JONATHAN SWIFT AND THE PSYCHOANALYSTS

Dra. Faith Wotton Cartwright

Since the eighteenth century few literary figures have received closer or more continuous attention from the critics than Jonathan Swift. Although he is universally acknowledged as a master of satire, Swift’s work is frequently viewed with disapprobation. For instance, the Earl of Orrery, Swift’s first biographer, in discussing Gulliver’s Travels, Part IV, states that “the representation which [Swift] has given us of human nature, must terrify, and even debase the mind of the reader who views it”. Orrery adds that Swift’s misanthropy is intolerable and that Swift by inventing the Yahoos became one himself (1). Although Swift certainly has his defenders in the Augustan Age (2), this tone of disapprobation is strong enough to carry into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

However, when the nineteenth century critics view Swift, their focus shifts from the moral nature of the work to the psychic nature of the author. One faction, at least, harshly labels Swift insane; the bases of this decision are the misanthropy and the scatological images in some of Swift’s writings. Such men as James Russel Lowell, Edmund Gosse, W.E.H. Leaky, William Makepeace Thackeray and Thomas Macaulay (3) generally agree with Sir Walter Scott who says the misanthropy of Gulliver is a result of Swift’s “incipient mental disease” (4).

The twentieth century has generally rejected the view that Swift was insane (5), but one group has substituted another name. The psychoanalyst, basing his convictions on the excremental imagery in Swift’s work (in what seems to be an extention of the nineteenth century view of insanity) (6), labels Swift “neurotic” and his “overconcern” with scatology “coprophilia”. Sandor Feucenzi is the first to apply Freudian psychology to Swift in 1926 in a paper entitled “Gulliver Phantasies”. Feucenzi contends that Gulliver’s Travels is Swift’s neurotic phantasy; for instance, the Lilliputian army’s marching through Gulliver’s legs is “the reassurance—phantasy or dream of an impotent man”, and Gulliver’s extinguishing the palace fire is a phantasy of sexual intercourse. This psychoanalyst then describes Swift’s relationships to women as “neurotic sexual behavior
as an inhibition of normal potency”, giving as cause Swift’s fatherless boyhood. He therefore concludes

this insight into Swift’s life surely justifies
us... in treating the phantasies in Gulliver’s Travels
exactly as we do the free associations of neurotic
patients in analysis, especially when interpreting
their dreams (7).

From this time on, a host of similar articles follows (8).

These psychological case studies might be brushed aside as absurd except for their frequent recurrence and their effectiveness in perpetuating the theories of Swift’s neuroses (9). For example, Aldous Huxley and John Middleton Murry, although not professional psychoanalysts, join the Freudian trend. Huxley, in his book Do What You Will, says,

Swift’s greatness lies in the intensity, the
almost insane violence, of that “hadred of
bowels” which is the essence of his misanthropy
and which underlies the whole of his work (10).

In this paper I intend first to prove that these psychoanalytical critics, who conclude that Swift’s use of scatology is evidence of neuroses or insanity, base their argument on faulty techniques and the following false premises: (1) that a conscious work of art can be treated and analyzed like an unconscious dream and (2) that Swift and his characters are the same. Second, I will propose an explanation for the scatological images in Swift’s writing. The works of Swift which I will deal with primarily are Gulliver’s Travel, Part IV, and three poems, “The Lady’s Dressing Room”, “Strephon and Chloe”, and “A Beautiful Young Nymph Going to Bed”, as these receive the most attention from the psychoanalysts.

In dealing with the first problem, I would agree that biography and literary criticism can complement each other. However, in Swift’s case this combination is often misused. First of all, some of the critics are clearly begging the question. The reasoning of the twentieth century writers who hold with the theory of Swift’s neuroses usually takes this course: first, they cite the scatology in Swift’s writing as proof of his neurotic life; then they cite events in his life as proof of the neuroses exhibited in his scatological writings. As one example of this circular reasoning see the previously mentioned passages from Ferenczi who works from Gulliver’s neuroses, to Swift’s, and back again.

Another fallacy frequently present in these arguments is the half truth. These psychoanalysts, when approaching from the biographical side, list events, quotations and most damning of all— the declaration of Swift as non compos mentis. These events and quotations used as proof of Swift’s neuroses, consistently are taken out of context or are taken without due consideration to Swift’s entire personality. One quotation which many critics cannot resist reprinting without explanation is Swift’s farewell to his friends in his later years: “Good night, I hope I shall never see you again.” This is offered as proof of Swift’s misanthropy as found in Gulliver’s Travels (11). The fact that Swift frequently used such ironic banter with close friends is not mentioned.

As for the declaration of Swift as non compos mentis, Walter Brain’s medical diagnosis refutes the critics who use this as proof that Swift’s works are the products of a neurotic mind (see footnote 5). These psychoanalysts assume that because a deaf, half-blind, old man was declared mentally incompetent in his seventies, that he must have been mentally incompetent much earlier. Some point out Swift’s complaints of sickness in middle age, suggesting this is the beginning of his neurosis. We know, indeed, that Swift did suffer from dizziness and nausea from age forty—two; and while it seems that Swift was not always careful to keep his pain to himself, it was a real physical pain. Consequently, the labels of hypochondria or neurosis or incipient madness hardly seem fair.
Dr. Greenacre is able to push the origin of Swift’s neuroses back even farther by tracing Swift’s fixation with excrement to his childhood. Dr. Greenacre, in discussing the nurse who kidnapped Swift when he was one year old, says that she was overly conscientious and harsh in her early toilet training, and left this stamp of the nursery morals of the chamber pot forever on his character (12).

Some critics prefer the theory that the first signs of Swift’s “madness” are present in Part IV of Gulliver’s Travels. They state as proof that while Parts I, II and III contain some scatology and little misanthropy, Part IV shows a great quantity of both. They conclude that Swift’s neuroses came to the surface between the writing of Part III and Part IV. The fact that Part IV was written before Part III does not seem to dissuade them from their theory.

Another problem of the half truths comes in to play with critics in general and psychoanalysts in particular who are not familiar with the entire body of Swift’s writing; they draw their conclusions from a few works even a single work. For example, Huxley, after citing “The Lady’s Dressing Room”, “Cassius and Peter” and “A Beautiful Young Nymph Going to Bed” as examples, concludes that Swift hated the fact that women had biological functions (13). This Swiftophobe also remarks that Swift’s “hatred of bowels...underlies the whole of his works” (14). The same is generally true of the professional Freudsians. Dr. Karpman, for instance, after examining Gulliver in Brodmtngag and Gulliver’s repulsion of the female Yahoo in Houyhnhnmland, decides that Swift was impotent (15). Harpman passes over the passages in Parts I, II and III where Gulliver speaks of his good and devoted wife (although, of course, at the end of the fourth voyage he does reject her physically), and Huxley does not bother to mention Swift’s poems “The First of April”, “Stella’s Birthday” or “On Stella’s Birthday” which display sincere affection and admiration for individual women. We might also have some difficulty in finding the “hatred of bowels” underlying the Drapier’s Letters or the Irish Tracts.

Huxley, Murry and the psychoanalysts become so absorbed with picking out individual examples of coprophilia in a literary masterpiece that they completely ignore the rest of the work. Dr. Norman Brown, a Freudian himself, refutes these Freudsians by suggesting that they seem to be afflicted with the neurotic trait which they accuse Swift of—an overconcern with excrement. Rather, Brown proposes that Swift’s writings reveal Swift’s “insight into the universal neurosis of mankind” (16). Brown’s approach is certainly an improvement over the previous group because he flatly states that “turning loose” psychoanalysis on literary works in order to judge the sanity of the author is not within the province or the ability of the psychoanalyst.

Not only does Brown, like Landa and Voight, point out the flaws in the psychoanalyst’s techniques, but—it seems to me—he strikes at the two false premises upon which their conclusions are based. First Brown does not make the same mistake the others have done—assume that Swift and his characters are the same. The major contribution of twentieth century Swift criticism is the realization of the separation of Swift from his characters. As Ricardo Quintana says, It is perfectly apparent...that in every one of Swift’s more notable prose satires we have a fictional character or group of characters: Lemuel Gulliver; Isaac Bickerstaff; M.B. Drapier; the humanitarian projector who writes A Modest Proposal; the three brothers in the Tale of a Tub. What we refuse to see is that Swift himself is not present... (17).
Swift is not the bitter Gulliver or the starry-eyed Strephon. As for the second premise, Brown attacks the equation of a conscious work of art with an unconscious dream, allowing Swift the mastery of his writer’s craft. Landa sums the argument up, saying:

It has been an overly simple process of equating biographical fact and artistic statement, of viewing the work as a transcription of the author’s [Swift’s] experiences or as a precise and complete representation of his personal philosophy or as a final explanation of his personality (18).

What then is Swift’s conscious, artistic purpose for using scatological images in his writing, especially in *Gulliver’s Travels*, Part IV and the poems “The Lady’s Dressing Room”, “Strephon and Chloe” and “A Beautiful Young Nymph Going to Bed”?

One of Swift’s aims in his writing is to dispel illusions and romanticizing about mankind. His demand for moral realism, the truth regarding human nature, is notable in the three poems mentioned above. Quintana proposes that Swift’s first poem in this tradition is “Verses Wrote in a Lady’s Ivory Table—Book” and that the view expressed in these poems is comparable to that in the Restoration comedy of manners.

The explorer in the dressing—room is a dramatization of the inside—outside contrast, and the nature of his discoveries accords perfectly with a comedy that characteristically works through images of nakedness and the functions of the human body (19).

Swift’s satire in the poem “The Lady’s Dressing Room” is conducted against two characters. Celia, who is all “Lace, Brocades and Tissues” (20), is the representative court lady concerned with little more than her appearance and collecting beaux. Furthermore, Celia (like Corinna in “A Beautiful Young Nymph Going to Bed”), it would seem, is excessively unclean beneath her “Ointments, Daubs, and Paints and Creams” (p.530, 1, 138). For example, Strephon finds “greasy Coifs and Pinners reeking, which Celia slept at least a Week in” (p.527, 11. 53–54). A passage in a letter Swift sent to Deborah Staunton Rochfort, entitled “Letter to a Young Lady, On Her Marriage”, echoes passages concerning cleanliness in “The Lady’s Dressing Table” and “A Beautiful Young Nymph Going to Bed”, *Gulliver’s Travels* and Restoration comedies. Swift cautions that fineness and cleanliness go together and gives as an example a comment made by a friend about a woman of quality: “that nothing could make her supportable but cutting off her Head; for his Ears were offended by her Tongue, and his Nose by her Hair and Teeth” (21).

But the main satire in “The Lady’s Dressing Room” is leveled at Strephon, the starry-eyed beau who cannot accept Celia as a human being with biological functions. In all three poems the heroines are first described as the goddesses or nymphae which Strephon and the other beaux take them to be.

Of Chloe all the Town has rung;
By ev’ry size of Poets sung:
So beautiful a Nymph appears
But once in Twenty Thousand Years.
By Nature form’d with nicest Care,
And, faultless to a single Hair,
Her graceful Mein, her Shape, and Face,
Confess her of no mortal Race... (p.584, 11. 1-8).

But Chloe’s and Celia’s (and Corinna’s) true natures are quickly exposed, and
Strephon finds they are all too human. The most heinous crime of Celia is discovered when Strephon finds her chamber pot, and the same is the one mar in Chloe’s “perfection”. Although Chloe is not exposed as uncleanly like Celia or Corinna, she too must perform bodily functions. And the Strephon of this poem has made the same mistake of romanticizing his love as the Strephon of “The Lady’s Dressing Room” did. The poet’s laugh at Strephon’s disgust at the end of “The Lady’s Dressing Room” may be too indirect a statement of the poem’s meaning for the Freudsians to grasp, but in “Strephon and Chloe” Swift carefully specifies the “moral” of these verses: surface beauty is deceptive and secondary to the qualities of decency and reason.

On sense and Wit your Passion found,
By Decency cemented round;
Let Prudence with Good Nature strive,
To keep Esteem and Love alive,
Then come old Age whene’er it will,
Your Friendship shall continue still:
And thus a mutual gentle Fire,
Shall never but with Life expire (p.593, 11. 307—314).

These lines sound like the text from a traditional sermon of an Anglical divine rather than the ravings of a neurotic woman—hater. A parallel passage in the “Letter to a Young Lady, On Her Marriage” shows that this is an important and constant theme with Swift. Swift warns against all romantic notions of marriage, saying it is far better to win the friendship and esteem of her husband (22). This is not anti—feminist but rather anti—romantic (23).

But once we have found and accepted this theme, there is still the question of the use of scatological images to portray it. Swift’s satiric use of excremental and dirt images is sensationalism, sensationalism devised to bring us back to common sense. It is not the unconscious sign of a psychological neurosis but an artistic device, couched in negative terms, perhaps, but nevertheless proposing a positive idea which is to expose the false and clarify the truth. And, as Quintana says (in discussing the poem “Description of a City Shower”), the realism typical of the eighteenth century “was so often defiance of all the polite traditions” (24). The same anti—romantic theme and the same imagery device found in Swift’s poetry is also found in Gulliver’s Travels.

Gulliver’s Travels is the work of Swift which the Freudian critics and psychoanalysts turn to most frequently to prove their hypotheses. The scatology and related dirt images which appear in this book, most profusely in Part IV, are the main bases for labeling Swift misanthropic or neurotic. These readers take no notice that Gulliver’s Travels was not shocking to most of its contemporary audience. If the letters of Pope, Arbuthnot and Gay are to be believed, the general opinion was that Gulliver was a merry fellow (25). And, indeed, Gulliver’s extinguishing the palace fire or crowering from the female Yahoo are funny incidents. But Swift includes such incidents for more than amusement.

It is the inclusion of the Yahoos which seems to stir the most controversy. “How could Swift conceive of something so repulsive unless he had a disordered mind?” is the rhetorical question the psychoanalysts ask. Actually there is evidence that Swift adapted these figures for his purpose rather than conceived them. R. W. Frantz, in his article “Swift’s Yahoos and the Voyagers”, gives detailed evidence which indicates that the Yahoos were patterned after descriptions of savages and monkeys found in the travel books popular in the eighteenth century (26). This evidence might lessen the cries against Swift, but, of course, he is still responsible for including them in Gulliver’s Travels. What, then, is his purpose for this inclusion, what do they symbolize?

What better image could Swift have chosen for his anti—romantic theme than the Yahoos of Part IV? The Yahoos are not “man” as some critics suggest for there are
differences between them and Gulliver, a fact pointed out by the author. Gulliver’s Houyhnhnm master observes that Gulliver is like a Yahoo “only a little more civilized by some tincture of reason, which however was in a degree as far interior to the Houyhnhnm race as the Yahoos of their country were to me” (27). Rather, the Yahoos represent man’s animal nature; they are reminders of our human limitations or demonstrations of what man would be without his reasoning faculties.

Furthermore, to use an outer ugliness to symbolize an inner ugliness is not an unusual literary device—read Shakespeare or Chaucer. Huxley misses the point when he says,

And if the Yahoos were all [Swift’s] personal enemies, that was chiefly because they smelled of sweat and excrement, because they had genital organs and dugs, groins and hairy armpits; their moral short-comings were of secondary importance (28).

The situation is the reverse. It is the Yahoos’ appearance which is there to remind us that they lack reason, that they are like men who do not possess reasoning faculties to control their animal natures. Consequently, this half-man figure is more repulsive than a simple animal. Gulliver observes,

By what I could discover, the yahoos appear to be the most unteachable of all animals, their capacities never reaching higher than to draw or carry burthens. Yet I am of opinion this defect ariseth chiefly from a perverse, restive disposition. For they are cunning, malicious, treacherous and revengeful (p.214).

This Yahoo—symbol fits perfectly into the larger purpose of the book; it is only one—half the picture.

The sensationalism of the excremental images connected with the Yahoos causes some readers to overlook the irony connected with the Houyhnhnms (29). As the Yahoos symbolize isolated bestiality, the Houyhnhnms symbolize isolated reason. Swift, the master satirist, carefully adapts his artistic devices to his subject. When he is dealing with the bestial Yahoos, Swift uses sensationalism (excremental and dirt images) and emphasizes their filth; when he is dealing with the reasonable Houyhnhnms, Swift uses irony and litotes and emphasizes their coldness. Swift, then, carefully selects these two contrasting devices and figures in order to set up dramatic antithesis. The Yahoos’ flesh smells “very rank”, they are “insolent, abject, and cruel” and their favorite means of protection is “voiding their excrements on their opponents” (pp.214–215). A description of the Houyhnhnms closely follows this passage and not all their characteristics are admirable. It is pointed out that the Houyhnhnms “have no fondness for their colts or foals,” they breed up a race of inferior Houyhnhnms to be domestics and their marriages are based on the color combinations which their offspring will inherit (pp.216–217). The Houyhnhnms’ reasonableness sometimes even results in cruelty as witnessed in Gulliver’s reaction to the Houyhnhnms assembly’s decree that he must swim back to England. Swift’s satire employs understatement when Gulliver humbly concludes that although he does not blame the assembly

yet, in my weak and corrupt judgment,
I though it might consist with reason

to have been less rigorous. That I
could not swim a league, and probably

the nearest land to theirs might be
distant above an hundred...(p.226).
This, then, is the dramatic antithesis. In the middle stands Guiller

A careful reading will reveal to literary critics and psychoanalysts that Gulliver is not Swift. Gulliver does not learn the lesson from the contrast of the Yahoos and the Houyhnhnms; Gulliver, like the psychoanalyst, sees the Yahoos as "man". Gulliver, like Strephon, trades one illusion—optimism or romanticizing of human nature—for another—pessimism or misanthropy. Gulliver has the qualities of both the Yahoo and the Houyhnhnm, and he is a ridiculous figure when he denies his physical nature completely. For it is part of man and reflects his inability to achieve the pure reason of the Houyhnhnm. In Part IV of Gulliver's Travels it is Gulliver's misanthropy which is expressed, not Swift's; and to affirm this Swift sets up another dramatic antithesis: the "inhumane" Gulliver and the humane Portuguese sea captain. With the kindly Don Pedro as an exemplum, there should be no trouble in discovering that it is Gulliver against whom Swift has turned his satire in the last of Gulliver's Travels. The psychoanalysts, it would seem, either have not discovered this or do not feel that it is important.

In summary then, the psychoanalysts have stepped out of their field, psychoanalysis, and into the field of literature without taking into account literary techniques and criticism. They have not allowed Swift the mastery of his satire; they have not realized the purpose of his satire and his use of sensationalism to strip away illusions. Brown and Ehrenpreis show that with care psychoanalysis may have a place in the study of Swift. But as Ehrenpreis points out, "there is no point in labeling [Swift] as this or that type of neurotic unless one can use the classification to understand his achievement. If the labeling conceals his achievement, it has been worse than useless" (30).

Also, I would certainly not deny that Swift expresses bitterness and cynicism in his personal remarks and literary works; but we must look at these expressions with care and not confuse them with the expressions of his fictional characters. Brown, Landa, Sherburn, Voight and Ehrenpreis would agree with Quintana's succinct summary of this problem:

one may concede a great deal [about Swift's eccentricities] and still insist upon a view which rests, biographically, upon the known facts, and critically upon the conviction that literature is better discussed in terms of its own artistic being than of what we may choose to believe to have been the author's subjective experience (31).
FOOTNOTES


(2) Louis A. Landa, "Biographical Evidence", Studies in the Literature of the Augustan Age, ed. Richard C. Boys (Michigan, 1952), p. 181 cites such men as Patrick Delany who refutes Orrery. However, Landa goes on to say that many critics denounced the "moral aspects of the Voyage to Houyhnhnmland and the degraded nature of the author". Landa notes that these first critics are interested in the personality of the man who could write such "immorality" and frequently decide that because a work contains "immorality" it must be artistically unsound.

(3) Jantes Russell Lowell, "Swift", The Function of the Poet and Other Essays (Boston, 1920), p. 188 says that Swift, like Gulliver, has a "disease of evil". Edward Gost's History of Eighteenth Century Literature (London, 1889), p. 161 explains Swift's writing as the product of a "brain not wholly under control". W.E.H. Leaky, "Biographical Introduction" to the Prose Works of Jonathan Swift, ed. Temple Scott (London 1897), I, xxxviii attributes Swift's misanthropy to a "physical malady which had long acted upon his brain". While other critics, such as Macaulay and Thackeray, do not state that Swift was mad, they do describe him in terms of either "madness or complete moral decay. William Makepeace Thackeray, "Swift", English Humourists of the Eighteenth Century (London, 1947), pp.35–37 condemned Gulliver's Travels Part IV as "filthy in word, filthy in thought, furious, raging, obscene". Thomas Babington Macaulay, The Works of Thomas Babington Macaulay (London, 1908), VIII, 307 is equally kind, saying that Swift's mind is furnished with "images from the dunghill". Milton Voight, Swift and the Twentieth Century (Detroit, 1964), pp. 6-9 gives a most complete account of this theory as does Landa, pp. 182–183. In fact, Voight's thought and critical bibliography guided me to many of my quoted sources. Landa seems to feel that it is unnecessary to footnote his quotes and so we have, for the most part, no real idea of whom he is refuting.


(5) Sir Walter Russell Brain, "Jonathan Swift: L'Enfant Terrible", Some Reflections on Genius and Other Essays (Philadelphia, 1960), pp.22–33 says that Swift showed no signs of mental incompetence until in his seventies and considering that he suffered from deafness, blindness and arteriosclerosis it is not surprising that he was declared non compos mentis at age seventy–four.


(8) William Barrett, "Writers and Madness", Partisan Review, XIV (January–February, 1947), 7–8 says "The mechanism by which any work of art becomes authentic...can only be revealed by the searchlight of psychoanalytic exploration". Barrett's "searchlight" illuminates a voyage to the Houyhnhmms by explaining on p.9 that "Swift wanted to be a horse, a beautiful and gentle animal--and probably nobler on the whole than most human beings. This is the madness already present in Gulliver". Katherine Rogers, "My Female Friends: The Mysogyny of Jonathan Swift", Texas Studies in Literature and Language, I (Autumn, 1959), 379 after meticulously picking out every derogatory remark made by Swift about women and completely ignoring the satire and irony, concludes that the "evidence from Swift's works, together with his scrupulous avoidance of erotic relationships with women in his life...suggests a deep, unconscious revulsion against Woman as Animal". Rogers finds Swift's wish for female cleanliness particularly incriminating. Benjamin Karpman, "Neurotic Traits of Jonathan Swift, as Revealed by Gulliver's Travels", Psychoanalytic Review, XXIX (January, 1942), 30, 31 says that Swift in Gulliver's Travels shows "many evidences of a neurotic personality" and a "decidedly immature mind". Continuing on p.31, Karpman tells us "Swift's neurosis belongs to that group of reactions which come under the heading of psychosexual infantilism and its particular aspect—coprophilia", the latter being associated with misogyny, misanthropy, mysophilia and mysophia. Phyllis Greenacre, Swift and Carroll: A Psychoanalytic Study of Two Lives (New York, 1955), p.102 can even find coprophilia in the sounds of proper names which "suggest an onomatopoeic derivation from the sound of drippings and droppings, possibly originating in the overly intense preoccupation with toilet functions, which seemed for

(9) Landa, p.184.

(10) Aldous Huxley, “Swift”, *Do What You Will* (New York, 1928), p.105. For a similar, although less violent, approach to the subject see John Middleton Murry, “The Excremental Vision”, *Jonathan Swift* (London, 1959), pp.432–448. Although Huxley and Murry are not psychoanalysts, they seem to use many of the Freudian techniques. Furthermore, the professional psychoanalysts pretend only to case studies, while Huxley and Murry use the techniques for literary criticism. For purposes of this paper I will group the literary and medical critics together. Irvin Ehrenpreis, *The Personality of Jonathan Swift* (London, 1958) uses a psychological approach to Swift with more restraint and thus considerable more success. However, even he cannot resist such statements as, on p.27, “Swift has achieved the quaint fantasy of a mother forty feet tall but young enough to be his daughter”, while discussing a comparison of the giantess Glumdalclitch and Stella.

(11) Landa, p.185.

(12) Greenacre, p.102.

(13) Huxley, p. 99. Later on p. 100 he indignantly refuses to quote the entire line from “The Lady’s Dressing Room”：“‘Oh, Celia, Celia, Celia...’ and the last word “rhymes with ‘wits’ and ‘fits’, he say.’


(18) Landa, p.187.


(20) Jonathan Swift, *The Poems of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Sir Harold Williams (Oxford, 1958), II, 525, I. 4. All quotes from Swift’s poems followed by a page number will be from this text.

(21) Quintana, p.140.

(22) Quintana, p.139.

(23) George Sherburn, “Methods in Books about Swift”, *Studies in Philology*, XXXV (July, 1938), 640 backs up this opinion by calling Swift an “'anti-poetical' poet.” He continues, “To Poesie involving illusion, fictitious glow, or imaginative persuasiveness Swift had after 1694 an invincible opposition”.

(24) Quintana, p.116.

(25) Alexander Pope, *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*, ed. George Sherburn (Oxford, 1956), II, 411 in a letter to the Earl of Oxford, Dr. Arbuthnot recounts, “There has been a vast dem [and] for Goliver [sic] the first impression was sold off in a moment every body has been mightily delighted with him...” On p.412 in a letter to Swift, Pope says, “I congratulate you first upon what you call your Couzen’s wonderful Book, which is *publica trita manu* at present, and I prophecy will be in future the admiration of all men.... I find no considerable man very
angry at the book: some indeed think it rather too bold, and too general a Satire: but none that I hear of accuse it of particular reflections...." On p.413 in a letter to Swift, Gay describes *Gulliver's Travels* as the center of conversation since its publication, "The whole impression sold in a week:...all agree in liking it extremely".


(27) Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver's Travels and Other Writings*, ed. Louis A. Landa (Boston, 1960), p.220. All quotes followed by page number are from this text.


(29) Kathleen Williams, *Jonathan Swift and the Age of Compromise* (Lawrence, 1958), pp.194-195 says that the likeness between Gulliver and the Yahoos "being expressed in physical terms, it makes much more impression on us than does the likeness between Gulliver and the Houyhnhnms, which consists in his possession of a tincture of that reason which constitutes the whole of their nature. This of course is what Swift intends, since he wishes to convey the faintness of reason in us, and the strength of our passions."

(30) Ehrenpreis, p.29.

(31) Quintana, p.28.
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