to your own credit, or to the discredit of the other side. (III, xvi, p. 229)

The narratio is interspersed with examples, both for the effect of the humor involved, and also to break up the tale, for as Aristotle noted, "it is sometimes undesirable to make the narration continuous . . . [because] the exposition thus becomes hard to recollect" (III, xvi, p. 228). The listing of examples of unscrupulous scribblers pestering him, ranging in terms from general to particular, indicates the extent of his sufferings, and finally leads to the question and proposition:

And is not mine, my friend, a sorer case,  
When every coxcomb perks them in my face? 73-74
The first paragraph begins immediately to construct the ethical appeal of the speaker. The character of the writer is strongly stressed in the opening lines by means of the device of identification with mankind in general. Who has not denied being at home to someone they wished to avoid? The universality of the situation is appealing, stressing a common trait and uncovering a vein of humor as the reader learns the extent to which the writer must go to avoid the scribblers.

Still, the excuses offered, "say I'm sick, I'm dead," indicate that the speaker will not be openly rude and hurt the feelings even of such bothersome callers, even though he is tired and weary. The implication of politeness balances the implication of madness on the part of his visitors. The madness theme is carefully and progressively constructed:

The dog-star rages! nay tis past a doubt, All Bedlam, or Parnassus, is let out: Fire in each eye, and papers in each hand, They rave, recite, and madden round the land. 3-6

The terms dog-star, rages, Bedlam, rave, and madden indicate madness, and their association with Parnassus, papers, and recite tend to associate the poetic terms with the madness terms. Implicitly, the author creates an image of himself characterized by sanity, good sense,
and good manners, in opposition to the lack of these qualities on the part of those who plague him. The virtues suggested also tend to establish a sympathetic disposition within the audience.

Having established himself quite good-naturedly as a person suffering from unwanted visits from madmen, Pope becomes more specific in relating his difficulties in the next section. While everyone can recognize the propriety of an occasional refusal to receive unwelcome visitors, he is faced with a worse problem; his is constantly besieged as if by an invading army or a horde of barbarians. The boldness of his callers and the violations of his right to privacy reaches its highest point with the reference to church, where, according to feudal custom, a person could find safety from pursuit in the sanctuary. Not even this refuge is to be given him, however, since

No place is sacred, not the church is free,
Ev'n Sunday shines no Sabbath-day to me: 11-12

Implied in these lines is the idea that since everyone knows that the practice of church-going should be respectfully regarded, the scribblers must be some alien race, either unaware of custom and propriety, or else unwilling to respect them. Whichever thought the
audience wishes to accept, Pope has built a case against the character of those who bother him. He has likewise lent justification to his actions, and has built up a picture of himself as suffering unduly and enduring much, a truly superior sort of person. The irony of the next lines,

Then from the Mint walks forth the man of rhyme, Happy! to catch me, just at dinner-time. 13-14

is a bit of mockery directed at himself. He willingly feeds such fools, well aware that they are interested in food, not in him or poetry. Again, this sort of person is well-known, and by calling forth similar happenings in the minds of the audience, Pope again stresses his similarity with all mankind, enlisting the sympathy of the audience of well-bred people who, on occasion, have found themselves in just such a position. This emotional identification tends to greatly enhance his ethical appeal and likewise tends to dispel any prejudice; the lack of bitterness in relating the incident provides just enough of the humorous touch to avoid antagonizing anyone. The right disposition of the audience continues to concern Pope; their importance as judges of the appeal is never overlooked.
The third section continues the *narratio*, but is somewhat more serious in tone. Following Aristotle's advice to use as many facts as possible (II, xxii, p. 157), Pope lists a drunken preacher, a poetess, a peer, and a clerk as among those who pester him. The terms bemused, maudlin, locked, scrawls, and desperate support his final contention of madness:

All fly to Twit'nam, and in humble strain
Apply to me, to keep them mad or vain. 21-22

In addition, the author not only suffers from incompetents in his own profession, but he is forced to endure the imputations of those with whom he has no possible connection, such as Arthur's delinquent son, and Cornus' wandering wife. He suggests that even these people are mad through the use of terms such as giddy and frantic; the audience is led to see Pope as a man attacked on all sides by madmen; one small reasonable voice surrounded by a sea of unreason.

Shifting the viewpoint of the *narratio*, Pope now pulls out all the stops in developing the ethical appeal. This portion also contains the functions of an introduction, since it provides additional insights into the character of the writer. Having discredited a large segment of his visitors, he now turns to
relating incidents which will lend credit to him. 6

Directly addressing his friend, Dr. Arbuthnot, for the first time, Pope praises him for maintaining his health and, with becoming modesty, refers to his own poetry as idle. Contrasting "friends" who will kill him, with Arbuthnot who has helped keep him alive, the author complains of his suffering at being forced to sit in judgment on the works of those who seek him out. Seeking relief from his troubles, he asks advice as to the best means of getting rid of the bothersome pests. Subtly changing and enlarging the group, he now includes those who attack him in writing, as well as those who claim to be friends, under the common term, fool.

This word ties in with the concept of madness which was earlier emphasized, but the result which affects Pope has changed from one of annoyance to a threat of death:

Or which must end me, a fool's wrath or love?
A dire dilemma! either way I'm sped,
If foes, they write, if friends, they read me dead.
30-32

While the idea of death is not seriously meant, its use emphasizes the graver implications of the insanity of fools. Even faced with mortal danger, Pope presents

a virtuous picture. A martyr to friendship, unwilling to offend still, too gentle to hurt anyone, he develops his superior character.

Seized and tied down to judge, how wretched I!
Who can't be silent, and who will not lie;
To laugh, were want of goodness and of grace,
And to be grave, exceeds all power of face. 33-36

Although suffering as a martyr, he refuses to circumscribe his beliefs and to be silent; he is too virtuous to lie, he is too polite to laugh. Having listed several virtues and merits, Pope again emphasizes his ordinary humanity and virtuous ties with the audience by noting his inability to keep a straight face. Nevertheless, in keeping with his character, not wishing to offend anyone, he continues to endure the suffering with sad civility, honest anguish, and aching head. And, unwilling to compromise his principles, he delivers his verdict, that the work is not worth publishing. 7

Having mentioned fools in general, Pope now gives examples of fools in particular. The insanity theme is dropped, but now other charges are brought, those of boldness, callousness, and stupidity. Giving

7 Olson notes the use of the quotation from Horace as adding the testimony of authorities, "Rhetoric and the Appreciation of Pope," p. 23.
instances of reactions to his advice, the author first describes a writer who would have Pope do his writing for him; next, a detractor who has the gall to ask for help in obtaining a patron; and finally, a playwright who asks for help in revision. These men refuse to accept Pope's advice and comments; he is coerced and threatened, and finally has to toss the offenders out. The listing of disreputable motives in such detailed examples not only has the forensic function of setting up circumstances and explaining the motives for Pope's actions, but also increases the value of his character in the minds of the audience.

Moving from the present time to the past, Pope shifts from the immediacy of his problems to ancient times with the telling of the Midas fable. The author's use of this tale is supported by Aristotle's comments on arguments:

There are two kinds of argument by example. One consists in the use of a parallel from the facts of history; the other in the use of an invented parallel. This last may take the form of a comparison, or one may employ fables such as Aesop's or the African beast-tale. (II, xx, p. 147)
Fables are suited to speeches in a popular assembly; and they have an advantage in that it is hard to find parallels in history, but easy to find them in tales. In fact, the speaker must contrive with the fable as he contrives a comparison; all he needs is the power to see the analogy—and facility in this comes from literary training. (II, xx, p. 149)

The use of the fable breaks up the tenseness of the irritation in the previous lines, and the shift in tone provides the audience relief from close attention and concentration for a moment. Its more important function, however, is to provide a lead-in for remarks on persons of high social standing, in contrast to the scribblers and poetasters who have been discussed previously. It also leads into the propositions that the annoyances which bedevil Pope constitute a "sorer case" and all those who have been mentioned are fools who must be chastised, asses who must be revealed for what they really are. Pope must speak the truth about fools, wherever they are found. Citing the fable as an authority and precedent for such action, Pope also "must speak, or burst," and then, resting his case, he will be silent.

The next section, beginning at line 83, opens with a refutation. Having exposed the disreputable motives of those who have plagued him, Pope turns to a justification of his proposal to speak the truth, by meeting
one of the charges which might be brought against him. The use of a **refutatio** so early in the work follows the suggestion of Aristotle to "meet the opposing arguments . . . by pulling them to pieces in advance" (III, xvii, pp. 235-236). Olson, in considering the problem of prejudice, says that "the audience may feel that while Pope's satire is . . . not unprovoked, the punishment may be excessive, and Pope consequently, may be cruel."\(^8\) Pope avoids this charge, or at least takes the sting out of it, by raising the question of cruelty himself. As Olson points out, the fact that the author himself brings up the point furthers his ethical appeal by creating an image of a person who has thought things through, considered all sides of the question, and overlooked nothing.\(^9\) Pope's answer to the charge of cruelty is that the "fools" he is concerned with are so stupid that even ridicule would not be recognized by them, and he cites several examples of persons who still maintain their positions and ordinary way of life, in spite of his satire. As the accumulation of names grows in intensity and vigor, the poet goes too

---

\(^8\) Olson, p. 26.  
\(^9\) Ibid.
far for his friend's taste, and the recitation is interrupted by Dr. Arbuthnot with the advice to exercise prudence.

"Hold! for God sake—you'll offend,
"No names—be calm—learn prudence of a friend;
"I too could write, and I am twice as tall; 101-103

The last line creates a sort of David-and-Goliath image and by the hint of deprecating self-mockery, the writer relieves the intensity of feeling which developed during the listing of enemies. The touch of humor also creates the feeling that the author is not being carried away by his emotions, that he is still in command of himself.

The last lines of this section present another proposition in the statement that of all fools, flatterers are the worst of all. This idea provides a transition into the next section of his poem, the confirmatio, or series of arguments in defense of his poetry. Calling insincere flatterers more dangerous than outright enemies, Pope opens his confirmatio by giving examples of the damage they have done his reputation and character. The use of material here which would appear more fitting in the narratio has the specific purpose of explaining the adverse results of his writing and fame. That he continued his work
under such conditions increases the stature of his character, and discards the thought that he might have devoted himself to writing only for the fame and fortune involved. With such ordinary motives dismissed, Pope has cleared the way for his own explanations.

Lines 115 through 125 involve a change in both the tone and scene by presenting an amusing personal account involving false friends and flatterers. While the subject matter is related to the previous section, the shift to humor and a lighter tone serves to provide a break in the forensic arguments between possible motives already hinted at and the real motives to be discussed later, and also serves the ethical appeal. The poet's ability to make light of his physical disabilities and to see through the insincerities of his flatterers marks him as a man of perception and superiority. The incongruity of such flattery is heightened by the contrast between the flattery and Pope's true physical appearance, and Pope points out his awareness of this incongruity in the lines:

Go on, obliging creatures, make me see,
All that disgraced my betters, met in me. 119-120

Further incongruity is seen in the fact that Pope's person and not his works is made the basis for the
comparisons. Modestly referring to the ancient writers as his "betters," he moves from mockery to irony in the closing couplets, but without relinquishing the humorous touch.

> Say for my comfort, languishing in bed
> Just so immortal Maro held his head:
> And when I die, be sure you let me know
> Great Homer died three thousand years ago. 121-124

The silliness of the flattering comments is stressed in the final line, when Pope points out that such a thing as death, common to all men, would be used as a point of comparison by these ridiculous people.

Moving directly and openly into the area of self-defense in the next section, Pope undertakes to establish his innocence by explaining his motives. For a time he lays aside attacks on others and concentrates on defense, beginning with his reasons for writing as the introduction to an inclusive view of himself as a person and poet. This paragraph combines elements of defense and emotional appeal, all directed at improving the author's image. The first reason for writing which is given is vague and uncertain:

> Why did I write? what sin to me unknown
> Dipped me in ink, my parents, or my own? 125-126

The use of the terms unknown, parents, and own suggest both the idea of a curse and the concept of original
sin, neither of which can be the fault of the person so burdened. The Achilles reference, "dipped me in ink," conveys the idea of vulnerability, but also superiority. The poet's early verses are defended and excused on the grounds of youth and inexperience; he knew no better than to use his natural gifts. Justifying his continued writing in mature years, Pope defends himself by pointing out that he has neither neglected obligations or duties, nor disobeyed his parents, but that, on the other hand, his talent served to bring pleasure and comfort to others and helped him to endure his physical sufferings and infirmities. The lines referring to Pope's physical condition have the effect of arousing sympathetic emotions, but the bid for sympathy is saved from being excessive by the device of addressing his friend. The effect, then, is one of suggesting the suitability of a harmless, idle pastime to while away long hours of suffering and pain. Who could be so callous as to deny the propriety of this?

Pope continues his defense with an explanation of his reasons for publishing his works. He cites the approval of recognized men of learning as authorities who "with open arms received one poet more" (142). This listing of well-known men is in line with Aris-
Recent witnesses are any notable persons who have pronounced judgment on some matter; their judgments are useful to those who are contending about the same issues. . . . the evidence of recent witnesses who are not concerned in the case . . . is very credible.

(1, xv, p. 83)

These men, writers and men of letters, are all "notable persons," and their names provide Pope ample justification for making his poetry public. Subtly inserting his own feelings here, Pope acknowledges his recognition of these men as important and adds to his own ethical appeal when he indicates his pleasure at the approval of such eminent persons, not only for his writings, but also for himself. This bit of ethical and emotional appeal is well done, since it encompasses both the poet and his poetry;

Happy my studies, when by these approved!
Happier their author, when by these beloved! 143-144

he implies that not only do his works have value, but he himself has worth as a person. The closing couplet of the paragraph reinforces this idea with the comparison of men who have approved him to those who are his detractors.

In line 147, Pope shifts from a discussion of his motives to a discussion of the motives of his enemies and of the unjust attacks he has always endured.
He defends his early poetry, describing it as soft, pure description, and flowery, and denies that it could be offensive, although he inserts the ironic remark that "description held the place of sense." Still, in spite of the gentleness of his verse, he was attacked by the critics, Gildon and Dennis. The poet's retelling of these attacks involves his own reaction, which is emphasized as one of humility and submission. These attributes are very fitting for a young man and point up the contrast between his character and that of his attackers. To the statement of corruption, Pope opposes submission; to madness, silence; and he repeats both these ideas, stressing them in the couplet stating his refusal to lower himself to the critics' level. Their motives might be understandable, if not excusable, but the author's reaction indicates his superior character:

If want provoked, or madness made them print,
I waged no war with Bedlam or the Mint. 155-156

Line 157 begins a discussion of "more sober" critics and their motives. In defining his reactions to these men, Pope may have had in mind Aristotle's comments on character:

It is equitable to remember benefits one has received more than injuries, and benefits one has received more than those one has conferred. It is equitable to be patient
under wrong; to be willing that a difference shall be settled by discussion rather than by force. [Italics mine] (I, xiii, p. 77)

Here he again stresses his patience, tolerance and humility, enhancing these virtues when he reveals his belief that, even though these critics do not act from evil motives, they still are lacking in "spirit, taste, and sense." The character of these men is not explored, but rather their intelligence and ability. They are accused of piddling comments and petty points of criticism; achieving nothing themselves, Pope still grants that they may attain some immortality by riding the coattails of geniuses like Milton and Shakespeare, and possibly even himself.

All others who took offense at Pope or his works are lumped together in lines 173 through 192. Pope's defense here is very brief, that these people are impossible to please, and the motive for this situation is suggested in the two-couplet sermon on pride.

A man's true merit 'tis not hard to find,
But each man's secret standard in his mind,
That casting-weight pride adds to emptiness,
This, who can gratify? for who can guess? 175-178

The discussion here does not involve critics, but Pope's fellow poets. The attacks of these men, the writer hints, might be based on jealousy. Describing poets who steal material because they cannot write their own, he points out their inability to recognize
their own shortcomings and lack of talent, their inability to distinguish between sense and nonsense, prose and poetry. Pride, jealousy and a lack of understanding of what really constitutes poetry characterize these men. The audience can be left with little doubt as to their value as judges. But even these persons are excused by Pope, stressing again his patience and virtue. The recital of the minor attacks which have been endured leads into the character sketches of those who have used him most badly, those who are his major enemies.

The next division interrupts the forensic arguments with epideictic discourse which takes up the vices found in the character of Atticus. This character sketch, an examination of the motives and character of Addison, is related to the forensic argument by providing a specific example of a well-known man who had attacked Pope unjustly. Pope does not use declarative statements for his portrait but constructs the sketch on the basis of a supposition. The indirect method of presentation may have been intended to emphasize the devious character of Atticus. The opening lines offer a picture of a man blessed with talents and ability. As the sketch proceeds, however, the
corruption of his character and soul is revealed. Jealous of rivals, afraid to attack openly, proceeding to destroy his rivals by hidden and devious means, the contrast between the inner and the outer man, between his actions and his abilities, is sharply drawn. Pope presents a picture of a man of genius, talented socially and intellectually, but crippled by jealousy. The evil results of this jealousy are compounded by the indirect character of the man, who uses sly and subtle means to undermine the fame and fortune of other writers who might challenge his standing. More than the vices, the lack of virtues is here underscored; Atticus' lack of honesty, candor and justice are primarily sins of omission, but they point up his refusal to accept the responsibilities of prestige, his refusal to use his success to guide and advance the careers of other writers. Here is involved the concept of charity; here is shown the opposite of the concept of love of neighbor. Pride and self-love are revealed as corrupting forces, abetted by the "little Senate" whose members, in their blindness, cannot or will not recognize them as evil, and the double tragedy is that these forces destroy not only those who suffer the outward effects but also the person through whom they operate.
In relation to justice, Aristotle notes, "the magnitude of a wrong depends on the degree of the injustice that prompts it; and hence the least of acts may be the greatest of wrongs" (I, xiv, p. 78). This is the point that Pope makes in his description of Addison as one who would

Damn with faint praise, assent with civil leer,
And without sneering, teach the rest to sneer;
Willing to wound, and yet afraid to strike,
Just hint a fault, and hesitate dislike;
Alike reserved to blame, or to commend,
A timorous foe, and a suspicious friend: 201-206

Certainly these are not important deeds; rather they are petty and trivial. But their injustice stems not from the acts, but from the jealousy and fear of a threat to his own position which prompted the acts. Pope indicates more than a hint of contempt in the lines quoted above, and in the first line of the closing couplet, but the last line of the section points out the tragedy of such a person, and closes with a turn to pity that such great promise and ability had fallen so low.

Who but must laugh, if such a man there be?
Who would not weep, if Atticus were he! 213-214

Laugh at the possibility of such a man, but weep to find it is one of the revered writers of the times!
To be betrayed by such a man makes the betrayal that
much harder to endure and justify because it would be so contrary to expectation. The passage is characterized by relative restraint on Pope's part, and is marked more with sorrow than anger.

The next lines balance the previous condemnation of Atticus with a passage of self-defense. It also provides a transition from the subject of poets to a discussion of patronage. Pope briefly states that he asked nothing from writers; that no matter how much publicity he received, he kept aloof and sought neither flattery nor a patron. This statement involves a contrast between his own conduct and those who degraded themselves to please their patrons and leads into the Bufo character sketch.

A discussion of patrons and the practice of patronage is taken up in lines 231 through 260. Much sharper in tone than the Addison sketch, the telling of Bufo's faults, pride, and cheapness is accented by the flattery of the writers who attend him. The entire section dealing with patronage is deliberative in urging the destruction of the patronage system. Bufo's vice is pride and its effects are to encourage insincerity by putting a price on assistance to writers. Whereas the Atticus sketch dealt with the obligations of suc-
cess, the Bufo sketch deals with the obligations of wealth; Bufo could have provided financial aid to the young writers and encouraged them in ways consistent with virtue. Instead he uses his wealth to set up a two-way system of favors, providing the writers with help, but demanding from them favors and flattery in return. According to Robert W. Rogers, in *The Major Satires of Alexander Pope*, this section reveals the distortions in human relations that pertain to the system of patronage. . . . The exchanges between patron and patronized are portrayed as similarly grotesque and bloated: in return for excessive adulation and prostitution of principle, the flatterers receive a dinner, a little port, and sometimes merely praise. Pope . . . had often condemned the . . . system of patronage, but nowhere else had he succeeded in so effective a manner in defining the moral conditions that such a scheme fosters.10

The actions of the poets who work under patrons is contrasted to the conduct of a truly great writer, Dryden. Dryden's lack of a patron suggests that the system is not a prerequisite of great writing and also lends support to Pope's refusal to tie himself down to a patron. The closing couplet ironically

sums up Pope's concept of patrons:

But still the great have kindness in reserve,
He helped to bury whom he helped to starve. 247-248

While the comments on Bufo do not appear to be directly related to Pope's forensic arguments, they do concern the concept of justice and repeat the early charges of blindness and pride. The poet charges that patrons are blind to the real values of poetry and the worth of poets, and are more intent on feeding their own pride than with providing help for deserving writers. As proof of this contention, lines 255 through 260 relate the tale of the neglect of John Gay and the results of this neglect and sets up an indictment of the patronage system. Here Pope adopts a tone of harshness, and the parody of the Scripture phrase makes his comments more scathing. "The Lord giveth, the Lord taketh away, blessed be the name of the Lord," becomes the bitter lines:

Blessed be the Great! for those they take away, And those they left me; for they left me Gay; Left me to see neglected genius bloom, Neglected die, and tell it on his tomb: 255-258

Next, Pope turns from his discussion of patrons to a passage which opens with an emotional appeal.

11Job, 1:21.
He has given little attention to his audience recently, but now, in preparation for his next character sketch, he proceeds to re-affirm his ethical appeal. Establishing his freedom from the demands of a patron, he pleads for what must be recognized as reasonable rights for anyone, the right to live and die his own man. He stresses the simplicity of his desires and denies both literary and worldly ambitions, making an open bid for support and understanding by citing simple, ordinary virtues.

I was not born for courts or great affairs; I pay my debts, believe, and say my prayers; 267-268

He denies, in lines 271 through 274, that for him writing is the only object in life, and suggests that there are more important things to take up his time and effort. His questions verge almost on the piteous when he wonders why people persist in pestering him about his work.

Why am I asked what next shall see the light: Heavens! was I born for nothing but to write? Has life no joys for me? or (to be grave) Have I no friend to serve, no soul to save? 271-274

The idea of justice is lightly touched here in the examples of rumor-mongers who interpret his every act, visit, or comment in their own light, and charge him with writings not his own. Whether he writes or not,
enemies and persecutors suspect him of writing, attributing to him works which are not his and refusing to believe his disavowal of authorship. They call him a liar, but the uprightness and virtue of his character is emphasized by his refusal to be moved to anger. Instead, he accepts the situation patiently with the gentle comment:

Poor guiltless I! and can I choose but smile,
When every coxcomb knows me by my style? 281-282

The mild tone of the comment belies its force. Pope is objecting to the lack of validity in the conclusions about his alleged writings, and his manner of objecting follows Aristotle's points on refutation.

Probabilities are always open to refutation . . . for the objector can refute a conclusion by showing, not that it is not probable, but that it is not inevitable . . . by showing that it is not likely to be true. Now this can be done if his objection states something more generally true. (II, xxv, p. 179)

The next section presents one of the principal points in Pope's defense, the basic purpose of his writings. The passage opens with an emotional statement of his conception of his works. He states his belief that if his poetry causes harm or makes enemies, it would be an evil curse. However, he modifies his statement with words such as worthy, virtue, and innocence; his aim is never to hurt people of these quali-
ties. Against others is his satire directed, to reveal their vices and to punish them. This group includes liars, slanderers, perjurors, false witnesses, betrayers of trust, and the contrast between the lack of principle on their part and the just and worthy motive of Pope is strongly stressed in the closing couplet, which summarizes the poet's aim:

A lash like mine no honest man shall dread,
But all such babbling blockheads in his stead. 303-304

In line 305, Pope shifts from a general condemnation of babbling blockheads as a type of person to a particular attack. This section contains the most cutting and vituperative of all the character sketches—that of Lord Hervey, here called Sporus. Unlike Atticus, whose character was marred with minor vices or Bufo, who was depicted as stupid and puffed with pride, Sporus is a clever, vicious enemy, deserving of all of Pope's sharpest barbs. The sketch opens with Arbuthnot's attempt to dissuade Pope from discussing the man. As Olson points out, "the contemptuous interruption of Arbuthnot reinforces the ferocity of the attack."^{12} Arbuthnot uses imagery which reflects his belief that Sporus is almost beneath

^{12} Olson, p. 28.
contempt; thing of silk, mere white curd, and butterfly
all carry connotations of smallness and weakness.
Pope, however, presses the attack, here using epideic-
tic discourse to provide a specific example of the
viciousness which he has vowed to attack. He sets
forth an image of deception disguised in fine garments,
a warped and twisted mind incapable of anything but
emptiness, a vengeful and spiteful creature totally
oblivious to the obligations of rank and position.
The comparisons used by Pope reduce Sporus to an irra-
tional level; he is presented as a creature below
human vices; an annoying insect, a well-trained dog,
a doll with a painted smile, a spitting toad. The
disgust aroused by these comparisons is summed up in
Pope's final charge that while Sporus may be human,
he is neither male nor female. Pope reinforces this
idea of deviation from normal conduct by his own poetic
deviation; the three-line rhyme for these lines is
his only departure within the poem from the couplet
pattern. The final point of comparison reaches the
climax of evil, portraying Sporus as Satan, involving
all the related ideas of wickedness, deceit and dis-
gusting corruption in the closing lines:
A cherub's face, a reptile all the rest,
Beauty that shocks you, parts that none will trust,
Wit that can creep, and pride that licks the dust.

Of this comparison, Rogers suggests:

The whole is an anatomy of the kinds of moral weaknesses which may develop in a weak man whom circumstances have conspired to place in courtly circles. . . . The series of images . . . culminates in the identification of Sporus with Satan; for Sporus in his position may be as dangerous to society as ever Satan was to man. The whole results in a calculating and deadly exposure of an individual—and also a fascinating study of a complex kind of moral corruption.13

Line 333 begins the peroratio or conclusion to the poem and again Pope follows Aristotle's advice (III, xix, p. 240). He exerts his energies towards disposing the audience in his favor and arousing emotions favorable to him, and summarizes the points made earlier. The recital of points favorable to him is offered in terms of what Pope is not and relates to characterizations of his enemies that he emphasized previously. He presents himself as neither foolish nor greedy, driven by neither ambition nor false values. Here moderation is stressed, as well as the importance of ordinary virtues of truth and honesty, and the

13 Rogers, p. 89.
concept of the ideal character of a literary man is presented in these lines:

Not proud, nor servile; be one poet's praise,
That, if he pleased, he pleased by manly ways;
That flatter'ry, ev'n to kings, he held a shame,
And thought a lie in verse or prose the same. 336-339

Pope next repeats the purpose of his writing, the basis of his defense, when he describes his development as a poet:

That not in fancy's maze he wandered long,
But stooped to truth, and moralized his song:
That not for fame, but virtue's better end,
He stood the furious foe, the timid friend, 340-343.

The intent to punish the vicious, which Pope mentioned earlier, is here somewhat modified to the intent to promote virtue; and the poet notes all he has had to endure in his steadfast refusal to drop below the level of his high ideals. With virtue as his aim, with truth as his guide, Pope has suffered much: condemning critics, loss of fair-weather friends, threats, lies, slander, caricatures, abuse directed towards even his family and friends. But in spite of all this, he accepts these injustices as worthwhile crosses if they promote "virtue's better end." This martyr-like tenacity repeats the martyr image presented humorously in the beginning of the poem, and promotes the ideas of virtue, patience, and long-suffering in the face
of unjust attack which constitute the major part of Pope's defense and ethical appeal.

The final comment by Dr. Arbuthnot, in line 360, is not an attempt to dissuade Pope from following a line of discussion, but simply a request for an explanation. His question, "But why insult the poor, affront the great?" provides the poet with a chance to justify his satire again: "A knave's a knave to me, in every state." Pope intends to attack evil wherever he finds it, in high position or low, as common criminal, inept poet, or corrupt statesman.

Lest the statement of his aim seem too harsh or vengeful, Pope softens his image by offering further comments on his own character. Justice is replaced by gentler virtues of trust, charity, humility and patience, and only when Pope returns to the thought that his enemies may continue to attack his parents, does he abandon his mild tone. This shift in tone is appropriate to the ethical character he has developed, since it is not only fitting that he should defend his parents, but it is a necessary part of his image to seem to be governed by filial devotion. These lines also evoke the emotions of sympathy and pity and recall Pope's contention that his enemies' attacks have been unjust and directed towards the innocent.
Line 382 returns to epideictic discourse but with a much different aim than the character sketches of Pope's enemies. The lines in praise of his father underscores the poet's devotion to him and serves the purpose of providing proof of Pope's character. A virtuous family indicates virtuous offspring, and this implication is reinforced by the author's statement, uttered as a prayer, that to live and die as his father did would be a blessing.

The final section of the poem continues the prayer, asking happiness for Dr. Arbuthnot, and for himself, if not happiness, then at least, not unhappiness. The blessings sought still maintain the virtuous character of the poet; he asks for life long enough to care for his mother's last years, reinforcing the image of filial devotion introduced in the lines regarding his father. The passage closes with a request for material well-being and peace of mind for his friend, and the emphasis here is on the outstanding virtue of a man who is more inclined to intercede with prayers in behalf of others than to consider only his own needs. The closing couplet refers to all the blessings sought and affirms Pope's contention that his course of action has been right and just. Closing his defense on
this note of self-confidence, Pope rests his case, and
directs his final plea, not only to his judges, the
audience, but also to the Higher Judge in Heaven.

Throughout the course of An Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot, Pope skillfully follows the patterns and functions
of arrangement set forth by classical rhetoricians. The early part of the poem is devoted to gaining the
sympathy of the audience and the removal of prejudice against the poet. The primary point of defense, based
on the argument that Pope's enemies have been unjust in their criticisms and attacks, takes up the major por-
tion of the poem, and is reinforced by the ethical ap-
peal, which presents a picture of a good man of virtue
finally forced to undertake a program of self-defense. Pope's satire is justified as being directed towards
the highest of aims, those of truth and virtue; these aims tend to refute the charges brought against him.
The conclusion reviews the arguments and also involves
an emotional appeal, calculated to dispose the audience
in his favor by developing feelings of pity, sympathy
and admiration for the poet's stubborn dedication to
his ideals. In terms of himself, his subject, and his
audience, Pope chose his method of arrangement to pro-
mote most effectively his forensic aim, clearing himself of
the charges.
CHAPTER II

THE RHETORICAL ARGUMENTS OF POPE'S ARBUTHNOT

Rhetoricians recognized three major means to be used in order to achieve persuasion of an audience. According to Aristotle, these were logos, pathos, and ethos—the rational appeal, the emotional appeal, and the ethical appeal (I, ii, pp. 8-9).

The rational appeal makes use of facts and evidence which are presented to the audience in the form of examples and enthymemes. The examples and enthymemes correspond to inductive and deductive reasoning in logic; they provide the basis by which conclusions are reached. One of the common uses of the rational appeal in the Epistle is to indicate fallacies in the arguments of Pope's opponents. The appeal to reason is limited to the forensic sections of the discourse; as Aristotle points out, logical reasoning is out of place in passages devoted either to emotion or character (III, xvii, p. 234).

The emotional appeal has the purpose of arousing within the audience the emotions which will cause them to favor the speech and the speaker. The two emotions
most useful to any discourse are pity and friendship (II, iv-xviii, pp. 102-123); once these feelings are developed, they will make the end and purpose of the speech and the aim of the speaker appear to be both acceptable and desirable. In regard to the opposing side, the emotions of fear and anger are to be developed, since the audience will not favor those whom they fear or dislike.

In the Epistle, Pope presents a defense of his writings and his life in order to exonerate himself from the charges of malice and injustice which have been brought against him and, in order to accomplish this end, he must have an audience which is sympathetic and friendly towards him. He also finds it necessary to dispel emotions of dislike and distrust which his reputation as a satirist may have already created within his audience. Both of these aims are accomplished by pointing out that his defense will contribute to the ultimate benefit of his audience, for, as Aristotle points out, men feel friendship towards those who do them a favor (II, iv, p. 103). Pope also directs unfavorable emotions away from himself and towards his enemies by suggesting that they are a threat to the audience. This skillful redirecting of adverse feel-
ings to other persons is more effective than trying to allay them on the basis of reason, since, by this method, they are likely to be replaced by favorable emotions while the use of reason would more likely result in neutral reactions.

The method best suited to arousing favorable emotions, according to rhetoricians, is to show emotion yourself or describe a person or situation in a way which will create the desired feeling. Aristotle suggests, "employ the traits of emotion \[and\] use the symptoms familiar to all" (III, xvi, p. 231), since this will make people believe in your facts. In their souls they infer, illegitimately, that you are telling the truth, because they, in a like situation, would be moved in the same way as you are. (III, vii, pp. 197-198)

Pope carefully follows this advice in his emotional appeals.

The ethical appeal, the image of the character of the speaker, is always of major importance in any work. In this regard, Olson explains:

To a rhetorician the appearance of having a good moral character is a first concern; as Aristotle says, goodness of character is almost the most effective means of persuasion the orator possesses, since good men are more completely and more readily given credence than others, and since the possibility of persuasion is dependent upon credibility.\[1\]

\[1\] Olson, p. 21.
In order for the audience to be convinced or persuaded of any point on any subject, they must trust the speaker and have confidence in him. Three factors lead to trust and confidence in the character of the speaker; he must seem to be a man of good sense, good character and good will.

Good sense refers to the intellectual qualities of a person and may be revealed by evidence of understanding the importance of an idea or event and its many ramifications. Additional factors which indicate the quality of good sense include evidence of a proper perspective, honest judgment, logical reasoning, refined taste and a broad knowledge of both the past and present, as well as "sharp insight into character and motive." ²

Good character may be demonstrated by instances of moral integrity, a dedication to virtue and aversion to vice, the avoidance of faulty reasoning, an appearance of openness and candor and courtesy. In addition, good moral character stems from the appearance of a lack of pride as well as from the ability to laugh at oneself. However, humility should never

²Ibid., p. 23.
slip into servility, nor self-mockery into undignified jesting; a certain modest sense of dignity is required.

Good will or benevolence is characterized by an unselfish interest in others and their welfare, and is shown by evidence of true friendship, a lack of vengeful feelings, a willingness to be openminded, unselfish, and forgiving, even towards enemies. Rogers notes this aspect of Pope's ethical appeal, when he comments that

in recommending versatility of taste, charity, justice and moderation Pope had not forgotten that benevolence is the highest state to which man can aspire. . . . Virtue is for Pope the triumph of reason, an exalted state in which self-interest has been refined into a love of all things. This state is not narrowly conceived; it is a universal benevolence or caritas, embracing love, kindness, natural affection. It is a disposition to judge kindly the character, aims, and destinies of others. It is largemindedness, appraising what is noble and worthy and hating what is mean, petty and sordid.  

This aspect of the ethical appeal is used primarily in the introduction and the conclusion of the Epistle although Pope never entirely disregards it.

In order to present the various appeals in the most effective manner, rhetoricians urged the exploration and examination of the topoi or topics of argument.

---

3 Rogers, p. 57.
These topics provided various general sources of argument which could be used to develop and discuss the subject under consideration. The topics were divided into the common topics, which could be used for any subject or occasion, and the special topics, which were especially fitted for use with a particular kind of discourse, whether forensic, deliberative or epideictic.

The common topics which Aristotle mentions involve the consideration of an idea or act in terms of its possibility or impossibility, its occurrence or non-occurrence in the past as determined by evidence or in the future as suggested by probability (past fact and future fact) and its relative worth or value (more or less) (II, xix, pp. 143-147). To these basic topics are added topics based on definition, division, genus, consequences, motives, causes, effects, laws, testimony, and precedents (II, xxiii, pp. 159-171).

The special topics are those areas which prove to be especially helpful in particular kinds of arguments. Forensic discourse will always make use of the special topics of justice and injustice for the basic consideration involving either accusation or defense; these are supported by other topics such as definition,
evidence, and motives. The deliberative speaker will ultimately shape his discourse in terms of advantage and injury as he seeks to recommend or discourage a course of action. The idea of advantage has two facets to be considered, that of being advantageous to a particular person or group and that of being a good in and of itself, a thing worthy to be done above and beyond the advantages accruing to it. The common topics of past and future fact, consequences, cause and effect, and possibility are particularly adaptable to this type of discourse. Epideictic discourse has as its aim honor and dishonor by means of praise or condemnation. The special topics of virtues and vices are to be used in these cases, and will be reinforced by the common topics of past fact, degree (more or less), circumstances and cause and effect (I, iii, pp. 18-19).

The Advertisement to the Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot is concerned with two points: the development of the proper ethos or character of the poet and an explanation of his reasons for writing the poem. In the first paragraph, Pope uses the topic of definition when he describes his poem as "a sort of bill of complaint." Such a designation of the work puts Pope in the position of plaintiff rather than defendant and takes the

---

4 Olson, p. 22.
initiative from his enemies, providing the poet with a more advantageous position in his undertaking. Additional descriptions of the poem, "begun many years since," and "drawn up by snatches," indicate a number of complaints over a long period of time, a continuing situation which has finally come to a head. Pope reinforces this idea when he explains his reasons for writing at the present time through the use of the topic of motives.

I had no thoughts of publishing it, till it pleased some persons of rank and fortune... to attack in a very extraordinary manner, not only my writings (of which being public the public judge) but my person, morals, and family, whereof to those who know me not, a truer information may be requisite.

The general point here is that the attack was unjustified and therefore, Pope has a justifiable grievance. This consideration of justice involves the special topics for forensic discourse, and is found repeatedly in the poem.

Pope's ethical appeal is carefully presented here. His failure to publish the "snatches" indicates his good sense, his willingness to view minor attacks in the proper perspective. Even now, having decided to publish, his decision not to write a new work but to make use of what is at hand indicates the same quality,
since if the proper weapon is at hand, there is no need to fashion a new one. An additional point can be drawn from his failure to publish the work until now; he suggests that it was never meant to be made public, but was written only for himself and perhaps a close circle of friends. This idea lends credibility to what he has to say, since it is commonly thought that people speak the truth and express their unreserved feelings and ideas in private, while public utterances are likely to be more guarded and circumspect. If this poem reflects private writing, then the conclusion must be that it represents the truth of Pope's ideas. The argument presented here is an example of an enthymeme, even though the premises and conclusion are only hinted at; as a matter of fact, it is probably more effective precisely because it is indirect rather than explicit and obvious.

To discredit his opponents Pope again uses the topic of definition, identifying them as "persons of rank and fortune" and the attack as "very extraordinary." Both of these phrases involve an emotional appeal. The use of the verb pleased suggests that the reasons for the attack were neither valid or important, that they were the result of either whim or spite. In
contrast to the slight reasons for attacking him, however, the attack was "very extraordinary." Moreover, the fact that the source of the attack was persons of "rank and fortune" creates an emotional response which favors Pope by developing the "underdog" idea. That persons of social position, wealth and influence would engage in such an attack makes it seem worse because it is contrary to expected behavior and paints a picture of power drawn up against weakness. The general acceptance of the thought that people often wrong those who cannot defend themselves creates within the audience an appropriate atmosphere for accepting the justice of Pope's reply; there is tremendous satisfaction in seeing power brought to its knees.

Pope further enhances his ethical character when he concedes the propriety of criticism of his works but denies that the same criticism can validly be extended to his "person, morals, and family." These are his private concern and an attack on them not only betrays a lack of courtesy but also indicates the use of fallacious arguments. This undermining of his opponents' character and argument almost simultaneously prepares the way for the audience to readily accept Pope's next argument that he proposes to provide the
truth, the real facts. His good will is stressed by the fact that he does not call the attacks made upon him lies; instead, he simply proposes that "a truer information may be requisite." The use of the word truer involves the topic of degree, and suggests both that his enemies have often spread a twisted fabric of half-truths about him and that they have as often failed to use valid arguments. Another argument is used in the phrase "whereof to those who know me not," an argument based on authority. Here Pope suggests that those people who do know him already have recognized the falseness of the charges brought against him, and this idea leads to the conclusion that when the general public knows him, they will also recognize the injustice done to him. As Aristotle points out, it is always possible to find someone who will act as a witness to the speaker's good character, and they may be used to establish the point in question (I, xv, p. 84).

The last portion of the first paragraph is devoted primarily to establishing a good moral character. When the poet describes himself as "being divided between the necessity to say something of myself, and my own laxness to undertake so awkward a task," the writer indicates his understanding of the necessity to
support justice by writing a defense but also his reluctance to become involved in a contest that is sure to be arduous. The audience might respond to this in various ways: by agreeing with the reluctance of virtue to become involved with vice, by recognizing and sympathizing with the normal aversion toward becoming involved in a messy situation, and the ordinary distaste for a defense which must involve what might seem to be bragging. Any of these would arouse feelings of sympathy. Pope's decision to use the materials at hand to reply as "the shortest way to put the last hand to this epistle" likewise is effective in two ways. First, while it indicates that although he will use only a few arguments, it also hints at the possibility of many more which are available; it also indicates that he will not undertake a long-winded and involved defense, since he is confident that he has at hand material to prove or disprove the charges. It is not long, but it is sufficient for its purpose.

The final sentence of the first paragraph emphasizes Pope's virtue by designating the noble purpose of his work. Aristotle's discussion of character shows the relationship of purpose to character.
The narration should depict character; and it will do so if we know what imparts character. One thing that will give this quality is the revelation of moral purpose; for the quality of the ethos is determined by the quality of the purpose revealed, and the quality of this purpose is determined by its end. (III, xvi, p. 230)

Pope's statement that his purpose is to please by means of truth emphasizes his virtue and goodness, and his contrast between the means by which he will please and those who will be offended, while not in equal terms, indicates that those who will be displeased, will be so as a result of "truth and sentiment." Here, as Olson notes, the topic of contraries is involved. Pope designates his audience as virtuous and his enemies as vicious; he manages to establish a common bond between himself and his readers by opposing his enemies, the "vicious and ungenerous." Yet, the poet establishes his benevolence, even in regard to the proponents of vice, when he writes that if the poem contain anything offensive, "it will be only to those I am least sorry to offend." Any indication of sorrow towards vice shows unusual superiority of character; Pope underscores both his virtue and his benevolence by being sorry, even in a minor degree, but very natu-

5Ibid., p. 23.
rally, not as much as if those hurt were virtuous members of society. An additional point is suggested, moreover; if Pope is sorry to any extent whatever in regard to his enemies, then it will be extremely unlikely that he would seek to offend the more virtuous members of his audience. This argument tends to remove from the reader's mind any trace of fear, for if the audience falls within the classification of virtuous persons, Pope is no threat to them. Likewise, the union of Pope with other virtuous men against the vicious lays the groundwork for the emotion of friendship. Olson says, in regard to these points:

The most important thing is to allay the fear of the reader that he may be the next to be attacked, since such fear would make it impossible for Pope to appear as one of good will, and hence to persuade at all. The enemies of Pope . . . are haters of virtue, hence enemies also of the virtuous, hence enemies of the audience.7

The second paragraph of the Advertisement reinforces Pope's dedication to truth. The writer states that his work contains "not a circumstance but what is true." The idea of total truth contrasts with the

6Ibid., p. 25.
7Ibid., p. 24.
half-truths attributed to his attackers earlier and is supported by his open admission that "many will know their own pictures in it." However, his complete dedication to truth is softened somewhat by his benevolence; he does not intend to expose these people indiscriminately to ridicule, explaining "I have, for the most part, spared their names, and they may escape being laughed at if they please." Here truth and discretion are nicely balanced on Pope's part; in regard to his opponents, he balances the possibility of ridicule with the exercise of good sense. They may avoid disgrace if they have the common sense to keep their mouths shut. The phrase if they please repeats the verb used in regard to his enemies in the first paragraph. Since it "pleased" them to provide the cause for the poem, it is only fitting that they should be also "pleased" with the effects.

The final paragraph changes the tone somewhat, but is still appropriate to Pope's contention of virtue and benevolence. Explaining that his failure to name names was "owing to the request of the learned and candid friend to whom it is inscribed," Pope creates the picture of a man who freely accedes to the wishes of his friends. This image of unselfish agreement to
a "request" indicates the poet's unselfish willingness to put another's interest ahead of his own inclinations, and tends to increase the value of his friendship towards the audience. He emphasizes again the contrast between himself and his enemies, between virtue and vice, when he writes, "I make not as free use of theirs [names] as they have done of mine." The firmness of tone of this statement is more straightforward than most of the preceding remarks and leads into Pope's final argument in regard to his virtue.

However I shall have this advantage, and honour, on my side, that whereas by their proceeding, any abuse may be directed at any man, no injury can possibly be done by mine, since a nameless character can never be found out, but by its truth and likeness.

The argument here turns on the topics of cause and effect and advantage. If they believe that they also might be the butt of some of these writings, they will agree with Pope that such writings should be restrained. Here Pope follows Aristotle's suggestions on deliberative argument:

... we must ascertain the nature of the goods or evils about which the deliberative speaker gives his counsel; for he is not concerned with all goods and evils, but only with such as either may, or may not, come to pass. (I, iv, p. 20)
Pope is urging the acceptance of his poem as a good means to a good end by pointing out the advantages and benefits to the readers of his work and the disadvantages and threats to them in the works of his enemies. Pope reaffirms his interest in the virtues of honor and truth and hints at his superiority as a poet by opposing his enemies' term abuse and his term, injury. Abuse suggests displeasure and spleen and discredits his opponents' character, while injury involves the concept of strength and power, directed towards a definite and premeditated end.

Throughout the Advertisement, Pope has carefully built up his ethical appeal by presenting an image of himself as a man of virtue, good sense, and benevolence. One of the factors which contributes to this image is Pope's indication of acting only as the result of a "deliberate moral choice" (I, ix, p. 52). His delay in replying to the attacks and his care to avoid hurting anyone support this idea, while the moral choice of his opponents is presented in a discredited fashion, since they attacked not his works, but him and his family. Another point favoring Pope is his skill in presenting his aim so that it appears to be a worthwhile aim in behalf of his audience; if their interests are involved,
they will accept Pope's writings as a proper means towards a desirable end.

The narratio, lines 1 through 68 of the poem, provides the necessary facts and events which make up the background of Pope's case and also contributes to the ethical appeal. Pope addresses his servant as "Good John" in the first line; this simple phrase supports the ideas of benevolence and virtue. Most people are polite to equals and superiors, but politeness to a servant, a person of inferior social rank, indicates superiority of an unusual sort. The topic of degree (more or less) is used in these sections as the basis for the argument supporting Pope's image of kindness and politeness; if these qualities are found in circumstances where they are rare, they are sure to be found in circumstances where they are common. The poet's benevolence is constantly stressed in describing his attitude towards the many callers who visit him. He will tell a social lie rather than hurt the feelings of the pseudo-poets who bother him, "say I'm sick, I'm dead"; he will feed poor poets, all the while recognizing the fact that they are more interested in

---

victuals than verse; he will endure the most flagrant invasions of his privacy, in church as well as at home. In lines 15 to 22, Pope lists many examples of the sort of persons who seek him out for advice on poetry, assigning to them motives of either madness or vanity. The concept of madness is driven home in the last couplets of this section, when Pope exposes the irrationality of the accusations which some have brought against him.

Arthur, whose giddy son neglects the laws, Imputes to me and my damned works the cause: Poor Cornus sees his frantic wife elope, And curses wit, and poetry, and Pope. 23-26

Pope frequently closes a section of his poem with a couplet or two which destroys the argument of his opponents; in this instance, the exposing of faulty cause and effect arguments puts the charges into the realm of illogical, if not insane, ravings, and tends to destroy the credibility of anything else they might say.

The adaptation of lines from classical writers, such as Horace, Ovid and Persius⁹ is designed both to flatter the audience and to provide evidence of Pope's education. A classically educated reader would be pleased to recognize familiar lines in an unexpected

---

⁹Ibid., note 33.
context and the allusions to other famous writings increase the force of Pope's lines. The poet's use of lines or phrases or references taken from well-known poets involves the use of the topic of testimony, since their comments may be used in reference to Pope's contention and support the validity of what he says.

In lines 1 through 68, Pope makes use of the topic of division. In the preceding lines he has dealt with strangers who annoyed him, painting a general picture of them; now he considers the problems of those who are or claim to be his friends, providing specific and particularly detailed conversation and events. Pope first seeks advice from Dr. Arbuthnot as to what means might be effective to rid him this "plague." The exaggeration provides the basis for a contrast between the situation and the writer's reaction to it; even in difficult circumstances, he does not depart from his virtuous character. The humorous tone in which the examples are presented also contrasts the poet's character with the characters of the petitioners, since he does not seem to take himself very seriously while they take themselves and their problems very seriously. The use of the martyr image (line 33) stresses his unselfishness and his recognition of the obligations of
friendship, even towards those who are friends only for ulterior motives. His apparent understanding and forgiveness of the frailities of others emphasizes his good sense while his willing submission to suffering in behalf of friendship is revealed by his description of himself doggedly reading poor manuscripts. His struggles to keep a straight face because of his reluctance to laugh at their puny efforts points to the virtue of kindness, but this virtue is superseded by the virtue of honesty in a man "who will not lie." His refusal to praise poor work or even to pass it over in silence reinforces the idea of good judgment and honesty in correctly assessing bad art, no matter what its source. Still, he cannot bluntly state the work's true merits and his attempt to prevent its publication without utterly condemning it requires deep thought. The struggle to find a fitting solution is reflected in the phrases "sad civility," "honest anguish," and "aching head." Finally, he suggests deferring publication for a time, using Horace's advice, "keep your piece nine years,"

---

which reinforces and supports his view of the work. However, his advice is refused by an ungrateful wretch who through pride even refuses to acknowledge the correctness and justice of Pope's suggestion.

The next section, lines 41 through 46, explores the character of this writer and his works. He lives in squalid surroundings, an attic with broken windows; he writes only to earn eating money, and then not well, since it appears that he writes in his sleep. The sordidness of his life, the poverty of his poetry is matched by his meanness of soul, for he is perfectly willing to let Pope rework the material. A lack of principle, a lack of pride in his work, interested only in money and praise, the bad poet serves as a contrast with the virtuous character of Pope. The next couplet summarizes the character of such men with their inverted sense of values:

Three things another's modest wishes bound,
My friendship, and a prologue, and ten pound. 47-48

To them, friendship is less important than poetry, and poetry is less important than money.

11 These lines are generally printed as the closing couplet to a section, but in the Twickenham edition they are set off as a section in themselves.
The story of Pitholeon (lines 49-54), a foolish poet who asks for help in finding a patron, adds another aspect to the false values mistakenly associated with friendship. Pitholeon was an enemy in the past, attacking Pope, but now, in need of a favor, he seeks his friendship. Insincerity and opportunism are his characteristics, and his lack of good qualities is supported by the flimsy argument he presents—that he knew no better. The playwright who asks help in revising his work is presented as an outright pest.

Pope's refusal to contribute to inferior works, even for pay, and his abrupt dismissal of the writer, contrasts sharply with the three examples of writers whose chief purpose in writing seems to be money. These deeds also increase his ethical appeal by underscoring his qualities of good judgment and honesty. Nor does it detract from his avowed dedication to the true meaning of friendship when Pope quarrels with the playwright and sends him away, for he has carefully noted that this man is not a friend, nor even a pretender to friendship, but a complete stranger (line 55).

The next section of the poem contains the proposito in which the point to be considered is explicitly stated. Pope prepares the way for his proposition
by re-telling the Midas fable, thus using an argument by analogy. Pope argues that just as someone had to expose the signs of asininity for Midas, the growth of asses' ears, likewise someone should expose the follies of people who, by their actions, show similarly obvious signs of abnormality. Since these things are as obvious to the poet as Midas' ears were to his minister, the poet, like the minister, must speak out. Pope further justifies his proposal to reveal the truth by pointing out that while the situations are similar, his is worse:

And is not mine, my friend, a sorer case,
When every coxcomb perks them in my face? 73-74

The many examples of writers who have displayed their marks of folly to him, given in the first portion of the poem, supplies sufficient proof that Pope does indeed have a "sorer case."

The deliberative speech by Arbuthnot, attempting to dissuade Pope from mentioning people in high position, makes use of the special topic for deliberative discourse, advantage or injury. He points out that Pope is becoming involved in "dangerous things" (line 75) and perhaps he should not take the matter so seriously; "Tis nothing." His speech also contributes to Pope's ethical appeal, for as John Aden points out
When he advises prudence, moreover, Arbuthnot is doing what every friendly adversary does, that is, more than he reckons; for he is not only counselling wisdom, but in so doing, providing a mark by which the satirist's superiority to convenience may be measured.12

Pope's refusal to follow his friend's advice indicates his unwillingness to be swayed from the path of virtue and justice, and his determination to put his ideals above the threat of possible danger to himself. His refusal also follows Aristotle's advice in regard to the topic of motive:

Here you consider the incentives and deterrents as the motives people have for doing or avoiding the acts in question. These are the conditions which, according as they are for or against us, make us act or refrain from action. We are moved to act if the thing is possible, easy, and advantageous to us or our friends, or hurtful to our enemies; this is true even if the act is damaging to us, so long as our loss is outweighed by a solid gain. (II, xxiii, p. 168)

Pope is suggesting that the benefits of exposing foolishness and of presenting truth far outweigh possible danger to himself. With this point established, he sets forth his proposition:

let the secret pass,
That secret to each fool, that he's an ass:
The truth once told, (and wherefore should we lie?)
The queen of Midas slept, and so may I. 79-82

Olson points out that the whole poem to this point
leads to the proposition to speak the truth. The ex­
amples in the narratio set up through induction a
minor premise, that Pope's situation is a serious one,
while lines 69 through 74 develop a major premise, that
people must speak out against follies, leading to the
conclusion that Pope must speak out.13 The argument,
set up in the pattern of a syllogism, takes the fol­
lowing form:

Anyone who sees signs of folly must speak out.
Pope has seen signs of folly.
Therefore, Pope must speak out.

The next division, lines 84 through 100, involves
a refutation of the possible charge of cruelty in ex­
posing the failures and faults of fools. Pope's recog­
nition of the possibility of this charge indicates his
good sense, his ability to examine both sides of the
question. His refutation is argued from several
points. He first of all uses the subdivision of max­
ims, a part of the topic of testimony. In this regard,
Aristotle explains:

13 Olson, p. 29.
Maxims . . . come under the head of the enthymeme; so that we enter the subject of the enthymeme by a discussion of the Maxim. . . . Now enthymemes are a kind of syllogism which almost entirely deals with such matters; take away the syllogistic form, then, and a premise or a conclusion of an enthymeme is a maxim. (II, xxi, pp. 149-150)

The maxim used by Pope, "No creature smarts so little as a fool," is described as a "rule" or law. The basis for the designation is common sense; it is a self-evident truth based on general observation that many people are too stupid or too foolish to even recognize criticism, let alone be hurt by it. The maxim serves as the major premise, "Fools do not suffer from ridicule;" the minor premise was given in the previous section when Pope described those he was about to expose as fools; the conclusion must be that no one will suffer as a result of his writings. This conclusion in turn is an enthymeme, used in refuting the charge of cruelty. In syllogistic form the argument is developed as follows:

Cruelty causes suffering.
Fools do not suffer.
Therefore, my writings are not cruel.

In addition to using enthymemes in the rather involved series of arguments Pope has presented, he also provides examples as proof that his work has not hurt anyone. These examples of people unmoved by his actions
support his rational argument through the special topic for forensic discourse, justice. He is not cruel, that is, unjust, because the effects of cruelty are not present. Since knowledge of the validity of this evidence is, so to speak, in the public domain, the audience can readily see the truth of Pope's examples, and of his argument that if cruelty consists of hurting people, and if no one has been hurt, then he has not been cruel. The Codrus lines, 85 through 88, provide a specific example of someone unmoved by ridicule, and are followed with an argument by analogy, comparing a scribbler and a spider. Pope argues that if it is not cruel to break the web of a spider, then it is not cruel to destroy the lies of writers. In order to stress the impossibility of a scribbler feeling shame, Pope emphasizes the point of comparison between the writer and the insect: the spider spins and repairs its web in its own interest and the writer does the same.

To provide definite proof that his writings are not cruel, he uses the forensic topic of past fact, citing examples of people who still maintain their position and follow their regular way of life in spite of what he had said. Lines 95 through 100 list these
people by name, but as the accumulation of names grows in intensity and vigor, the poet goes too far for his friend's taste, and the recitation is interrupted by Arbuthnot with the advice to exercise prudence. Once again the doctor uses the topic of advantage and injury, but the danger refers not to danger from political power, but the threat of physical injury, in the line, "I too could write, and I am twice as tall."

Pope's diminutive size, his weakness and his infirmities would make him particularly susceptible to threats of this nature, and his good character is pointed out again when he simply ignores the advice, and continues his argument.

Line 104 begins the section of the Epistle which deals with flatterers. Pope here uses the topic of genus. Fools in general have already been defined, and what is true of them is likewise true of fools in the form of flatterers. Pope states this very explicitly:

A fool quite angry is quite innocent;
Alas! 'tis ten times worse when they repent.

To support his argument that flatterers are the worst of all fools, he uses the topic of testimony, by citing modern authorities:

Of all mad creatures, if the learned are right,
It is the slaver kills, and not the bite.
The poet's use of the term mad includes flatterers in the group of fools who are motivated by insanity or irrationality, but here the concept is strengthened by being related not to human madness but to the danger from a rabid animal. Pope here is arguing that it is not the attacks themselves that are dangerous, but the venomous disease which causes the attacks.

Lines 109 through 114 present examples of his sufferings at the hands or pens of flatterers, who ridicule "beyond a hundred foes." Even though Pope recognizes the danger from flatterers, he does not describe them in vicious terms. Maintaining his ethical appeal, his description of the flatterers indicates his good sense in his ability to recognize them for what they are. The next section presents an amusing tale of Pope's personal experiences with flatterers. The poet's ability to laugh at himself again emphasizes his good sense and the passage also makes use of a very clever emotional appeal. The description is presented not in an open bid for sympathy, but is more effective for that very reason. As Aristotle points out, in speaking of arousing the emotion of pity, "Most affecting of all is it when . . . the victims maintain a noble bearing" (II, viii, p. 123).
The details of Pope's physical disabilities and his illnesses all contribute to arousing the feelings of pity and even more so when the detached view is taken by the sufferer himself. The refusal to make an obvious bid for pity fulfills the purpose of arousing sympathy and also admiration. The flatterers' use of fallacious arguments provides a contrast between them and Pope; his superiority is enhanced by the recognition of the impropriety of their comparisons based on his physical characteristics instead of his poetry.

The references to Horace, Ovid and Homer appeal to the intellect of the audience; and the closing argument is made to seem ridiculous.

And when I die, be sure you let me know
Great Homer died three thousand years ago. 123-124

The analogy between his death and Homer's death indicates the ridiculous extent to which their flattery may go. The faulty logic of comparing death, which comes to all men, as a basis for greatness in poetry, is exposed since there is no similarity or relationship. Such a comparison detracts from the good sense of the flatterers, and Pope's repeated recognition of faulty arguments prepares the audience to accept his arguments uncritically.
The examples presented in lines 109-124 provide instances of inductive reasoning to support Pope's claim that those who are addicted to flattery belong in the category of fools against whom he has promised to speak out. Pope's ethical appeal has been carefully developed by repeated evidence of his virtue, benevolence and sound sense. The solidly logical arguments he has presented prepare the audience for his defense, which opens in the next section.

Line 125 opens a section of the Epistle devoted to Pope's defense of himself as a poet. He first undertakes to explain his reasons for writing and publishing poetry and points out the reaction it received from the critics. The section is forensic in nature; therefore Pope makes use of those topics most helpful to him, past fact, motives and testimony. Here he relies chiefly on the rational appeal, presenting a series of facts to prove his points.

The argument presented in lines 125 through 134 is a rather weak defense. Pope is vague, excusing himself on the grounds of youth and inexperience:

As yet a child, nor yet a fool to fame,
I lisped in numbers, for the numbers came. 127-128

The excuse of being young is not a strong argument, but it is strengthened because it is a sort of maxim;
it is a generally accepted truth that many things may be excused in the young. In addition, Pope defines his early poetry as a harmless pastime, an "idle trade" which took him away from neither duty nor obligation, but which still had some use in amusing him by taking his mind off his illnesses. His argument in these lines (129-134) is that if his writing did little good, neither did it do any harm. The lack of strong arguments in this section is overshadowed by the ethical appeal and the emotional appeal. The use of the Biblical reference in the phrase "Why did I write?" (St. John, 9:21) and the classical reference to Achilles in the words "dipped me in ink" appeal to the intellect of the audience while Pope's description of "this long disease, my life," creates a rather pitiful picture.

Lines 135 through 146 also present a defense, this time of Pope's reasons for publishing his works. However, unlike the previous arguments, this one is very strong. Using the sub-topic of authority, the writer gives the names of nearly a dozen men of learning who approved his work, and "with open arms received one poet more" (142). And not only did these eminent men approve his poetry, but they offered their friendship
also. Pope enhances his ethical appeal with the acknowledgement of his own pleasure in such recognition, in particular his pleasure in regard to their friendship and esteem. The closing couplet sums up his argument and sets up a comparison between the great men who approved him and the lesser men who attacked him:

From these the world will judge of men and books, Not from the Burnets, Oldmixon's, and Cooks. 145-146

Implied is the conclusion that if men who are good and wise have approved Pope, then he cannot be either a poor writer or an evil man.

The next division of the poem presents the reaction of critics to Pope's work. The poet first describes his poetry, repeating his earlier argument that even if it did no good, neither did it do any harm, being soft, flowery, and inoffensive. Even then was he attacked by the critics Gildon and Dennis, and he discredits the validity of their comments by suggesting disreputable motives for their criticism. The approval of eminent men disallows criticism of his poetic skills on the basis of its literary value, so other reasons must exist. In such circumstances, Aristotle suggests the use of "some conceivable motive as the actual motive for the event" (II, xxiii, p. 168), and Pope returns to the same motives used in his earlier dis-
cussions, those of greed and madness. These motives are understandable, if not excusable, and present a clear image of the character of these two men. In contrast to them, Pope describes his reaction to their criticism to point out the many virtuous qualities he possessed, even as a young man. He was benevolent and judicious, he refused to engage in a battle of words, he understood the motives for the criticism but did not seek revenge. Since young men are readily moved to anger, the poet's humility and restraint are more admirable because they are unusual.

The section which begins with line 157 continues Pope's explanation of his attitude towards his critics. His good sense is revealed by his reaction to sober criticism: "if wrong, I smiled; if right, I kissed the rod" (line 158). But these critics also fail to judge his work on its literary merits; instead they concentrate on punctuation, spelling, grammar, the smallest components of a work.\(^\text{14}\) Pope's wisdom as a poet is indicated in his assessment of the critics:

Pains, reading, study, are their just pretence, and all they want is spirit, taste, and sense. 159-160

And his willingness to grant them their due is presented when he comments that it would be wrong "to rob them of their mite," since they do have a certain claim to fame by attaching their criticisms to the masterpieces of Milton and Shakespeare. Lines 169 through 172 repeat this argument in the form of an analogy, comparing the great works of these poets to precious amber and the critics' petty contributions to such common or repellent objects as "hairs, or straws, or dirt, or grubs, or worms."

The next section discusses any one who, besides the critics, has been displeased with Pope. Characterizing them as driven by pride and stupidity combined, the writer designates them as impossible to please, and sets forth examples of men who lack talent, who steal the work of others, who write nonsense. This part is primarily transitional and has as its function the introduction of the Atticus sketch.

The epideictic passage on Atticus is one of the major portions of Pope's defense in which he attempts to defend himself against his chief enemies. This section makes use of the special topics of vices and virtues, but the argument is presented in a tentative,
rather than a straightforward manner. It is based on a series of suppositions and Pope reaches his conclusions by inference from the supposition. Here Pope sets up a contrast between the talents with which Addison is blessed and the use he makes of them. Addison is presented as a man of genius and fame, extremely talented with both literary ability and social graces, but also with a character so warped by jealousy of other writers that what would normally be virtues are carried to extremes and thus become a lack of virtue. Restraint becomes dissembling, prudence becomes timidity and deviousness, and the evil results of his jealousy are compounded by his indirect character, the sly and subtle means he uses to undermine the fame and fortune of other writers who might challenge his standing. More than vices, the lack of virtue is here underscored; Pope is suggesting that Atticus is acting not from active vice, but from moral weakness. The long description of his actions is required to prove an important point in Pope's argument, that Addison

---

The writer reinforces this idea of injustice by using the topic of degree. "The magnitude of a wrong depends on the degree of the injustice that prompts it; and hence the least of acts may be the greatest of wrongs" (I, xiv, p. 78); Atticus' refusal to accept the responsibilities of prestige and to use his success to guide and advance the careers of other writers denies them the opportunities they are entitled to, hence, it is most unjust. It involves the concept of a lack of charity, the opposite of love of neighbor, which in this case is prompted by jealousy, leading in turn to undeserved scorn and contempt for members of his own profession. Such self-love is compounded with vacillation, with the lack of commitment either to vice or virtue, with the unwillingness to take a stand, and reveals extensive weakness of character, which destroys
not only the person whom it infects, but also those who come in contact with it. The conclusion which is drawn from the example of Atticus is two-fold: that an ordinary man so lacking in virtue would be laughable, but if the man were Addison, a man of fine qualities corrupted, the situation would be tragic.

The next section, beginning with line 215, moves from the condemnation of his enemy to passages of self-praise, and is primarily transitional, leading into the discussion of patronage. Pope stresses his independence of "the race that write," his indifference to homage and dedications to provide the means of contrast with most patrons, and he continues to set up his merits as a contrast with those poets who serve a patron, stating that he did not degrade himself like a carefree pup chasing a stick to amuse its master nor take part in the unreal world of actors and playwrights. Pope depicted himself as fulfilling the functions of a patron in the narratio and the good judgment revealed in that section verifies his statements here. In addition to this point, his position as neither patron nor client contributes to the appearance of a disinterested judge of the situation and removes the charge that his motive in speaking out against the system might be spite.
The character sketch of Bufo (lines 231-248) follows Pope's disclaimer of any association with patrons. This sketch is epideictic in pointing out the vices of patrons and also involves a deliberative aspect in showing the flaws of the patronage system and urging its discontinuance. The tone is one of mockery in describing the statues of dead poets that Bufo surrounds himself with and turns to scorn in describing the way he treats the men for whom he acts as patron. The very name, Bufo, encompasses an argument by analogy by calling to mind Aesop's tale about the frog that wanted to puff himself up to the size of an ox, supporting Pope's designation of Bufo as "puffed with pride."

The use of the fable would appeal to the audience's ability to catch the allusion, as well as the ironic reference to the "Castalian state." Pope expands the quality of pride into ridiculous vanity by coupling the patron Bufo with the poet Horace. However, Bufo's poets are not like Horace; they are "an undistinguished race" who readily exchange praise and flattery for advice and money. Bufo's willing acceptance of their flattery contrasts with Pope's reaction to flatterers noted earlier and further discredits the patron, as does his conception of the duties of a patron:
Till grown more frugal in his riper days,
He paid some bards with port, and some with praise,
241-242

A drink of wine or a kind remark does not begin to
fulfill the duties of a patron who should provide solid
help and encouragement.

Using an example to support his argument, Pope
cites the case of Dryden, a great writer who had no
patron, as an instance of worth refused recognition
during his lifetime.

But still the great have kindness in reserve,
He helped to bury whom he helped to starve. 247-248

This charge that patrons are eager to prey upon the
memory of great poets is particularly disgusting, since
by refusing to help them in life, they have no right
to pretend kindness and virtue at a time when help
can do no good. Rogers points out the deliberative
aspect of this passage, which is developed by means of
the special topic of what is worthy.

The sketch of Bufo . . . is a more frankly
contemptible figure . . . [showing] the dis-
tortions in human relations that pertain to
the system of patronage. . . . The exchanges
between patron and patronized are portrayed
as similarly grotesque and bloated: in
return for excessive adulation and prosti-
tution of principle, the flatterers receive
a dinner, a little port, and sometimes
merely praise. Pope . . . had often con-
demned the . . . system of patronage, but
nowhere else had he succeeded in so effec-
ive a manner in defining the moral conditions that such a scheme fosters. 16

While Bufo's vice is pride, it extends beyond harming him to affecting others; these effects are shown to be harmful to society. By encouraging insincerity, by putting a price on encouragement, men of Bufo's type corrupt other members of society and lead to all kinds of viciousness. Pope shows here a frightful deviation from the fulfillment of the obligations of wealth. Bufo could have provided financial aid to the writers and encouraged them in a way that would be consistent with virtue; instead, he uses his wealth to set up a two-way system of backscratching, providing the writers with a minimum of aid, but demanding from them in return the maximum in favors and flattery.

Pope continues his attack on patronage in the next section, lines 250 through 260, here attacking the poets who write for patrons, and implying that, in many instances, bad poets deserve bad patrons, since the poets willingly demean themselves to retain the favor of their patrons.

So, when a statesman wants a day's defense,
Or envy holds a whole week's war with sense,
Or simple pride for flattery makes demands;
May dunce by dunce be whistled off my hands! 251-254

16 Rogers, p. 88.
Pride and envy demand flattery and nonsense, and without thinking, the poets, like trained creatures, respond to the whims and whistles of their masters. In line 255, Pope returns to his charge against the patrons, that they too often neglect good poets, using as an example to prove his point, the life and death of John Gay. The use of examples follows Aristotle's advice that "examples are best suited to deliberative speeches, since we judge of things to come by divining from things that have gone before" (I, ix, p. 54), and "the parallels from history are most effective, since in the long run things will turn out in the future as they actually have turned out in the past" (II, xx, p. 149).

The choice of the life of John Gay as a "neglected genius" is especially apt. James Sutherland describes Gay as gentle, good-natured, lovable, and innocent, but rather impractical and incapable of managing worldly affairs, a man whose friends regarded him with affection. Pope is using an emotional appeal here.

---

to arouse pity for Gay and indignation towards the patrons by showing the undeserved misfortune brought about by the decisions of patrons, who, as the parody of the Bible suggests, rank themselves with God. These points underscore the false set of values inherent in the patronage system and Pope sets up a strong contrast with his own virtues. His recognition of Gay's genius indicates his good judgment; his steadfast loyalty to him even after death shows his awareness of the duties of true friendship. The exposure of the disadvantages to good and worthy men of the patronage system, reinforced by Pope's ethical appeal and Gay's emotional appeal, is an excellently constructed argument and must have been most persuasive.

Line 260 begins a portion of the Epistle devoted to reinforcing Pope's ethical appeal. His Atticus sketch was presented in the form of a supposition, the Bufo sketch was presented by the poet in the guise of a disinterested witness, but the Sporus sketch will be an outright attack and denunciation. Therefore, Pope spends a great deal of time to establishing himself in his audience's favor so that they will accept his remarks about Lord Hervey, his most dangerous enemy.
Pope devotes the first section of this appeal to stressing his humanity. His desires are simple; he wishes only to lead his own life among his friends and books. His virtues are also simple; he is honest, religious, and humble, more concerned about these things than the literary world, in spite of what carping enemies may think or say. His reply to those who charge him with anonymous writings combines both an emotional and a rational appeal. Pope exposes their conclusion about his work as a faulty conclusion drawn from insufficient evidence and refutes it with the argument:

Poor guiltless I! and can I choose but smile,  
When every coxcomb knows me by my style? 281-282

The use of the enthymeme provides one of the premises of the argument; the other premise and the conclusion are implied. The full form of the argument is:

A man's writing may be recognized by its style.  
These are not in Pope's style.  
Therefore, these cannot be Pope's writings.

Aristotle designates such an argument as a "sham enthymeme," in which the conclusion, although probable, is not inevitable (II, xxv, p. 179). Pope's argument, therefore, is not completely true, for it might be argued that his style is not always readily recognizable or that he is able to write in more than one style.
However, the argument is persuasive because the previous arguments have been valid and because Pope has carefully developed his ethical appeal in terms of honesty and truth. He could not have gotten away with such a slight argument early in his poem but his virtuous character has predisposed his audience to accept his statements without examining them closely.\(^{18}\)

The emotional passage which opens the next section (line 283) re-emphasizes Pope's ethical character. His interest in the welfare of all mankind is indicated by his reference to his poetry as a curse if it should

\[
\text{make one worthy man my foe,} \\
\text{Give virtue scandal, innocence a fear,} \\
\text{Or from the soft-eyed virgin steal a tear!} \quad 284-286
\]

Balancing his lofty concept of the aim of poetry is the aim of less virtuous poets who offend others through the misuse of their talents.

\[
\text{But he who hurts a harmless neighbor's peace,} \\
\text{Insults fall'n worth, or beauty in distress,} \\
\text{Who loves a lie, lame slander helps about,} \\
\text{Who writes a libel, or who copies out:} \quad 287-290
\]

In these lines, the persons wronged are portrayed as weak and innocent, further discrediting the character of one who would attack them. To insult "fallen worth"

\[^{18}\text{Cf. Olson, p. 25.}\]
suggests the modern term, "to kick a man when he's down," and indicates meanness and lowness. To insult a "beauty in distress" carries the idea of a callous disregard for womanhood and denies any thought of honorable or gentlemanly conduct. Such a poet's dedication to vicious deeds, which include lies, slander, libel, and plagiarism reveals the wickedness of his character.

Lines 291 through 304 were originally written in 1732 as a sketch attacking Lord Hervey, but here Pope uses them as a general picture of evil and vices of which the Sporus sketch will provide a specific example. The person described in these verses betrays the most basic obligations, those of friendship, through such faults as pride, vanity, dishonesty and pure malice. For this picture, Pope adapted part of a sketch of a false friend from the Satires of Horace,¹⁹ which gives the lines a two-fold effect, a general picture of an evil person convincing on two levels. The level of common sense and experience will verify the truth of

the existence of such men; the level of classical edu-
cation and intellect will appreciate the adaptation of
the words of a classical writer to a particular occa-
sion. Both of these enhance the intellectual stature
of the poet and leads his audience to accept as right
and just his aim to punish all such evil people:

A lash like mine no honest man shall dread,
But all such babbling blockheads in his stead. 303-304

The Sporus portrait, which begins with line 305,
is an epideictic passage condemning Lord Hervey. Vice
is the special topic used, but the presentation is much
 harsher than the earlier sketches. Atticus might have
been excused his jealousy and Bufo his stupidity, but
for Sporus there is no excuse. He is presented as
unmitigated malice, a "lord who has the ear of the court
and uses it for character assassination and smutted
innuendo."20 Arbuthnot's advice to Pope at this point
uses, not the topic of advantage and injury, but the
topic of the worthy and suggests that Hervey is beneath
even contempt. Arbuthnot's speech contributes to Pope's
ethos by serving as an authority to verify the character
of Sporus; as Aden suggests, the doctor functions as

20Francis B. Thornton, Alexander Pope: Catholic
the collaborator of the poet, and through him,

Pope can have it both ways, can express the feeling that Hervey is beneath contempt and yet pile on him all the same, all the while gaining the sanction of an Arbuthnot.21

The early part of the portrait of Sporus uses a series of comparisons. The first one is a vague reference to Sporus as a bug, not particularly dangerous, but bothersome and annoying; the impression created is that of someone out of place, a parasite trying to create a good impression. The suggestion of annoying harrassment is supported in the lines:

So well-bred spaniels civilly delight
In mumbling of the game they dare not bite. 313-314

And this couplet also presents the idea that Sporus is not his own man, but is managed by others like a well-trained hunting dog. The next lines, with references to smiles and emptiness, underscore the impression that Hervey is guided by others and this idea is again reinforced by characterizing him as a powerless puppet, a two-faced sycophant, a self-seeking opportunist. The next picture of Sporus is no longer an animal image, but a disgusting deviation from normal human beings, a mixture of male and female. The term amphibious repeats the idea of the duality of Sporus' nature, a creature at home in either realm:

21Aden, pp. 578-579.
Fop at the toilet, flatt'rer at the board,
Now trips a lady, and now struts a lord. 328-329

The final comparison likens Sporus to the devil, both
with an angelic appearance concealing a treacherous
being, both revealing how moral corruption can destroy,
both dangerous in their capabilities to bring ruin to
mankind.

Following the argument destroying the character
of Lord Hervey, Pope opens his peroratio with a summary,
reaffirming his virtue and reiterating the vices of
his enemies. The comparison is forcefully presented
by the use of negative definitions in which Pope
denies any interest in fame, fortune, fashion or lit­
erary ambition, the motives attributed to his enemies.
His superiority to Sporus, especially, is stated in his
description of himself as one who "pleased by manly
ways," and the qualities of honor and truthfulness are
supported by his statement of the purpose of his
poetry, "not for fame, but virtue's better end."

Pope's dedication to virtue provides the reason
for all the attacks which vicious men have made against
him and the long list of instances of those who have
hurt him includes all persons described previously,
summed up in the general terms, the dull, the proud,
the wicked, and the mad. Lines 348 through 357 enumer-
ates again the attacks he has suffered, stressing their
injustice and closing with their most unjust attack of
all, against those who cannot defend themselves:

Abuse on all he loved, or loved him, spread,
A friend in exile, or a father, dead. 354-355

In spite of his enemies' injustices, however, Pope is
not moved to anger or revenge. Instead he presents
himself as gladly enduring these attacks, if only
virtue might be served.

Welcome for thee, fair Virtue! all the past:
For thee, fair Virtue! welcome ev'n the last! 358-359

Arbuthnot's question, "But why insult the poor,
affront the great?" provides Pope with an opportunity
to present again the justice of opposing vices and
his uncompromising insistence on virtue, in his reply,
"A knave's a knave, to me, in every state."

The portion of the poem which begins with line
368 presents still another aspect of Pope's character,
his benevolence even towards his enemies. Claiming
that he is "soft by nature," he cites instances of
forgiveness and friendship, and it is only when he
again mentions the attacks on his family that the tone
changes to anger.

The epideictic lines in praise of his family
(lines 382 through 403) present them as virtuous and
also show Pope as a devoted son properly defending his parents. Among the virtues attributed to both his parents is charity, a willingness to seek out the best in people:

That father held it for a rule
It was a sin to call our neighbor fool,
That harmless mother thought no wife a whore, 382-384.

An examination of the background of the family makes use of subdivisions of the epideictic topics, deeds and circumstances which contribute to their virtuous superiority. Pope shows them as neither wealthy or aristocratic, but well-bred and honorable; neither proud nor belligerent, but moderate and peace-loving; not well-educated but wise. The mention of his father's health and long life suggests that even nature approved this man, even in his final hour, by granting him the blessings of a quick and painless death.

The praise of his parents also provides the poet with an additional argument to support his contention that he is a good man. His closing couplet is a prayer that he too may live and die as his father did, and calls to mind the maxim, "like father, like son," which serves as proof of the poet's virtue. The final section of the Epistle reaffirms Pope's worth as a friend and a man. His prayer uttered for the benefit of his
friend emphasizes his good will, his own request to live long enough to comfort his mother in her final hours emphasizes his filial piety. The closing couplet places the request before Heaven as the ultimate judge, the court where virtue and justice and honor will find a triumphant reward.

Throughout the Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot, Pope uses the appeals which are most suitable both to his subject and to his audience. The ethical appeal is emphasized in order to dispose his audience to listen to his presentation and to accept his point of view as not only good, but advantageous. The emotional appeal develops the feelings of friendship and sympathy for the poet, and serves the additional purpose of magnifying the injustices of his opponents' attacks. The rational appeal is used for those arguments which may be proved through the use of evidence or testimony; the frequency with which a strong argument follows and augments a weak one indicates Pope's awareness not only of the appeals themselves, but also how their arrangement could enhance their effectiveness. His masterful skill exhibited in this work indicates an extensive study and studied application of the principles of rhetorical argument.
POPE'S USE OF TROPES AND SCHEMES IN ARBUTHNOT

In addition to the arrangement and the arguments of a discourse, there is a third area of study important to the effectiveness of a work, that of style. The importance of style is pointed out by Aristotle, when he notes that "it is not enough to know what to say—one must also know how to say it" (III, i, p. 182).

The necessary qualities of style are that it must be clear, correct, appropriate, and apparently natural; of the last point, Aristotle cautions:

Thus we see the necessity of disguising the means we employ, so that we may seem to be speaking, not with artifice, but naturally. Naturalness is persuasive, artifice just the reverse. (III, ii, p. 186)

The mention of the persuasiveness of a natural style indicates Aristotle's recognition of the ways that style could be used to support the various arguments and appeals. He mentions as one of the points in regard to propriety of language that it should express emotion and character, for "the appropriateness of your language to the emotion will make people believe in your facts" (III, vii, p. 197). Arrangement of
words is another way in which an appropriate style may reinforce an argument, and Aristotle mentions the effectiveness of an antithetical arrangement in achieving persuasion:

Things are best known by opposition and are all the better known when the opposites are put side by side; and (this style) is pleasing also because of its resemblance to logic. (III, ix, p. 204)

Clarity and correctness readily add to the ethical appeal of the speaker by presenting the arguments in ways so that they are readily understood. In Aristotle's view, the metaphor is the kind of language which was "of the utmost value in both poetry and prose... It is metaphor\(^1\) above all else that gives clearness, charm, and distinction to the style" (III, ii, p. 187).

Its value in regard to the effectiveness of arguments is noted, also:

And we may start from the principle that we all take a natural pleasure in learning easily; so since words stand for things, those words are most pleasing that give us fresh knowledge... Accordingly, it is metaphor that is in the highest degree instructive and pleasing. (III, x, p. 206)

---

\(^1\)Aristotle's designation of metaphor as the most useful device of style was not confined to the trope metaphor which we know today; rather, metaphor was a generic term covering a wide range of figures in which words were used in transferred senses.
The instruction stems from the fact that the implied comparison of the metaphor gives the reader a new insight or a different concept of a familiar thing and the pleasure arises from the delight in finding the resemblance on which the metaphor is based. Metaphors can present an argument clearly and quickly in the guise of a process of learning in a manner that is pleasing both in style and reasoning. Aristotle sums up the effects of style concisely, concluding that

such are the qualities an audience likes in the argument. In respect to the style in which the argument is put, what they like in the arrangement is antithesis and balance. . . . What they like in the dictionary is metaphor. . . . And, finally, they like words that set an event before their eyes; . . . In style, accordingly, the speaker must aim at these three points, metaphor, antithesis, actuality. (III, x, pp. 207-208)

Thus Aristotle seemingly prefers the devices of style which involve parallelism, antithesis, and metaphors and similes, although he mentions some other figures, such as asyndeton, polysyndeton and hyperbole.

Later rhetoricians went into far greater detail in regard to the figures of speech, which were defined by Quintilian as

any deviation, either in thought or expression, from the ordinary and simple method of speaking. . . . Let the defi-
nition of a figure, then, be a form of speech artfully varied from common usage.²

By the time of the Renaissance, rhetoricians had distinguished more than two hundred figures which were divided into tropes and schemes. Tropes are figures of speech which involve a deviation from the ordinary and normal meaning of a word; schemes are devices of arrangement of words in any order that is not completely ordinary and normal. Schemes are divided into those that are grammatical and those that are rhetorical; grammatical schemes involve both orthographical schemes, which has to do with the spelling of words and elision, and syntactical schemes, which involve the construction and arrangement of units such as phrases, clauses and sentences. Rhetorical schemes are chiefly figures of repetition.³ The relationship of the schemes and tropes to effective argument may be seen in Sister Miriam Joseph's definition of the schemes of grammar as "deviations from ordinary expression to achieve swiftness,


³Sister Miriam Joseph, p. 33.
emphasis, rhythm, or some similar grace of style,"⁴ and in her consideration of the tropes as extremely useful means of expanding the topics of invention.⁵

The orthographical schemes of words are particularly useful in fitting words to the demands of poetic meter and rhyme since they involved the omission of syllables from words or the elision of adjoining words or the modification of stress upon syllables. Pope, therefore, used these schemes of words frequently, but since they represent poetic form rather than an effective device of style, they make no particular contribution to his arguments. This chapter, therefore will concentrate upon the tropes and the syntactical schemes; however, it is not in any sense an exhaustive study, but rather a discussion of the most noticable devices.

One of the characteristics of Pope's Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot which is frequently mentioned is the easy flow of the conversational style of the poem. Geoffrey Tillotson, in Pope and Human Nature remarks that Pope's word-order is almost prosaic,⁶ and both James Suther-

⁴Ibid., p. 293.
⁵Ibid., pp. 308-353.
land and Jacob Adler comment on the conversational quality of the work. This effect is attributed to the use of ordinary words and normal word order and clearly supports Aristotle's advice that the style should be clear, appropriate, and natural. While this apparent simplicity of style might seem to indicate that Pope used relatively few rhetorical devices in his work, the contrary is true; it merely emphasizes how well he was able to conceal his art, how skillfully he made all his words seem so appropriate that the schemes and tropes are not readily apparent. Olson, for example, notes how Pope's style supports his purpose:

The simplicity of diction of course makes for clarity; ... any such departure from the simple would have belied the simplicity of taste that Pope was attempting to establish as characteristic of him... since people tend to believe that sincerity is attended by simplicity of speech.

The most forceful example of simplicity of diction is found in the Advertisement. The purpose of this portion of the work is to serve as an introduction to Pope's defense and also to establish him as a good man.


8Olson, p. 31.
In order not to obscure any of the elements of the ethical appeal, Pope wrote the Advertisement in prose, using commonplace words and simple sentence structures and avoiding the use of many of the rhetorical devices which are prevalent in the poetry. The Advertisement opens with a straightforward statement of the background of the poem, explicitly stating the reasons for its being written and designating those against whom it is directed. The sentences are simply arranged, marked only by parallel structure and a balance of the several elements. This balance serves to reinforce Pope's contention that his poem involves a case of good against evil, truth against falsehood, virtue against vice. There is very little deviation from the natural word-order except when a negative is used, as "to those who know me not," and "I make not as free use of theirs." In these instances, the negative is emphasized by its unusual position, and in turn, augments the force of the poet's statements.

The final sentence of the first paragraph of the Advertisement is a fine example of parallel structure reinforcing an antithetical idea. The following diagram indicates the careful construction:
If it have any thing pleasing
it will be that by which
I am most desirous to please,
the truth and the sentiment;
and if any thing offensive
it will by only to those
I am least sorry to offend,
the vicious or the ungenerous.

The use of the terms bill of complaint and drawn
up are particularly suitable choices of words for a
defense and well fitted to a forensic discussion, since
they suggest legal terms which oppose the idea of a de­
fendant filing a counter claim. The use of these meta­
phors follows Aristotle's advice:

If you aim to adorn a thing, you must take
your metaphor from something better in its
class; if to disparage, then from something
worse. (III, ii, p. 187)

The scheme of climax is used in the listing of
the various offenses which he has undergone as attacks
on his writings, person, morals and family. Since
these attacks are set forth as the basic cause of
Pope's reply, it is necessary for him to make them
appear important and weighty, and his arrangement does
this, since, according to Aristotle, "the same things
will seem greater when they are separately listed . . .
so combination (accumulation) and climax are used to
make things seem greater" (I, vii, pp. 41-42).

Occasionally Pope uses an implied antithesis which
is developed through the use of negative or comparative
forms. In his statement, "whereof to those who know
me not, a truer information may be requisite," both are
used to develop the contrast between the half-truths
which his enemies have spread and the true and com-
plete account of himself which he proposes to give.
The restraint with which Pope uses only a few stylistic
deVICES in the Advertisement is really a device of
style in itself, for it creates the impression of an
open statement in a court of law on a case in which
facts and evidence are of primary importance and the
proof so solid that a florid style would only obscure
the issue.
Aristotle advises that the use of humor can be
very effective as a means of argument, noting that
"the means to laughter . . . are thought to be of some
value in controversy. . . . we must ruin our opponent's
earnestness with our jocularity" (III, xviii, p. 239).
Pope develops a humorous tone in the narratio of the
Epistle by the use of the tropes hyperbole, irony,
metaphor which relate poets to madmen, and the clever
inversion of the scheme climax to anticlimax.
The casual and colloquial exclamation in the
opening lines of the poem uses hyperbole to express
Pope's exasperation with the vexing demands made upon him.
Shut, shut, the door, good John! fatigued I said,
Tie up the knocker, say I'm sick, I'm dead,
The dog-star rages! 1-3
While his excuse for not seeing his callers exaggerates his weariness to illness or death, it is such a commonplace expression that it does not seem unusual or unwarranted, but a relatively mild reaction to minor annoyances. The examples of these annoyances which follow, even though they are directed toward the establishment of the forensic fact that Pope has endured many unjustified criticisms and that he has, indeed, a "sorer case," also provide the poet's reaction to his critics and detractors. His reaction is important to his defense, since his ability to view his vexations lightly contributes to his ethos by pointing up his sensible and reasonable attitude. In addition, the minor annoyances presented early in the poem will lead into very serious attacks later, and the propriety of Pope's reaction to the first will lend veracity to his reaction to his major enemies. The effectiveness of using a hyperbolic expression to open the poem is noted by Olson:

The jesting tone of the opening lines . . . permits exaggerations which a more serious statement might have made to appear falsity; in addition, the pleasantry is most disarming.\(^9\)

Another contribution to the humor of the opening lines is Pope's parody of the pattern of classical epic poetry, which began with an invocation to the gods or the Muses. The mockery of the epic invocation which Pope addresses to his servant establishes a humorous tone and subtly combines metaphor, hyperbole and irony. The metaphor compares Pope's vexations to the mighty struggles of epic heroes; the hyperbole is based on this exaggerated view of the situation; the irony stems from the obvious lack of valid relationships.

Hyperbole is used for the purpose of contrast as well as humor in Arbuthnot's warning to the poet not to name names; "I too could write, and I am twice as tall" (103). The exaggeration of Pope's smallness of stature and the possible danger of physical retaliation contrasts sharply with the greatness of his ideals and his dedication to virtue. Pope's enemies are also described in an exaggerated way.

What drop or nostrum can this plague remove? Or which must end me, a fool's wrath or love? 29-30

The exaggeration of his attackers as a death-causing plague suggests the seriousness of their attacks, and adds support to the poet's contention that he is justified in undertaking a defense. The use of plague as a metaphor is particularly appropriate here, for it calls
to mind the poet's relationship with Dr. Arbuthnot, who has often treated his physical ailments. Since the Epistle is addressed to Arbuthnot, it is proper that the attacks and subsequent sufferings be designated in a manner befitting the doctor's skills.

Pope also uses the trope of irony in the early parts of the poem to promote his ethical appeal by creating the image of himself as a clear-sighted judge of men's characters and motives. Pope's ironic acceptance of the would-be poets and their problems gives the impression of both good judgment and benevolence; he endures them, but he has no illusions about their reasons for visiting him.

All fly to Twit'nam, and in humble strain
Apply to me, to keep them mad or vain. 21-22

Irony also produces a humorous effect, since it makes his opponents appear ridiculous. The ironic use of the word humble in conjunction with vain and mad contradicts the visitors' humility; the irony in the next couplets continues the contradictions, here between their charges and the truth.

Arthur, whose giddy son neglects the laws,
Imputes to me and my damned works the cause:
Poor Cornus sees his frantic wife elope,
And curses wit, and poetry, and Pope. 23-26
The charges brought against Pope are ridiculous and to be condemned by such faulty reasoning presents a ludicrous situation. The irony here stems from the irrationality of the charges themselves and the irrationality of the men who bring the charges. Pope often uses the scheme of climax to make his ironic comments more forceful, as in line 26, which lists the causes which made Cornus' wife run away. To undercut the accusation and reveal the silliness of the charge, Pope inverts the traditional order of climax, and of all the improbable reasons for a wife to wander, he puts the least likely reason in the most prominent position. Irony is also found in the metaphorical use of the name Cornus. Mack describes this kind of metaphor as one of Pope's reticent modes of imaging, which achieve metaphorical effect without using what it is customary to regard as metaphor... Pope saw... the qualitative elements (including in Pope's case the humorous qualities) that could be extracted from proper names.10

Here the name Cornus carries the weight of the implied metaphor. Derived from the Latin word for horn, the

name calls to mind the horns which, in medieval times, were supposedly the marks of a cuckold or deceived husband. This connotation of *Cornus* adds additional force to the lack of validity in his charges against the poet and provides a sharp contrast between Pope's qualities of keen insight and understanding of others' motives and the attributes of his enemies who are so blind to reality that they are even unaware of what goes on within their own families.

Pope also uses irony to designate the self-serving motives which prompt his visitors to seek his friendship; motives based on a need for advice, money, a patron, a recommendation. Pope's awareness of the one-sidedness of the relationships is shown by his ironic description of one poet who writes only for money, but evidently earns little, since he lives in an attic, and is "lulled by soft zephyrs through the broken pane" (42). And of another, he notes:

Three things another's modest wishes bound,  
My friendship, and a prologue, and ten pound. 47-48

The contradiction of modest with the favors asked points out the character of the man as one who apparently has no valid conception of the worth or importance of the things he requests. The use of climax in this couplet again takes an inverted form; this arrangement
indicates the inverted values that such men live by, values by which money becomes more important than friendship.

In the refutation against the charges of cruelty, irony is apparent in Pope's description of Codrus, but in this instance the irony is not so much in the meaning of the words as in their form:

Let peals of laughter, Codrus! round thee break,
Thou unconcerned can'st hear the mighty crack,
Pit, box, and gallery in convulsions hurled,
Thou stand'st unshook amidst a bursting world. 85-88

The example of Codrus as one who does not suffer from ridicule because he does not recognize it is written in a manner which itself is ridiculous. The use of the pronouns and verbs in the seldom-used second person singular, because of their inappropriateness to the person addressed, a fool, suggest that Codrus is in fact blind to ridicule. Probably Pope was aware of the use of this form of familiar address as expressing scorn or contempt in French when used in speaking of those with whom one is not on familiar terms, and knowledge of this point by his audience would be an additional support to his derogatory characterization of Codrus.

Pope's discussion of his experiences with flatterers also is expressed ironically:
There are, who to my person pay their court,
I cough like Horace, and though lean, am short,
Ammon's great son one shoulder had too high,
Such Ovid's nose, and "Sir! you have an eye—"
Go on, obliging creatures, make me see,
All that disgraced my betters, met in me.
Say for my comfort, languishing in bed,
"Just so immortal Maro held his head":
And when I die, be sure you let me know
Great Homer died three thousand years ago. 115-124

The progressive irony of the couplets contributes to
Pope's ethical appeal by showing his awareness of the
silliness of their remarks. His refusal to be taken
in involves the rational appeal by suggesting the lack
of logic in the flatterers' comparisons; the references
to his physical disabilities serve as an emotional
appeal, here raised beyond pity to admiration for one
who suffers nobly. The final couplet of this section
is obvious nonsense, but Pope's attitude of amusement
removes any taint of bitterness and serves further to
make those who are inclined to flattery seem silly
and ridiculous.

Within the narratio, Pope frequently uses irony
to support his ethical image. Since the effect of
irony is based on the difference between the real truth
and the apparent truth, its use by the poet establishes
the impression of keen judgment and wide experience,
as well as confirms his ability to see through the
outer covering of situations and people to the reality
at the core. These attributes in turn create an impression of superiority, and this superiority leads to confidence in the writer's statements.

The many classical references in the opening section of the Epistle provide Pope with a basis for his metaphors which align poetry with madness and which have the additional function of contributing to his ethos, since he evidently views the people and situations in the same manner as did Horace, Ovid, and Juvenal, whose lines he uses or adapts to his own verse. Elias Mengel, in "Patterns of Imagery in Pope's Arbuthnot," explains this two-fold effect in the relationship of Pope's description of his visitors as men who "rave, recite, and madden round the land" to the previous references in lines 3 and 4:

The dog-star rages! ney, tis past a doubt
All Bedlam or Parnassus is let out: 3-4

These lines, according to Mengel, suggest

the maddening heat of dog days (as well as the custom in Juvenal's time of rehearsing poetry in August) . . . the correlation of Bedlam and Parnassus implies a mock-heroic metaphor in the connection of lunacy with the classical furor poeticus of the divinely inspired. 11

Pope's use of the Midas fable to explain his decision to speak out is an example of how he adapted classical writings to his own ends. In the analogy of his own situation and that of Midas' court, the poet amplifies the image of foolishness and states his determination to take action. When he refers to his "sorer case," the use of the comparative lends greater justification to his proposed actions, since not only are the two situations similar, but his is worse. The use of the word case also has more than a single meaning. The adjective sorer indicates that case is used as a medical term, and this meaning ties in well with the previous references involving disease and suffering. However, case is also a legal term and as such is entirely appropriate at this point, for since Pope is now nearing the close of the narratio and preparing to offer the proofs of his arguments in self-defense, it is fitting that he should call his audience's attention to this fact.

The fable of Midas also provides Pope with an opportunity to develop his tale into a double meaning. The appearance of the ears of an ass on Midas' head is equated with the marks of an ass in the sense of a foolish person, and the actions of the creature who
bites and kicks is applicable also on two levels, the animal and the human. The use of a word in a double meaning, one literal and one figurative, is given the name antanaclasis, and Pope drives home his point in line 80 with his description of his proposal:

Out with it, Dunciad! let the secret pass,
That secret to each fool, that he's an ass: 79-80

Another sort of metaphor may be observed in the narratio, and that is the metaphorical characterization of Pope as a martyr. Of this factor, Mack points out:

There is the implicit theme, usually announced in a word or phrase toward the outset of the poem, and while seldom developed in recurrent imagery . . . almost always developed in recurrent references and situations.12

Pope's reference to himself as a martyr, "seized and tied down to judge" (33), casts a religious tone over the whole poem and provides a proper setting for a battle between good and evil, vice and virtue, madness and rationality. The effectiveness of this sort of image is explained in Mack's comment on Pope's use of such allusions:

A second restrained mode of imaging in Pope's poetry is the allusion . . . a kind that is specifically evaluative, constructing its image by setting beside some present object or situation not so much another object or situation as another dimension, a different

12Mack, p. 33.
sphere—frequently for the purpose of diminishing what is present, but often, too, for the purpose of enlarging or elevating it.  

The poet's view of himself as a martyr to the demands of fools provides an effective contrast of humility with the pride and madness of the pseudo-poets. Using the same metaphor in his discussion of the comments of critics, he describes his reaction: "if right, I kissed the rod." (158) His humble acceptance of their criticism, either right or wrong, again contrasts with their view of themselves and their work and Pope's ideas of their activities.

Pains, reading, study, are their just pretense,  
And all they want is spirit, taste and sense. 159-160

The epideictic lines which present the aim of Pope's poetry and his dedication to virtue again hint at the sufferings of a martyr, who endures "the dull, the proud, the wicked, and the mad" (347) "for virtue's better end" (342), and the concept of martyrdom is summed up in the final couplet with the poet's affirmation that the purpose of his suffering makes all the pains and vexations worthwhile:

Ibid., p. 29.
Welcome for thee, fair Virtue! all the past:
For thee, fair Virtue! welcome even the last! 358-359

The repetition within this couplet, as well as the use of repeated exclamations, and the addressing of the words to Virtue as a personified deity, all contribute to a highly emotional effect. The same concept of Pope as martyr is suggested again in the closing line of the Epistle, "Thus far was right, the rest belongs to Heaven" (419). Here he looks to Heaven as the final reward, secure in the knowledge that he has done everything possible for a man to do in the service of virtue.

There is one other reference to martyrdom within the poem, but this one refers not to Pope, but to Sporus. Arbuthnot asks:

"What? that thing of silk, "Sporus, that mere white curd of ass's milk? "Satire or sense alas! can Sporus feel? "Who breaks a butterfly upon a wheel?" 305-308

In these lines, the implication is that such means of torture as Pope's satire are not necessary, since Sporus would yield before much milder pressures. The metaphors involving the concepts of weakness, blandness and fragility which are used in Arbuthnot's denunciation of Sporus indicate that for the doctor the subject is beneath contempt and is unworthy of Pope's consideration. The inability of Sporus to withstand suffering coupled
with Arbuthnot's contemptuous portrait of him clearly contrasts his weaknesses with Pope's strength, which not only endures suffering but endures it nobly and willingly.

The background metaphor of a martyr-like poet serves to tie together the frequent religious elements in the poem—the Biblical references, the description of Sporus as Satan, and the constant battle of good against evil.

The other metaphors which Pope uses cover a wide range of ideas. Lines 89-94 present an argument by analogy, in this case a comparison between a scribbler and a spider. Terms associated with a spider are applied to the writer, and the section ends with an anti-climactic couplet which presents the contrast between the scribbler's conception of his work and its true value:

Who shames a scribbler? break one cobweb through, 
He spins the slight, self-pleasing thread anew: 
Destroy his fib or sophistry, in vain, 
The creature's at his dirty work again, 
Throned in the center of his thin designs, 
Proud of a vast extent of flimsy lines! 89-94

The contradiction between the words throned, proud and vast and the words thin and flimsy is expressed with the trope oxymoron (a combination of contradictory terms) and provides a wittily ironical comment on the stupidity of scribbling writers.
When Pope is about to launch into his discussion of flatterers, he describes them in animal terms:

But foes like these! one flatterer's worse than all;
Of all mad creatures, if the learned are right,
It is the slaver kills, and not the bite. 104-106

The metaphor involving a rabid animal, possibly a mad dog, expresses concisely Pope's understanding of the dangers from flatterers, and relates to his previous contention that attacks from fools may lead to death. Another animal metaphor is expressed in the poet's description of critics who deal in picayune matters. This metaphor is probably deliberately imprecise—that is, no definite animal can be ascertained to be the basis for comparison. The value of such an indefinite metaphor lies in its implication that such critics are too insignificant to be readily and easily identified, as wight and word-catcher suggest in the following lines:

Each wight, who reads not, and but scans and spells,
Each word-catcher, that lives on syllables, 165-166.

The coined word word-catcher carries the idea of a small creature, perhaps a bird, that lives on insects, here modified to a creature that flits about, ready to swoop down upon an unwary syllable. The lack of precision is continued in Pope's discussion of the relationship between these critics and those whose works
they criticize. The analogy between their activities is graphically presented:

Pretty! in amber to observe the forms,
Of hairs, or straw, or dirt, or grubs, or worms!
The things, we know, are neither rich nor rare,
But wonder how the devil they got there? 169-172

The works of the great poets are compared to precious amber, while the meager efforts of the critics are compared to common refuse embedded in rarer material. However, the preserved items are vague and indefinite, since they are only the forms of these things; they appear to resemble them, but are not, in reality, what they seem.

Pope takes up the same sort of imprecise metaphor in his first description of Sporus as "this bug with gilded wings, / This painted child of dirt, that stinks and stings" (309-310). The vagueness of bug effectively combines, through its very lack of definite representation, all the favorable and unfavorable aspects of the insect world. The description also provides a contrast between the appearance and the actions of the creature. The contradiction between the appeal to sight and the offense to the sense of smell and touch is pointed up by the assonance of these lines and suggests the deceit and danger of Sporus, since he is not readily recognized for what he is. The inversion in
the following lines also support this effect:

Whose buzz the witty and the fair annoys,
Yet wit ne'er tastes, and beauty ne'er enjoys: 311-312.

As Olson points out, "his 'eternal smiles,' his personal beauty, his evident charm, his wit, his possession of royal favor—all suffer a horrid inversion."\(^{14}\)

Pope uses a very different kind of metaphor in his description of a poet whose writings betray his lack of ability. Of these lines, Adler says that the sound pattern supports the emotion of disgust,\(^{15}\) but in spite of the inelegance of the metaphor, the comparison is a highly effective one. Describing the poet as one who

Just writes to make his barrenness appear,
And strains, from hard-bound brains, eight lines a year; 181-182.

the couplet sketches a picture of extreme effort and concentration which results in a sense of satisfaction and pride in accomplishment. The incongruity of the picture results from the scantiness of the result of such exertion, both on the poetic and the physical level. The metaphor may be carried further and may point out the lack of results when what should be a

---

\(^{14}\) Olson, p. 28.

\(^{15}\) Adler, p. 43.
natural process becomes forced; the aptness of this comparison would then be disgusting only to a Puritan taste.

Equally effective in presenting a vivid picture is the metaphor which Pope uses in the final section of the poem. The emotional appeal of much of this passage stems from the metaphor which inverts the usual relationship of mother and son:

Me, let the tender office long engage,
To rock the cradle of reposing age,
With lenient arts extend a mother’s breath,
Make languor smile, and smooth the bed of death, 407-410.

Mack remarks on the effectiveness of such images, noting that they "take the ordinary established relationships of . . . parent and child . . . and with a delicate readjustment, freshen and fortify their implications."\(^{16}\)

And Tillotson likewise comments on Pope's metaphors, saying that he presented his ideas clearly by using the sort of imagery that has made its hearth and home in the memory of any reader. The clarity of Pope's remarks becomes more "shining" by means of images which are commonplace of everyday experiences.\(^{17}\)

As noted earlier in the discussion of the metaphorical use of the name Cornus, Pope frequently uses

\(^{16}\)Mack, p. 24.

\(^{17}\)Tillotson, p. 141.
names to suggest a comparison. One example of this may be found in his judgment of bad poets that "nine such poets made a Tate" (190). Mack comments on this line that

Pope's best metaphorical effects with names were obtained from specific ones... Did the vein of poetry in contemporary versifiers hardly weigh up to a gramme? Then doubtless it was an age when nine such poets made a Tate.¹⁸

The section on patronage also makes use of a name for the metaphorical effects:

Proud, as Apollo on his forked hill,  
Sat full-blown Bufo, puffed by every quill; 231-232.

The use of the name Bufo, meaning a toad, combined with the adjectives full-blown and puffed, calls to mind Aesop's fable on the frog that wanted to be an ox and thus develops the idea that patrons are equally incapable of what they attempt. To describe his enemies, Pope chose metaphors from areas which would lessen their value, such as animals, while for himself he presented a picture of one of the highest levels of human attainment as a martyr.

Some devices of style are concerned with the form in which the arguments are presented rather than

¹⁸Mack, p. 28.
the material of the arguments. Two of these, the rhetorical question and the use of parenthesis, will be considered next.

In presenting his defense, Pope frequently begins any section of his poem which treats of a point of fact with a rhetorical question. While basically the rhetorical question is a trope which affirms or denies a statement indirectly and while Pope uses it in this way to sum up many of his arguments, he gives it the additional functions of limiting the material to be discussed to the point he wishes to make and of presenting opposing arguments and opening the way for him to suggest the answers he wants his audiences to accept. The many questions in the first thirty lines point out Pope's inability to escape from the poetasters who besiege him for help and advice and also give him an opportunity to provide more details about his own character.

Line 83 introduces Pope's refutation to the possible charge of cruelty:

19 The Twickenham Edition uses only quotation marks to indicate speakers other than Pope and does not have the P. and A. designations of some other editions. Therefore, I am considering Pope's questions, which are obviously not a part of a dialogue, as rhetorical questions directed to his audience.
You think this cruel? take it for a rule,
No creature smarts so little as a fool. 83-84

The rhetorical question here opens Pope's argument that his program does not constitute cruelty and each of his separate arguments on this point is likewise introduced by questions: "Who shames a scribbler?" (89) and "Whom have I hurt?" (95). Rhetorical questions constitute the proofs of his argument that he has not hurt anyone, that no one's life has been changed because of his writings as the following couplets show:

Whom have I hurt? has poet yet, or peer,
Lost the arched eye-brow, or Parnassian sneer?
And has not Colly still his lord, and whore?
His butchers Henley, his free-masons Moor?
Does not one table Bavius still admit?
Still to one Bishop Philips seems a wit? 95-100

The number of questions, piled one on top of another, has the effect of a massive accumulation of evidence, of overwhelming proof of his innocence, and the parallelism of structure stresses this point. The repetition of the word still throughout the series of questions also contributes to the idea that in spite of what Pope has done, nothing has been changed.

When Pope opens his defense of his writing and publishing with questions, he is stating the questions which his opponents might put to him. The persuasiveness of this use of the rhetorical question is effective;
it indicates that he is aware of the areas in which he is open to attack:

Why did I write? what sin to me unknown
Dipped me in ink, my parents, or my own? 125-126

In this couplet, the second question offers to the audience a possible answer to the first one. The Biblical reference to an unknown sin (St. John, ix:2) adds a convincing note of solemnity to his defense of youth and inexperience. These are rather weak arguments, but the question suggests the line of thought which he wishes his audience to accept. "But why then publish?" (135) provides Pope with the opportunity to list all the men who approved his work, and the same trope is used as a persuasive device in the next section, in which he explains:

Soft were my numbers; who could take offense
While pure description held the place of sense? 147-148

If the audience accepts Pope's definition of his poetry as "pure description" (which he proceeds to prove) then they must grant that it would be most improper to be offended by it.

In the discussion of lesser poets who have become angry with him for his appraisal of their talent and art, Pope uses rhetorical questions to indicate the impossibility of pleasing such men in his brief sermon on pride:
A man's true merit 'tis not hard to find,
But each man's sacred standard in his mind,
That casting-weight pride adds to emptiness,
This, who can gratify? for who can guess? 175-178

The question which comes at the close of the Atticus sketch also directs the audience to concur with Pope's conclusion: "Who but must laugh, if such a man there be?" (213). This line summarizes the supposition which makes up the entire sketch and urges the audience to agree that the possibility of such a vacillating man should provoke scornful laughter.

Pope's defense against the allegations of writing anonymously also uses the rhetorical question:

Why am I asked what next shall see the light:
Heaven's! was I born for nothing but to write?
Has life no joys for me? or (to be grave)
Have I no friend to serve, no soul to save? 271-274

Pope's denial through the rhetorical questions that he spends all his time writing or that he has no other interests in life makes up an emotional appeal which is used at this point because he has no real arguments to prove his innocence of the charges. The phrasing of the questions is such that an unqualified answer, either affirmative or negative, would not be true, but the negative words within the questions are a strong influence to require an affirmative answer and prepare the audience to accept the final question which openly
denies his authorship, even though the reasons he gives are not at all reliable:

Poor guiltless I! and can I choose but smile,
When every coxcomb knows me by my style? 281-282

The question does not prove or disprove his authorship; still, if the audience accepts the question, then the only possible answer is the one Pope is angling for, that his style is so characteristic that it may be used to identify his writing.

Another device which Pope uses to support his arguments is the scheme of parenthesis. His use of this scheme in the Advertisement has the function of establishing his ethical appeal by pointing out his recognition of the propriety of comments on his works. When he writes, "it pleased some persons . . . to attack . . . not only my writings, (of which being public the public judge) but my person, morals, and family," he is conceding the right of others to criticize his works, but at the same time, he is denying this right of criticism in regard to himself and his family. This concession that the attacks and criticism of his writings is proper and acceptable and that the public is entitled to whatever judgment it wishes to make establishes him as a man of good judgment and common sense, and this
Impression of the poet lends validity to his annoyance at similar criticism of himself and his family.

Pope also uses parenthesis in order to develop an emotional appeal:

Friend to my life, (which did not you prolong, The world had wanted many an idle song) 27-28.

These lines acknowledge his debt to Arbuthnot and are designed to bring to the audience's mind the poet's physical disabilities. However, the parenthetical presentation, joined with the point that the remark is directed only to Arbuthnot, makes it a rather offhand bid for sympathy, imparting the idea, but casting the comment in the form of an "aside" rather than a direct statement.

The parenthetic expressions within the fable of Midas are used to hint at the political situations:

'Tis sung, when Midas' ears began to spring, (Midas, a sacred person and a king) His very minister who spied them first, (Some say his queen) was forced to speak, or burst. 69-72

The first of these parentheses uses the phrase "sacred person" to relate the description to the King of England, and the interposing of the comment within the fable calls attention to the statement so that the audience will not miss the allusion. The scheme also calls attention to the queen of England, and the polit-
ical situation as a whole is summarized by Arbuthnot's remark that the whole discussion is highly dangerous even though he repeats in sequence what Pope had mentioned at intervals: "I'd never name queens, ministers, or kings" (76). This denial of discussing something and then providing the information by means of the denial indirectly provides the audience with precisely the information which the author is seemingly unwilling or reluctant to impart.

Pope concludes his statement of his proposal to tell the truth about fools with a couplet which contains a parenthesis:

The truth once told, (and wherefore should we lie?)
The queen of Midas slept, and so may I. 81-82

The rhetorical question presented here as a parenthesis contains an implicit denial of any reason for lying, and the use of the word we instead of the singular pronouns which are used in the rest of the section adds authority to the remark, since it is a common form of usage among persons of high position in handing down statements. Pope's role of a judge of fools and asses is thus developed, and the use of the pronoun in a passage referring to kings, queens, and ministers further supports the analogy.

Two of the parentheses in the Epistle refer to Dryden. The first of these is found in the lines
listing the eminent men who approved Pope's work:

And St. John's self (great Dryden's friend before)
With open arms received one poet more. 141-142

The parenthesis in this couplet increases the value of the approval and suggests Pope's reaction to the honor bestowed upon him as a mixture of pride at being accepted by the friend of a great writer and perhaps humility at being placed in such high company. It also implies a similarity between Pope and Dryden, but avoids any taint of boasting through the indirect presentation. Another parenthesis regarding Dryden is found in the passage on patronage:

To some a dry rehearsal was assigned,
And others (harder still) he paid in kind.
Dryden alone (what wonder?) came not nigh,
Dryden alone escaped this judging eye: 243-246.

The parenthetic expression "harder still" is an ironic comment on the character of Bufo who delighted in flattery, poetic dedications, and witty praise, but found it difficult to be witty or to write poetry in return. The rhetorical question "What wonder?" suggests that the superiority of Dryden as a poet was matched by his superiority of judgment in keeping aloof from foolish patrons who could offer him nothing worthwhile.

Further irony is presented in parentheses in the description of Bufo's library--"(where busts of poets
dead/ And a true Pindar stood without a head)"
(235-236). Pope's comments in these lines point out the contradictions between what is generally considered the important objects in a library and what is considered important in Bufo's library. The representations of the poets, rather than their works, suggests Bufo's interest in surface matters rather than in literary values and serves as an indictment both of him as a patron and of the patronage system which permits such a discrepancy in values.

Pope again uses parenthesis in his statement of the simplicity of his desires in life:

Oh let me live my own, and die so too!
("To live and die is all I have to do:) 261-262.

The scheme in this couplet has the purpose of giving emotional force to the statement by pointing out as an aside his attitude towards the things in life that he considers truly important. The comments in parenthesis seem to bring the speaker in closer touch with the audience by speaking directly and familiarly to them, and in this instance, the line is emotionally touching. The interruption by parenthesis also shows that, to the speaker, whatever he is discussing has other aspects so important that they must be interjected into the discussion, and it reveals deep feelings on the subject,
thus leading the audience to consider the matter in the same light. Another important point about this couplet is the simplicity of the words and the naturalness of their order. The use of commonplace words and natural order reflects the simplicity of Pope's wishes. As Olson points out, simplicity gives the impression of sincerity and lends veracity to the poet's remarks, and the style is a valuable support to Pope's argument in this section, since he is dealing with the sort of thing that cannot readily be proved, as the following lines show:

I was not born for courts or great affairs;
I pay my debts, believe, and say my prayers; 267-268.

The use of climax in line 268 also supports the credibility of Pope's view since it provides evidence that he gives each of the facts mentioned its proper relative importance, with duties to God more important than duties to man.

The last instance of parenthesis occurs in the lines praising the poet's parents:

Of gentle blood (part shed in honor's cause,
While yet in Britain honor had applause) 388-389.

Again the interruption indicates how strongly Pope

---

20 Olson, p. 31.
feels about the role of honorable defense of one's nation which has come to be considered unworthy. The comment offers his view of contemporary society and his condemnation of a society which no longer regards honor highly, and this comment provides the means for a contrast of his parents with their corrupt milieu.

Pope uses the device of parenthesis to call attention, by way of an aside, to his comments, explanations, or point of view, and the interruption of the poem with these remarks supports his arguments by creating the impression of deep emotional reaction. This impression in turn lends an appearance of truth to his remarks, since it is an open application of his statement in line 72 that he is "forced to speak, or burst."

Other schemes which Pope uses to support his arguments are those of repetition. Their chief function is to provide emphasis. Alliteration, the repetition of sounds, is used to make his poetry more forceful. His description of his vexations at the hands of poetasters is marked with alliteration to achieve effects of summation:

A dire dilemma! either way I'm sped,
If foes, they write, if friends, they read me dead. 31-32

The unusual phrasing of "they read me dead" reveals Pope's ability to use words in unusual combinations to emphasize an idea. The parallel structure within the last line supports his argument that he is faced with a dilemma; the opposing pairs of words, friends and foes, read and write all lead to the same result, while the repetition of the sounds f, r and d contribute to the catchy appeal of the statement.

Alliteration is effectively used in the Sporus sketch to express the poet's distaste for his subject. Sporus' "emptiness" is discussed through lines 315-322 and the repetition of the letter p with its sound of harshness adds force to the condemnation.

Whether in florid impotence he speaks,
And, as the prompter breathes, the puppet squeaks,
Or at the ear of Eve, familiar toad,
Half froth, half venom, spits himself abroad,
In puns, or politics, or tales, or lies,
Or spite, or smut, or rhymes, or blasphemies, 317-322.

The range of Sporus' speech, "half froth, half venom," and the repetition of the conjunction or, by the separation of the varieties of speech, accumulates and intensifies the viciousness of his remarks. Lines 321 and 322

---

22 Adler, pp. 32, 93, points out the effect of Pope's repetition of key sounds. He feels that the repetition of the letters m and s contribute to the ugliness of sound in these lines, but I would consider the harsh sound of p and perhaps t as contributing more of an effect of unpleasantness.
oppose one another; the first provides examples of the frothiness of Sporus' speech, the second the venomous aspect. However, within each line there is one incongruous item which reveals how thoroughly mixed together are the diversities of evil which this man embodies.

Another example of a couplet which concisely sums up a point by repetition is found in the section in which Pope defends the publication of his works by citing the approval of eminent men of letters:

Happy my studies, when by these approved!  
Happier their author, when by these beloved! 143-144

The extensive repetition within the couplet expressing Pope's pleasure at being honored both as a person and a poet with the approval of eminent men of letters reinforces its sense. The scheme anaphora—the repetition of words at the beginning of successive clauses—develops a forceful emotional effect, and the use of exclamations indicates Pope's deep emotional response to the approval. The scheme of polyptoton—the use of variant forms of a word—is used in the repetition of the word happy, and the use of the comparative form supports the ethos of the poet by indicating that he knows that the friendship of good men is of more value than their approval of his works. The same scheme is used to indicate contrast in the description of poor poets:
And he, who now to sense, now nonsense leaning,
Means not, but blunders round a meaning: 185-186.

In this couplet, sense and nonsense contradict each other, and the variation of the words means and meaning emphasizes them, as does their placement, one at the beginning and one at the end.

Pope's discussion of the early attacks by critics is marked by a definite balance of structures in the following lines:

Yet then did Gildon draw his venal quill;
I wished the man a dinner, and sat still.
Yet then did Dennis rave in furious fret;
I never answered, I was not in debt.
If want provoked, or madness made them print,
I waged no war with Bedlam or the Mint. 151-156

Here there is a balance of thought, with the critics' charges followed by Pope's reaction, supported by a balance of structure, through the use of anaphora in lines 151 and 153. The last couplet sums up the characterization of these critics, by pointing out the antithesis of their motives, want or madness supported by Bedlam and Mint, with those of Pope. An example of chiasmus occurs in Pope's comments on more "sober critics":

Pains, reading, study, are their just pretense,
And all they want is spirit, taste and sense. 159-160

Here chiasmus reinforces the antithesis between what these critics pretend to have and their lack of qualifications in these areas.
The lines describing Dryden's aloofness from the favors and demands of patrons make use of anaphora:

Dryden alone (what wonder?) came not nigh,
Dryden alone escaped this judging eye: 245-246.

The scheme in this couplet repeating "Dryden alone" suggests the differences between Dryden and the lesser poets, differences not only in regard to patrons but also in regard to talents. The closing couplet continues to use this scheme:

But still the great have kindness in reserve,
He helped to bury whom he helped to starve. 247-248

The irony of kindness is undercut by bury and starve following "he helped to," which accentuates the parallelism of the clauses as well as the antithesis of the idea of harming someone alive but honoring them dead.

Pope continues his use of the schemes of repetition throughout the next passage:

May some choice patron bless each grey goose quill!
May every Bavius have his Bufo still!
So when a statesman wants a day's defense,
Or envy holds a whole week's war with sense,
Or simple pride for flattery makes demands,
May dunce by dunce be whistled off my hands!
Blest be the great! for those they take away,
And those they left me; for they left me Gay;
Left me to see neglected genius bloom,
Neglected die, and tell it on his tomb:
Of all thy blameless life the sole return
My verse, and Queensbury weeping o'er thy urn! 249-260

The first part uses anaphora to add to the emotional effect of the exhalations. These statements have the
effect of a parody on prayer, both in their form and in the use of may and bless. The answer to these prayers is cast in ironic terms, "a day's defense," and "a whole week's war," to point out the frivolous requests that patrons are accustomed to make upon their writers. The prayer-like reference in line 249 becomes more precise with the parody of the Scripture passage in lines 255-256, and the repetition of "let me" and neglected adds to the emotional effect. This parody also has a metaphorical effect which is ironical in nature. The implied comparison of the patrons with God, (The Lord giveth, the Lord taketh away, blessed be the name of the Lord, Job, 1:21), and the obvious lack of omnipotent wisdom in their choice of poets to favor, suggest again their inability to recognize their limitations. The parody is particularly appropriate as an introduction to a comment on the life and death of John Gay, since the lines are often used as the basis for funeral sermons. The emotional effect is carried through in the closing couplet, where Pope uses the figure of apostrophe (speaking to an absent person) and directly addresses Gay. The emotions expressed support Pope's veracity23 and make his comments on the flaws of the system of patronage more persuasive.

Another scheme of repetition which Pope uses to achieve a particular effect is polysyndeton, the repetition of conjunctions. Its use in line 48,

Three things another's modest wishes bound,
My friendship, and a prologue, and ten pound. 47-48 creates the effect of a deliberate decision on the part of the favor-seeker that the items are to be considered in this particular order. It also makes the items more separate and distinct, giving the impression of persistent and repeated demands. The same scheme is used in line 170, "Of hairs, or straws, or dirt, or grubs, or worms." Here the repetition of or is combined with the monosyllabic words to produce the effect of deliberation on Pope's part in seeking exact examples and to create the effect of separation, which stresses the common lowness and uselessness of these things as well as of the men to whom they are compared.

Polysyndeton is used for a somewhat different purpose in Pope's comments on the reactions of untalented poets to his judgments—"How did they fume, and stamp, and roar, and chafe? /And swear . . ." (191-192). The repeated and creates the impression of furious and simultaneous action, of irrational and undirected movement and clearly indicates the poets' frustration and anger.
The scheme of ellipsis—the omission of words readily supplied by the context—is noticeable in the passage on patronage. It is supported by the trope of syllepsis—the use of a word understood differently in regard to the two or more words which it governs—and the scheme of anastrophe—the inversion of usual word order—in the following lines:

Received of wite an undistinguished race,
Who first his judgment asked, and then a place:
Much they extolled his pictures, much his seat,
And flattered every day, and some days eat,
Till grown more frugal in his riper days,
He paid some bards with port, and some with praise,

The inversions and omissions in this section have the effect of stressing the false image and the corrupt results of the patronage system; the use of syllepsis reinforces the flaws and faults of the system and the use of anastrophe reinforces the inversion of values that accompany, in Pope's view, the practice of patronage.

Pope often used parallel structure to augment the force of his arguments against his major enemies. In the Atticus sketch, Pope uses antithesis within the lines which are marked by parallel structure to indicate the deviousness of Atticus' actions and his motives:

Damn with faint praise, assent with civil leer,
And without sneering, teach the rest to sneer;
Willing to wound, and yet afraid to strike,
Just hint a fault, and hesitate dislike. 201-204
The contradiction of damn and praise, assent and leer is supported by the variation of sneering and sneer (polyptoton). The alliteration of "willing to wound" emphasizes the desire and provides a strong contrast with "afraid to strike," and all of these point out the many contradictory characteristics of the man. The failure of Atticus to act openly in accordance with his hidden desires is suggested by the opposition of word with word and clause with clause, and his deviousness is particularly suggested in the finely chosen verbs hint and hesitate. Rogers comments on Pope's use of style to support the charges against Atticus, stating that the poet's

use of antithesis and balance to suggest something of the poise and deliberate calculation of Atticus's efforts is characteristic of Pope's management of rhetoric to complicate his meaning.24

Mack also notes the effectiveness of the style in the Atticus lines, "its subjunctives, its antitheses, the way it hangs the portrait over an individual without identifying it with him."25 The use of the hypothetical statement, "but were there one" (193), creates a picture of involved possibilities,

24 Rogers, p. 87.
25 Mack, p. 36.
which contrasts with a plain statement of simple and certain fact, and this element of uncertainty is carried even into the final couplet, in which question and exclamation are joined:

Who but must laugh, if such a man there be?  
Who would not weep, if Atticus were he! 213-214

The antithesis between laughing and weeping contrasts the possibility and the reality of such a man; the question indicates the wonder that such a man could exist; the exclamation is an emotional reaction to the verified existence of the man. Pope's use of laugh and weep indicates also that Atticus' faults are more frailties than vices, frailties which are at the same time laughable and sorrowful. As Adler explains, "the effect of the portrait is . . . the impression that the man himself is not ignoble." 26

The section immediately preceding the Sporus sketch opens with an exclamatory statement whose purpose is to reinforce and emphasize the attitude of the poet in regard to the proper use of poetic talent:

Cursed be the verse, how well soe'er it flow,  
That tends to make one worthy man my foe,  
Give Virtue scandal, Innocence a fear,  
Or from the soft-eyed virgin steal a tear! 283-286

---

26 Adler, p. 92.
This emotional rejection of a good talent which is misused develops Pope’s ethical appeal and provides the basis for a contrast in the following lines which depict the sort of writers who use their talents for bad ends:

But he who hurts a harmless neighbor’s peace,  
Insults fallen worth, or beauty in distress,  
Who loves a lie, lame slander helps about,  
Who writes a libel, or who copies out: 287-290.

The concentration on the appropriate use of a gift is underscored by the personification of virtue and innocence, while the long sentence, from line 287 through line 302, which describes the opposing sort of writers, with its inversions and devices of repetition, provides a general indictment of all men who fail in their relations with others. The joining of a long series of antithetical clauses with the single noun fop adds weight to the accumulation of flaws and defects and
creates an effective concentration of vices:

That fop, whose pride affects a patron’s name,  
Yet absent, wounds an author’s honest fame:  
Who can your merit selfishly approve,  
And show the sense of it without the love;  
Who has the vanity to call you friend,  
Yet wants the honor injured to defend; 291-296.

Pope’s use of the word you and your in these lines is designed to involve his audience in his condemnation of these writers and tends to make his attack more im-
personal because it is more general, involving all his audience and their experiences with vicious men. The generalization of the preliminary sketch, written so as to gain not only the approval and support but also the participation of the audience, creates the proper atmosphere for the acceptance of Pope's aim:

A lash like mine no honest man shall dread,  
But all such babbling blockheads in his stead. 303-304

The most obvious instance of suiting style to the idea is found in the triple rhyme of lines 323 through 325, the only example of deviation from the couplet throughout the poem. Pope here uses antithesis to emphasize his point that Sporus is an abnormal deviation from the normal:

His wit all see-saw, between that and this,  
Now high, now low, now master up, now miss,  
And he himself one vile antithesis. 323-325

And the repetition of the word now reinforces the idea of the duality of Sporus' nature, as does the term amphibious in the next line. The antithetical concept is continued as Pope begins his metaphorical description of Sporus as Satan, but in these lines the antithesis is not in opposing clauses or phrases but within the clauses themselves.

Beauty that shocks you, parts that none will trust,  
Wit that can creep, and pride that licks the dust. 332-333
The paradoxes in these lines emphasize the feelings of disgust and aversion by adding the metaphorical description of the devil as a snake to the picture of Sporus as the devil.

Pope opens his conclusion by defining himself in negative terms, stressing through the parallel construction of his lines the differences between himself and his enemies:

Not fortune's worshipper, nor fashion's fool,
Not lucre's madman, nor ambition's tool,
Not proud, nor servile; be one poet's praise,
That, if he pleased, he pleased by manly ways; 334-337

He uses the same constructions in the lines in praise of his father:

No courts he saw, no suits would ever try,
Nor dared an oath, nor hazarded a lie.
Unlearned, he knew no schoolman's subtle art,
No language, but the language of the heart. 396-399

Here the negative terms are used to provide a more definite contrast with the common vices of the times. The choice of the negative term is effective here; Pope uses the adjective no rather than the adverb not, and this choice demands a slight, though not unusual, variation in the word order. This variation adds emphasis to the negative idea by placing it first in the clause.

Other features of the style of the passage in which Pope describes himself contribute to the persua-
siveness of the lines. His use of the subjunctive mode to indicate the areas in which he deserves praise and commendation, as well as the use of the conditional phrase, "if he pleased," indicate not a tentativeness about the fact but rather provide an indirect way of putting his point across. The reference to himself in the third person casts an aura of objective and disinterested judgment over the comments, and this impression in turn lends validity and credibility to the statements. The effectiveness of the indirect argument is explained by Aristotle, who points out that the appearance of bragging may be avoided by the use of a third person as the speaker (III, xvii, pp. 236-237), and Pope uses this device of style again when he presents a summary of his reactions to the attacks of his enemies. A few of his virtues are presented in the following lines:

So humble, he has knocked at Tibbald's door,
Has drunk with Cibber, nay has rhymed for Moor.

The statement of Pope's humility, patience, and lack of inclination to revenge are presented in simple words as straightforward statements, and this presentation, reinforced by the use of the names of many of his enemies, creates a vivid impression of truth.
Pope states that his aim as a poet is one of the points which is worthy of praise:

That not in fancy's maze he wandered long,
But stooped to truth, and moralized his song:
That not for fame, but virtue's better end,
He stood the furious foe, the timid friend, 340-343.

The use of the word *not* in these lines is emphasized by being placed before the main elements of the sentence, and its position heightens the contrast between his aim and those less worthy. The whole long section of instances of his sufferings and vexations is based on his claim of having endured these things for the sake of virtue and constitutes a summation of all the attacks which have previously been considered individually. Much of the effect of this passage comes from the balance of line with line and within each line, clause with clause, as the following couplets reveal:

The tale revived, the lie so oft o'erthrown,
Th'imputed trash, and dullness not his own;
The morals blackened when the writings 'scape,
The libelled person, and the pictured shape;
Abuse, on all he loved, or loved him, spread,
A friend in exile, or a father, dead; 350-355.

Adler suggests one reason for Pope's choice of style in this section:

Pope seems to have felt that greater emotion required greater regularity of form. If we nowadays are likely to stress breaks in the flow as characteristic of emotional outbursts, Pope's attitude is nonetheless psychologically
valid: emotion highly wrought is more rhythmical than the casual conversation of every day.27

Pope carefully uses many of the devices of style to support his defense and to reinforce his arguments. The schemes of repetition and inversion often emphasize his point, while his metaphors provide a basis for many of his emotional appeals. Irony is used to enhance his ethical appeal and detract from the value of his opponents and hyperbole frequently is used for the humorous effect. Antithesis stresses the contrast between virtue and vice and frequently is based on the use of negative terms, especially in the epideictic passages. The delicately adjusted combination of the style and the material reflects the outstanding mastery of rhetoric which Pope possessed.

27 Ibid., p. 48.
CONCLUSION

The Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot reveals not only Pope's knowledge of rhetoric but also his skill in the application of its precepts in order to determine the best arrangement, the most appropriate arguments, and the most suitable tropes and schemes to effectively persuade his audience of his innocence of the charges which his enemies have brought against him. The arrangement of the poem follows more than a simply logical plan which moves from beginning to end; the major divisions contain within themselves arrangements suited to the poet's defense by setting up contrasts between the character and deeds of Alexander Pope and the character and deeds of his enemies. The arrangement of the Epistle follows the patterns of classical orations; the same pattern of arrangement has been noted in the Essay on Man. R. E. Hughes describes the latter work as "a rhetorical persuasion drawn up along the lines of a classical oration . . . Pope allows himself no variation on this scheme; it seems to be a conscious use of the rhetorical form."

---

In addition to using the plan of arrangement of classical orations, Pope also used the ethical, emotional, and rational appeals to present his arguments persuasively. The common and special topics served as the basis for his arguments, and the deliberative speeches of Arbuthnot and the epideictic lines condemning his enemies and praising himself and his parents are used to support the forensic aim of explaining the motives and aims of his poetry. The deliberative discussion of patronage verifies his claim that poetry should work for the good of all society and not just for the benefits of a few patrons. The rational appeals are used in those areas where proof, facts, and evidence are available; the emotional and ethical appeals are closely tied together to present a picture of the speaker as a good man who can be trusted by the audience. The ethos of the speaker is one of the major means of persuading and convincing the audience, and the ethical appeal is returned to again and again throughout the Epistle to reinforce the forensic arguments and the emotional appeals. The ethical appeal is one of the most important rhetorical elements in the work; without it, the arguments would deteriorate into petty bickering and name-calling. The emotional appeals are presented in order to develop a feeling of friendship in the audience and are often combined with humorous
comments to avoid the appearance of excessive sentimentality. The final impression of Pope as he is revealed in the poem is one of a good man, honorable, dedicated to virtue and inimical to vice, a man whose purpose is to curb and restrain evil, not only for his own benefit but also for the benefit of all mankind. How closely this ethical picture approaches the real man may always be open to question, but Pope himself affirms his attitude toward vicious men in a letter to Arbuthnot, written in July of 1734, in which he says:

The only sign by which I found my writings ever did any good, or had any weight, has been that they raised the anger of bad men. . . . And my greatest comfort and encouragement to proceed, has been to see, that those who have no shame, and no fear, of anything else, have appeared touched by my satires.  

While most of Pope's argument in favor of virtue involves his ethical appeal in support of the forensic arguments, it nevertheless has a much wider application, and this broadening of the target of his satire is based on Pope's use of a personal situation to argue against vice universally. Rogers comments on the wide aspect of Pope's satire when he writes that Pope's 

---

2 Sherburn, Correspondence, III, 419.
The ultimate aim was the improvement of public morals. . . . [which] made him condemn most strongly the unsocial passions . . . that set the claims of the individual above those of society.\

Pope is not, however, unaware of the ways of the world; he understands the fact that good does not always triumph. The latter point is shown clearly in the last line of the Epistle, "Thus far was right, the rest belongs to Heaven" (419). He has been urging the virtuous life throughout his poem, and these lines call to mind the idea that even if virtue is not its own reward, even if the world does not value virtue, still virtue will find its recompense in the heavenly domains and will triumph finally in eternity.

The tropes and schemes which Pope uses in order to present his arguments most effectively often suggest the contrast between himself and his enemies and add force to the emotional and ethical appeals. His use of rhetorical questions guides the discussion to the areas he wishes to consider and occasionally are used to refute his opponents. His parenthetical remarks often constitute ironic comments and the same holds true for his use of climax. The metaphors characterizing his enemies

---

3Rogers, p. 85.
generally are taken from the lower levels of human life or from the animal world, while those which refer to Pope are based on the highest of human virtues, such as filial devotion and a martyr-like dedication to virtue.

Many critics object to a consideration of poetry and rhetoric together on the basis that poetry is above the realm of the practical art of rhetoric. Satire, however, is a didactic type of poetry, and it is fitting that all the arts, practical or otherwise, be used to achieve its purpose of ridiculing vice and promoting virtue. During the early eighteenth century there was little concern with the overlapping of these two areas; Samuel H. Monk recognizes that during this time, "poetry and rhetoric went hand in hand. The importance of ancient and Renaissance rhetorical theory and practice . . . is only now being fully realized by literary scholars." Still, the downgrading of rhetoric is an often-found characteristic of many literary critics, and when faced with the problem of a poem which is also a rhetorical work, they go to great lengths to show that it is not the rhetoric which makes the poem good, but some other factor operating in

---

4 Samuel H. Monk, "'A Grace Beyond the Reach of Art,'" in Essential Articles . . ., p. 39.
spite of the rhetoric. Of course, their basic assumption that rhetorical skill per se does not produce great literary works is correct. But their insistence on overlooking the rhetorical aspects of a work, or stating that the rhetoric of a work can be misleading, indicates an unwillingness to grant to rhetoric any value at all. Since this paper has dealt only with the rhetorical considerations of Pope's Epistle as an effectively persuasive work, a brief consideration of another view and interpretation of the work may be interesting.

One of the critics who wishes to consider more than the rhetorical aspects of a work is Murray Krieger, whose article, "Contextualism and the Relegation of Rhetoric," offers the opinion that rhetorical discussions miss much of the idea of the work or else misinterpret its purpose, while the contextual approach, through the examination of the persona of a work, may reveal other dimensions hidden within the rhetoric. Krieger recognizes the rhetoric in the poem but looks for an additional or deeper purpose than Pope's defense; his disinclination to accept the rhetorical values must

---

somehow come to terms with the fact that the Epistle is a good poem, and therefore he searches for some poetic basis for its excellence. His quest for poetic values is very often based on another view of the rhetorical devices; he sees the "means of persuasion" in another light and is not persuaded. What we have here is one man offering his defense rhetorically while another is attacking the defense rhetorically. Krieger's article clearly offers an obvious point in the use of rhetorical devices—that the same facts can be used on both sides of a question, but that their rhetorical presentation, the choice of what is to be discussed and the way in which it is presented in terms of the subject, speaker, and the audience will determine its effectiveness as a means of persuasion. This is precisely the way forensic rhetoric is used in law courts, and it is therefore worthwhile to see Krieger's view of the other side of the question.

According to Krieger, the purpose of Pope's Epistle is "to reveal the uproariousness of his soberer claims, to reveal the fact that he is toying with us and with his satirist's role," and the critic feels that the

---

6Ibid., p. 56.
speaker in the poem is not Pope speaking in his own behalf, but a persona whose use "converts the rhetoric of self-righteous satire to the double-edged poetic irony of a satirized world viewed by a similarly, if far more subtly, satirized satirist." The uproariousness of the claims of virtue, filial piety and long-suffering patience are, in Krieger's view, found in the contradictions of the deeds of the persona who mixes benevolence with attacks, defense of his parents with implied slander, and modesty with hints of his own genius; these contradictions indicate that the persona is a violent man, self-deluded in his rationalization of the justice of the attacks he himself is making. This delusion of the persona, Krieger maintains,

temps the rhetorical with the poetic, so that the element of mock-apologia ends by leading to a far profounder apologia; one based on an understanding of the pressures, the appeals, the temptations of the public poet's arena, its rivalries and hatreds, its inhumanities, and the human response to it as well as the rationalizing—if transparent—defense of that response.8

Krieger further claims that Pope wishes us to recognize the obvious (to Krieger) contradiction between what the

7Ibid., p. 49.
8Ibid., p. 57.
persona claims to be and what he is, through the contradictory juxtapositions of arguments and tone. In summary, Kreiger proposes that Pope or the persona is not only satirizing the vices of his enemies but also satirizing himself for allowing himself to be driven to answer them. While Kreiger admits in his conclusion that this double view of the speaker has an unsystematic and sporadic nature, he gathers several examples to prove his point.

Krieger's first point is that no one would be convinced of the truth of Pope's stand as the innocent and injured party because

every argument in the poem presents us only with circularity since we have only Pope's word for the facts, even for Arbuthnot's presence and for the words that Pope, after all, puts in his mouth. The poem is to establish Pope's good moral character, except that we can trust what he says in it only if we believed to begin with that he had good moral character. . . . Saying what he would and acting as if he would if he were truly virtuous, he circularly persuades us that he is. 9

The truth of this statement cannot be denied, for there is no proof of Pope's moral character; there is only the attempt on the poet's part to create the impression of a good moral character, and this impression, Krieger

9Ibid., p. 50.
insists, is contradicted by the mixture of violence and innocence, as well as the "contemporary reader's awareness of Pope's reputation for playing a venomous and craftily aggressive public role, a role that Pope would surely trade on."\(^{10}\) Whether anyone is persuaded by Pope's attitude as an innocent and injured party is not a point which can be determined, since the effect can only be sought and not assured. The Advertisement certainly indicates that Pope was well aware of his reputation, for he explains that "to those who know me not, a truer information may be requisite." If Pope is dissembling here, so be it; there is no reason to believe that he would "surely trade on" his reputation. It is more likely that he would attempt to counter his reputation since, as he wrote to Arbuthnot, the aim of the Epistle was to "explain my motives and aims of writing."\(^{11}\) Pope's ethical appeal fails to impress Krieger; to him it seems a thin cloak which is devised to deceive the unwary. Having come to the poem already convinced of the nature of the defendant, Krieger is a prejudiced

\(^{10}\) Ibid., p. 51.

\(^{11}\) Sherburn, Correspondence, III, 428.
judge. He does not believe Pope's characterization of himself, nor does he credit the motives which Pope proposes; primarily, he seems to feel that a man "soft by nature" could never be aroused to such a brilliant defense, and that this contradiction of self-admitted character and deeds proves his point.

Krieger's main point is not that the poem fails as "rhetorical apologetics" but that "Pope must have meant to give the game away" and reveal himself (the persona) as a man just as vicious and unreasonable as his enemies, even though they had driven him to the position he takes. The persona is to be seen as a deluded man when he talks about justice and virtue; the critic avers that the poet's gladiatorial role is seen critically... although P. is given great freedom to play it broadly enough to appease the appetite of his embittered creator. But the creator is also poet enough to keep P. as the object of a case study. He is transformed from spokesman to persona as the Epistle is transformed from rhetoric to poem, from apologia to mock-apologia, at least in part.

The assessment of Pope as an "embittered creator" who can objectively (as Krieger implies) judge his persona

12Krieger, p. 51.

13Ibid., p. 52. The P. in these lines refers not to Pope but to the persona who speaks the lines assigned to him in the Epistle.
as a "case study" seems to be as neat a contradiction as any that Pope allegedly makes. Bitterness on Pope's part would have led to a far less well-balanced and judicious assessment of his opponents, who are generally characterized as silly, ridiculous, or somewhat irrational, rather than as purely vicious men. Moreover, there is no evidence of feelings of futility or despair that such bitterness would be expected to lead to; Pope does not give up on the capacity for good in the human race, even though this potentiality may not be realized, and if the charge of bitterness is true, then the work fails as satire (which must imply some admonition to virtue by the implied virtue of the satirist), and becomes only harsh, scathing invective.

Some of the arguments which Krieger proposes are based on the following couplets:

Cursed be the verse, how well soe'er it flow,
That tends to make one worthy man my foe,
Give virtue scandal, innocence a fear,
Or from the soft-eyed virgin steal a tear! 283-286

Pope's denunciation of his verse, if it "tends to make one worthy man my foe" is, according to Krieger, a threat to the audience that they must approve the verse if they are to be considered virtuous, and in turn, the denunciation contradicts itself by cursing a talent even while using it. Krieger neglects to note, however, that
Pope condemns the use of poetic talent only if it is used for an unworthy end, and uses these lines as both an introduction and an effective contrast to poets who do use their talent as a means to vicious ends, as described in the lines which immediately follow:

But he who hurts a harmless neighbor's peace,
Insults fall'n worth, or beauty in distress.
A lash like mine no honest man shall dread,
But all such babbling blockheads in his stead. 287-304

Krieger also sees line 303 as a threat; he has neglected the Advertisement which might have provided the best support for his case, for here Pope openly threatens his readers: "I would have some of them know, it was owing to the request of the learned and candid friend . . . that I make not as free use of theirs as they have done of mine." Krieger also charges that Pope, in lines 282-286 (quoted above), is leading the reader astray; "if the reader is not aware that he is being put on in the first of these couplets, this second of them, with its deadpan piety, would seem to make it unmistakable." The exaggeration of these lines or their overstatement of his attitude seems to Krieger not to have the rhetorical purpose of providing a con-

\[14\text{Ibid.}, \text{ p. 53.}\]
tract with the lines which follow, but instead seems to have the purpose of making the reader aware of the delusion of the persona and so the irrationality of his rationalization of his attacks. This attitude demands that the reader not take the poem seriously; or as Krieger says, the contradictory juxtaposition is "the poet's defense against being taken only seriously by us, his indication to us of his self-critical awareness."¹⁵

One example which Krieger uses as an instance of a contradiction is the following couplet:

Were others angry? I excused them too:
   Well might they rage, I gave them but their due. 173-174

Here, Krieger sees Pope contradicting himself because while he is "insisting upon his soft-hearted endurance of violent opponents, he clearly admits to retaliating in kind."¹⁶ But it should be pointed out that "their due" is not necessarily violent opposition, for the following couplets

A man's true merit 'tis not hard to find,
   But each man's secret standard in his mind,
   That casting-weight pride adds to emptiness,
   This, who can gratify? for who can guess? 175-178

indicate that these words mean that the pride of the

¹⁵Ibid.
¹⁶Ibid., p. 54.
angry writers had expected much more than Pope, in justice, could allow to their work.

Another instance of contradiction is found by Krieger in these lines:

Poor Cornus sees his frantic wife elope,  
And curses wit, and poetry, and Pope.  
Friend to my life, (which did not you prolong,  
The world had wanted many an idle song) 25-28

Here Krieger sees the "idle song" as directly contradicting line 26, in which "all the world's ills" are blamed on him as the sole incarnation of the twin spirits of wit and poetry. One of the flaws in this argument is that the lines are taken from two different sections of the poem; the second couplet involves different subject matter from the first. Lines 25 and 26 are not the persona's description of himself, but rather the charge of one of Pope's enemies, and this line, considered in context with the previous lines, sums up the irrationality of the demands and charges which are made against the poet. Krieger takes seriously Pope's irony, and asks that we not take seriously the more straightforward statements.

17 Ibid.
Krieger claims that it is the act of attacking while denying he has the temperament to attack that constitutes the basis for the contradictory juxtapositions. As we have repeatedly seen, he represents himself as one who would excuse—has excused—his enemies, although he insults them on all levels, public and private, lightly and gravely, even as he parades himself as resisting the urge to do so.\textsuperscript{18}

This contradiction is the basis for Krieger's claim that Pope is not only satirizing society but also satirizing the satirist and that the elaborate defense is only a mock-defense. This mock-defense must then be considered not as forensic discourse (which Pope said it was) but rather deliberative discourse used to expose all the irrationalities of human nature, whether in good men or evil. Perhaps there is some validity to this view, for the repeated references to martyrdom within the poem could be construed to indicate that this world holds no justice, no virtue, and that the only possible course for a truly virtuous man is simply to endure and die in the hope of finally finding peace in another world. But if Pope felt that the search for virtue in a vicious world was a futile task, why bother then to write satire? Should good men cease to fight

\textsuperscript{18}Ibid., p. 55.
against vice, because they then engage in battle vicious men? Is there no justice in self-defense? Should good men stand quietly by and let vice go its own way? Was Pope preaching an early doctrine of non-commitment and non-involvement? Or was he advancing a sort of mass morality not based on moral precepts, but upon the actual deeds of society? Krieger says that the apologia condemns the pressures of society which demand such a defense and exposes the corruptness of the period, and while he admits to overstating his case, he insists on Pope's bitterness at others as well as his self-awareness. However, Krieger's view does not take into account the touches of humor in the poem; at this point he has, as he says, made himself "attack-proof" by explaining that the double view of the persona has an "unsystematic, sporadic nature."19

A good assessment of Krieger's stand may be found in Irving Ehrenpreis' clear-sighted article, "Personae."20 Here Ehrenpries points out that the concept of a per-
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19 Ibid., p. 57.

sona is the same as what has been considered in this paper as ethos or ethical appeal. This statement indicates that Krieger has not moved into a discussion of poetic but has chosen only another view of rhetoric, and as Ehrenpreis points out, such a method of discussion can "never create values but can only reveal them." 

Probably no one will argue that the ethos or persona of the Epistle represents an idealized person; naturally a work of self-defense will put forth only those points favorable to its own side of the case. Krieger's suggestion that the poem has a bitter speaker (who is really Pope) satirizing the apparent speaker (who is Pope idealized) appears to be an attempt to "create values" which are present only in the critic's mind.

Ehrenpreis states that the audience should not approach a given work with preconceived judgments, for they may invalidate the meaning of the work.

As audience, we try to discover what the real author means in the particular work. That he may possibly (without our knowing) deliver a different doctrine elsewhere, or that his life may exemplify the vices he begs us to avoid, is irrelevant. At the moment, in the poem, he
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21 Ibid., p. 25.
says what we have to accept as his assertion if no evidence appears to the contrary.22

And while Krieger believes there is evidence to the contrary to be found in various contradictions, his presentation of this evidence is rhetorically emotional and rarely rational. He says that the reader should recognize the deceptions he sees, but his chief method of explanation is to turn Pope's statements into lies, although as Ehrenpreis points out, "the speaker of the Epistle appeals continuously to history, resting his defense upon the verifiable truth of his data."23

One of the points of an effective ethical appeal is the appearance of truthfulness, and this appearance, joined with the telling of truth is very persuasive. In other words, the speaker should not only tell the truth, but should appear to be truthful, for the first without the second is not effective. As Ehrenpreis points out above, Pope's statements are true. Krieger, however, twists the approach; he claims that to him Pope does not appear truthful and therefore, Pope is not telling the truth, and he supports this illogical reasoning by citing various contradictions
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22Ibid., p. 28.
23Ibid., p. 32.
within the poem. In these arguments, he denies to Pope ordinary human responses, and this denial, I suggest, is because Krieger will feel more comfortable about the Epistle if it can be viewed as an impersonal, rather than a personal, work. This view removes the embarrassment of reading Pope's lines of self-praise, it explains the violence of his attacks on his enemies which are distasteful to a more cultivated (and hypocritical?) age, it rescues Pope's character and makes him a refined, if bitter, man. Ehrenpreis explains the value of Krieger's view more clearly:

> Inept or distasteful aspects of [a work] can always be interpreted as revelations of the character of the "speaker," while the author remains deft and refined. . . . The more admiring but defensive we feel toward an author, the more reassurance we draw from this knowledge. . . . if we wish to ignore the violence of expression in such works [as the Epistle] and hunt only for a device to screen the author from his meaning, we may rouse up the concept of persona.24

While Krieger's view of Pope's Epistle enables him to consider it as a poetic rather than a rhetorical achievement and suggests some intriguing insights into the poem, still, a clearer explanation of his arguments is necessary for them to be really persuasive. Cer-
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24 Ibid., p. 29.
tainly, Krieger himself manipulates the devices of rhetoric to promote his arguments in favor of impersonal art over direct self-expression in order to enhance the qualities of the work, or, as the critic claims, to change rhetorical satire into poetic irony, to change specific satire into general satire against all of society. It is asking too much to expect Pope’s readers to accept the fact that a writer who used all the skills and talents at his disposal would write in an "unsystematic and sporadic" way and thus lead by indirection to an indistinct, and for years, unsuspected, concept of his purpose.

Whether or not all readers agree with Pope’s presentation of the injustice of his enemies and the justice of his own defense, the rhetorical effectiveness of the work is not vitiated. Rhetorically, the poet seeks to persuade with all the means available; his use of these means and their adaptation to his purpose indicate his skill in the use of rhetoric.

By indicating that the purpose of his poem is not limited to a defense of his life and works, but also has the additional purpose of promoting the aims of truth and virtue, Pope expands the scope of his satire beyond his own enemies to include all vicious and wicked
men who have caused the virtuous and good to suffer. This generalization of the satire tends to make his remarks have a universality which appeals to his readers, assuring him of their attention and interest. The attention of the audience is held by the poet's care in the arrangement of his work, by his presentation at the outset of the poem of all the information essential to an understanding of his position, by the gradual progression of narrative which moves from a discussion of mere pests to his response to the worst of his detractors, and by the skillful balance between the serious comments and lighter passages of humor.

The many arguments which Pope uses within the Epistle are based on the appropriate use of the common and special topics. The special topics of justice, advantage and praise are related to the poet and his supporters, while the opposing special topics are the basis for his comments in regard to his enemies. The common topics provide the means for expanding the arguments. Pope combines the forensic element of his defense with both deliberative and epideictic passages in support of various points; this element of variety not only supports the forensic aims but also adds liveliness and diversity to the work. Just as the
poet uses all three kinds of rhetoric in the Epistle; so also he uses all three of the rhetorical appeals. His concentration on the ethical appeal affirms his awareness of its importance, while his use of the rational and emotional appeals indicates that he is able to adapt his material to appeal to the intellectual, moral and emotional qualities of his audience: their reason, their sympathy, and their sense of virtue.

The devices of style which Pope uses in the Epistle likewise indicate his ability to use rhetoric effectively. While schemes and tropes are everywhere in the poem, the effect is one of simplicity and clarity and ease; every word and phrase seems to be appropriate. All the elements of rhetoric, the arguments, the topics, the appeals, the tropes, the schemes, provide Alexander Pope with a framework for his art. Perhaps the best proof of his mastery of rhetoric may be found in the fact that in the Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot, rhetorical artifice is completely overshadowed by poetic art.
APPENDIX I

ADVERTISEMENT
Advertisement

This paper is a sort of bill of complaint, begun many years since, and drawn up by snatches, as the several occasions offered. I had no thoughts of publishing it, till it pleased some persons of rank and fortune [the authors of Verses to the Imitator of Horace, and of an Epistle to a Doctor of Divinity from a Nobleman at Hampton Court,] to attack in a very extraordinary manner, not only my writings (of which being public the public judge) but my person, morals, and family, whereof to those who know me not, a truer information may be requisite. Being divided between the necessity to say something of myself, and my own laziness to undertake so awkward a task, I thought it the shortest way to put the last hand to this epistle. If it have any thing pleasing, it will be that by which I am most desirous to please, the truth and the sentiment; and if any thing offensive, it will be only to those I am least sorry to offend, the vicious or the ungenerous.

Many will know their own pictures in it, there being not a circumstance but what is true; but I have, for the most part spared their names, and they may escape being laughed at, if they please.
I would have some of them know, it was owing to
the request of the learned and candid friend to whom
it is inscribed, that I make not as free use of theirs
as they have done of mine. However I shall have this
advantage, and honour, on my side, that whereas by
their proceeding, any abuse may be directed at any man,
no injury can possibly be done by mine, since a name­
less character can never be found out, but by its truth
and likeness.
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