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Abstract

This thesis is an examination of Alexander Pope's relationships with his patrons, the primary purpose of which is to discover the ways in which patronage mattered to him. Much of the thesis is a study of Pope's relationships with two particular patrons: Richard Boyle, 3rd Earl of Burlington (1695-1753) and Allen Bathurst, 1st Baron and later 1st Earl Bathurst (1684-1775). It argues that these two were his most important patrons. Taking Pope's relationships with these two men as case studies, it examines his claim that his relationships with his patrons were governed not only by need but by friendship.

Chapter 1, 'Living "among the Great": the Historical Background to Pope's Relationships with his Patrons', consists of six sections. The first section introduces and gives a rationale for the thesis. The second section surveys significant literary-historical discussions of patronage in the early eighteenth century, and expresses some scepticism about the roles that Pope is made to play in some of these accounts. The next section discusses Pope's representation of the relationship between commerce and writing and this is followed by an examination of Pope's own finances as a necessary background for an understanding of his reliance on patrons. In the next section I describe his often satirical portrayal of patronage in his poetry. The final section is an overview of the roles of particular patrons (apart from Burlington and Bathurst).

The next three chapters are concerned with Pope's relationship with Burlington. Particular attention is given to the attacks on both men by their contemporaries in order to come to a better understanding of the nature of the bond between them. In Chapter 2, 'Sanctifying Expense: Pope, Burlington and Taste', I investigate the hostile response to the claims made by Pope and Burlington to be arbiters of Taste. In Chapter 3, "The Freedomes of Friendship": Pope's Relationship with Burlington', I concentrate on Pope's claims to friendship with Burlington, measuring these against biographical evidence. In Chapter 4, "A Most Extravagant Censure": The Outcry against the Epistle To Burlington', I describe how these claims were tested in the attacks on Pope for ingratitude towards his patrons on account of his Epistle To Burlington.

My last two chapters are concerned with Pope's relationship with Bathurst. I argue that, of all Pope's patrons, Bathurst is the only one with whom he was really friends. Chapter 5, "Yet Unspoil'd by Wealth": Pope's Friendship with Bathurst', focuses on money in their relationship and considers the attempts of Pope's Epistle To Bathurst to suggest the gentlemanly equivalence of poet and patron. Chapter 6, "Alas, my BATHURST!": Pope's Later Relationship with Bathurst', focuses on gardening and highlights Pope's remarkable combination of ridicule and respect in his treatment of Bathurst in his Imitation of Horace, Epistle II. ii.. At the end of this chapter, I make some suggestions about the ways in which my research might help towards an understanding of what was a transitional stage in the history of authorship and how changing ideas about authorship shaped Pope's poetry.
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1. Living ‘among the Great’: the Historical Background to Alexander Pope’s Relationships with his Patrons

The first section of this chapter introduces and gives a rationale for this thesis. In the second section of this chapter, I will survey modern discussion of patronage in the early eighteenth century; in the third section, I will give an account of Pope’s attitude to finance before, in the fourth section, discussing the intricacies of his own financial dealings and, in the fifth section, his often satirical representation of patronage in his poetry. Finally, in the sixth section, I will give an overview of his relationships with his patrons.

i) Introduction

The aim of this thesis is to discover the ways in which patronage mattered to Alexander Pope. Much of my thesis is a study of Pope’s relationships with two particular patrons, Richard Boyle (1695-1753), 3rd Earl of Burlington and Allen Bathurst (1684-1775), 1st Baron and later 1st Earl Bathurst. I concentrate on two patrons because only close studies of Pope’s relationships with particular patrons fully reveal his attitude towards patronage. In Chapters 2, 3 and 4, I will investigate the ways in which Pope’s relationship with Burlington shaped much of the first part of his career, from their initial acquaintance in early 1714 to Pope’s publication of his Epistle To Burlington in 1731. Chapter 2 concerns Pope’s early career and his and Burlington’s common interest in the formation of Taste; Chapter 3 concerns Pope’s claims to friendship with Burlington, which were put to the test when he was attacked for To Burlington, as I will show in Chapter 4. In my last two chapters I will explore Pope’s relationship with Bathurst, examining the special emphasis that he placed on friendship in this relationship and investigating his attitude towards Bathurst’s lavish spending on gardening projects in the Epistle To Bathurst and the Imitation of Horace, Epistle, II. ii.: Chapter 5 will deal with Pope’s relationship with Bathurst in the financial sphere; Chapter 6 will focus on gardening. I have chosen to give over two substantial
chapters of my thesis to Pope’s relationship with Bathurst because my research indicates that this particular relationship marks a dramatic change in poet-patron relations and helps towards an understanding of what might be considered a transitional stage in the history of authorship.

The way in which poets earned money in the early eighteenth century is particularly interesting because it was uncertain: Court patronage was scarce and what we now call ‘the reading public’ did not yet exist. There was no commercial readership of sufficient size by which a writer could live. A typical print run in the eighteenth century was 1,000 copies.¹ Patronage was not at an end: although Sir Robert Walpole and his administration showed little interest in literature, part of my research aims to show that there was an increasing number of opportunities for a resourceful and diplomatic poet such as Pope to find patronage in circles outside the Court. By tradition, apart from government, landed aristocrats were still the main patrons of the arts and, in Pope’s case, a poet’s protectors. I will show that a poet might achieve financial independence from patrons but that, without their continued support, it was impossible to maintain his status – in Pope’s case, his status as the greatest poet of his age and a gentleman.

In the early eighteenth century, what was a patron considered to be? The etymological root of ‘patron’ is ‘patronus’, meaning ‘protector of clients, advocate, defender’ (OED). Traditionally, a patron was a writer’s ‘protector’: the person who lent his or her influential support to advance a writer’s influence. Specifically, a patron was the person to whom a writer dedicated a work. With Pope, the question of what constituted patronage became more complex. First, few of Pope’s works had dedications; secondly, although many of his works were addressed to people, in most cases, this did not amount to patronage; thirdly, although he had a great number of influential supporters, he counted only a few as his patrons.² In the course of this introduction I will make distinctions between Pope’s patrons

---


and his other significant friendships and allegiances. To Pope, a patron was a member of the Great who promoted his reputation. In his Preface to the *Iliad*, Pope emphasized the support of the aristocracy and revealed that his ‘highest Obligations’ were to such who had ‘done most Honour to the Name of Poet’ (T. E. VII, 24). Ideally, a patron was also the protector of his reputation.

Why did Pope need the protection of his patrons? Pope was not only one of the highest-earning poets but also one of the most lambasted poets in the history of literature – J. V. Guerinot’s survey, *Pamphlet Attacks on Alexander Pope, 1711-1744*, lists 158 attacks on him dating from the beginning of his career, with John Dennis’ first attack in 1711, to the year of his death, with Colley Cibber’s pamphlet of 1744. Pope spent his whole life under siege: ‘The life of a wit is a warfare upon earth’. With the accession of George I and the coming to power of the Whigs, led by Walpole and Charles, 2nd Viscount Townshend, there were three factors which marked him out as a target for his enemies: first, he was a Catholic; secondly, he was a Tory; thirdly, to a large extent by virtue of these first two factors, he was a satirist independent of the Court and Government. The number of attacks on him, and their virulence, were proof of the efficacy of his satire, yet his vulnerability is shown in his reliance on his patrons as shields. In the *Testimonies of Authors* that precede the *Dunciad*, Pope points to his noble supporters as witnesses in his defence against the attacks of the dunces. Naming Henry St John, Viscount Bolingbroke, Charles Mordaunt, 3rd Earl of Peterborough (henceforth referred to as ‘Peterborow’, as Pope called him), and John Sheffield, 1st Duke of Buckinghamshire (henceforth referred to as ‘Buckingham’, again Pope’s name for him), he draws attention to the fact that, as nobility, their authority is absolute:

> Here in truth should we crave pardon of all the foresaid right honourable and worthy personages, for having mentioned them in the same page with such weekly riff-raff railers and rhymers; but that we had their ever-honoured commands for the same; and that they are introduced not as witnesses in the controversy, but as witnesses that cannot be controverted; not to dispute, but to decide.’ (T. E. V, 35)

---

4 Preface to 1717 *Collected Works*.
5 Mack refers to ‘Peterborow’ throughout his biography. In his correspondence Pope uses the spellings ‘Peterborow’ and ‘Buckingham’ for these two patrons’ surnames. Sherburn’s index also indicates that Peterborow himself used this spelling, *Corr.*, V, 131.
Burlington and Bathurst emerge from a survey of Pope’s patrons as his most important, as I will show towards the end of this introduction, and were the patrons to whom he addressed his Epistles *Of the Use of Riches*, the joint-title for *To Burlington* and *To Bathurst*. These Epistles were celebrations of patronage and enquiries into the value and proper use of riches. Both Burlington and Bathurst had reputations as wealthy and distinguished patrons: as I will show in Chapters 2 and 6, Burlington’s reputation in architecture and Bathurst’s reputation in gardening were, to a large extent, made by Pope. In turn, by virtue of their wealth and influence, Burlington and Bathurst were best able to promote Pope’s reputation as a poet: they can be viewed as his chief patrons. In the course of my analysis of the Epistles *Of the Use of Riches*, I will examine Pope’s questioning approach to their use of wealth and his own, as well as his motives for courting them. An understanding of how money figures in the Epistles hinges on Pope’s perception of the thin line between the proper use and the abuse of wealth.

Pope’s relationships with Burlington and Bathurst are intriguing: they were the patrons whom Pope had to handle most carefully and yet, at the same time, he enjoyed their company and was indebted to them for their whole-hearted support and exceptional generosity. As the two patrons with whom he had most difficulty in maintaining relationships, Burlington and Bathurst make the most fitting subjects for an enquiry into Pope’s handling of the art of praise. As we will see, both failed to live up to Pope’s patriarchal ideal modelled on the principles of housekeeping and good stewardship of the land and, in view of the fact that their respective attentions to architecture and gardening became, in Pope’s eyes, no more than private concerns, he began to find fault with the ways in which each spent their money. These difficulties are the main concerns of Chapters 3, 5 and 6.

Although Pope’s relationships with Burlington and with Bathurst are described in biographies and Burlington is a well-known figure in his own right, what is missing from
biographies is a sense of how Pope's relationships with his patrons developed or cooled and an assessment of their relative importance in his career. In biographical studies such information inevitably becomes lost in the business of his life: in Maynard Mack's biography, for example, we might meet a patron and be introduced to him and then return to him a hundred pages later, by which time we have lost a sense of the patterns of Pope's friendship with him and his patronage of Pope. Howard Erskine-Hill's *The Social Milieu of Alexander Pope: Lives, Example and the Poetic Response* gives detailed portraits of Pope's relationships with John Caryll, William 5th Baron Digby, and Ralph Allen, all of whom supported Pope's career but were not, as I will show, his patrons; Erskine-Hill also gives biographical studies of John Kyrle (Pope's model for Man of Ross) and Kyrle's antitheses, Sir John Blunt and Peter Walter, investigating Pope's attitudes towards them; Pat Rogers treats of Pope's friends, Hugh Bethel, William Fortescue and Martha Blount, but only one of his patrons, Bathurst, in his essay 'Pope and the Social Scene'. In my studies of Burlington and Bathurst I aim to follow Erskine-Hill's and Rogers' lead both in singling out particular figures for study and in attempting to gauge their significance in Pope's life and work by interweaving biographical and literary critical material.

David Foxon's comprehensive study, *Pope and the Early Eighteenth-Century Book Trade*, has dealt with Pope's business activities. *Pope and the Early Eighteenth-Century Book Trade* is, however, a work of publishing history and does not touch on literary criticism; my research is, in part, an exploration of the ways in which Pope's relations with

---


the book trade, as described in detail by Foxon, shaped his poetry. Foxon documents the extent of his involvement in the publishing arrangements for his works from choice of print, editions and illustrations to decisions about the timing of publications; Pope took a businessman’s interest in the whole process of book production, negotiating costs, contracts and control of copyright with a view to maximizing his own profits. As we will see, Pope carefully maintained relationships with both booksellers and patrons and contrived a degree of interchange between their two otherwise distinct worlds. One of the most striking features of his career was his close involvement of his patrons in the publication of his own works, to the extent that he could persuade them to perform services for him usually undertaken by booksellers.

Samuel Johnson’s letter to Philip Dormer Stanhope, 4th Earl of Chesterfield, of 1755, declaring himself independent of patrons, has shaped modern understanding of patronage in the eighteenth century:

Is not a Patron, My Lord, one who looks with unconcern on a Man struggling for Life in the water and when he has reached ground encumbers him with help. The notice which you have been pleased to take of my Labours, had it been early, had been kind; but it has been delayed till I am indifferent and cannot enjoy it, till I am solitary and cannot impart it, till I am known and do not want it.

I hope it is no very cinical asperity not to confess obligation where no benefit has been received, or to be unwilling that the Public should consider me as owing that to a Patron, which Providence has enabled me to do for myself.9

Contrary to Johnson’s impression that a writer could do without patrons, whose help he presented as a hindrance, my research indicates that patronage still mattered in the early eighteenth century, but in quite different ways to earlier times. Alvin Kernan points out Johnson’s continued involvement with patrons, despite his avowal of independence: in 1763 Johnson accepted the crown’s offer of a pension of £300 a year.10 Patrons could offer many useful services, ranging from accepting dedications and providing introductions, hospitality

---

and presents, to making suggestions as to what a poet might write, giving commissions and
providing pensions, arranging sinecures, extending loans and offering legal protection.

Pope built up a formidable list of friends and patrons and is widely credited by
sympathetic commentators with a genius for friendship. Mack writes of Pope's
'extraordinary success in making and keeping friends' (Alexander Pope, p. 111), and, as
Barbara Everett points out, makes this the centre of his biography. Johnson comments on
the number and lastingness of his friendships and describes how his devotion to his friends
was matched by their loyalty: 'In the duties of friendship he was zealous and constant [...]
it does not appear that he lost a single friend by coldness or injury: those who loved him once
continued their kindness.'

John Gay's Mr Pope's Welcome from Greece (written 1720) acts as a testimony to the warmth of his friendships, picturing his many friends and patrons
welcoming him back to their company after his years of translating Homer. This gift for
friendship is further illuminated by the praise of John Boyle, 5th Earl of Orrery: '[...]
he treated his friends with a politeness that charmed, and a generosity that was much to his
honour. Every guest was made happy within his doors. Pleasure dwelt under his roof, and
elegance presided at his table.' Pope's acquaintance with Orrery probably dates from 1735;
Orrery's business interests in Ireland made him a useful contact for Pope in the securing of
his letters to Swift, which Pope published in 1737. Orrery's generous praise seems,
however, to be contradicted by his comments on the last letter that he received from Pope:
' [... ] [he] concludes with professions of great kindness. - but notwithstanding all the many
and high assurances of friendship, gratitude, and affection in these Letters, he forgot me in
his will. Mens curva in corpore curvo' (Corr., IV, 521 and n.3). In private, Orrery echoed
Pope's enemies' charge of ingratitude, yet, officially, he promoted Pope's friends' image of
him as a generous friend and a gentleman. While Pope's circle and sympathetic eighteenth-

---

14 In his first surviving letter to Orrery of 12 July 1735, Pope mentions that their acquaintance dates from about this time.
century commentators might not necessarily paint a true picture of Pope’s friendships, they nevertheless show us that friendship mattered.

A close study of Pope’s dealings with patrons reveals that an emphasis on friendship was his trump card in forging relationships with them. At this point in the history of the man of letters, the startling novelty of this behaviour should be appreciated. Whereas in the past, a poet’s relationship with a patron had been governed by need, in the early eighteenth century, this relationship might be governed both by need and friendship. From his correspondence, it would seem that, at least in part, Pope owed this strategy to Jonathan Swift. In a letter of August 1723, he paid tribute to Swift for the most valuable lesson in patronage that he ever gained, ‘The Top-pleasure of my Life is one I learnt from you both how to gain, & how to use the Freedomes of Friendship with Men much my Superiors’ (Corr., II, 185). Swift was, however, better at giving than following advice, his outspokenness standing in marked contrast to Pope’s diplomacy.

In this time of shifting relationships with patrons, one of the most testing problems facing a poet was how truthfully to praise them. As Pope put it to George II in his *Imitation of Horace, Epistle* II. i., the Epistle *To Augustus*: ‘A vile Encomium doubly ridicules’ (l. 410, T. E. IV, 229). Pope’s manuscript revisions of the Epistles *To Burlington* and *To Bathurst*, as well as the nature of his consultation with each patron about each Epistle, testify to the subtlety of the editorial decisions that he had to make in order to come up with poems which would both please his patrons and yet not shame him. As I will show in Chapters 2 and 5, one way in which Pope sought to keep his balance in the writing of the Epistles *Of the Use of Riches* seems to have been by following the classical tradition that held a poet’s advice to be the greatest service he could offer his patrons. In particular, one of the major preoccupations of Pope’s poetry is the responsibility of the Great towards the arts.

Pope’s diplomatic skills are most clearly shown in his letters. By his manipulation of his correspondence in the various editions that he published, Pope could shape the image of

---

himself that he wanted to project: thus his desire to have them published. As we will see, Pope's letters played a vital part in his courting of his patrons and his winning of friends. Significantly, he viewed his letters as presents, as exemplified by a letter to Caryll of 1711:

Besides the two letters you last favored me with, I am yet more in your debt for one to Mr Englefield, where you have defended me with all the spirit of friendship, and the very essence of good nature [. . .] The extreme goodness with which you accept the offer I too impudently made you of [my friendship], can never be enough acknowledged: I am like a poor fellow who makes his rich landlord a scurvy and worthless present, on the hopes of receiving one of infinitely a greater value in return. (Corr., I, 120)

The emphasis on presents is important: in his dealings with patrons, Pope made sure that money never changed hands, but presents were more than welcome. Both Pope and Swift were acutely sensitive to matters of deference and obligation. If men of letters were judged inferior because aristocrats and politicians paid them as they would servants, Pope and Swift refused such methods of payment. By writing satirical portraits of mercenary patron-poet relationships, they dissociated themselves from such transactions. By removing the taint of servant and dependent from the notion of the man of letters, Pope helped invent the profession of letters which continues to this day.

In relationships between poets and patrons there was now a balance to be struck between dependence and friendship; it was an uneasy situation. In time, Pope took things one step further and, in his poetry if not in his actual dealings with patrons, forged the modern relationship between poet and patron whereby friendship took precedence over need. Although he was not invulnerable as regards his reputation, the small fortune that he made from the publication by subscription of his translations of the Homer and his edition of Shakespeare enabled him to affect a lofty attitude to those poets who were dependent on patrons for financial reasons: I discuss this later in this introduction in my sections on his financial dealings and his satirical representation of patrons in his poetry. Where Pope differed from other poets of his age was that he commanded a hard-won respect from his patrons made possible by his money, which gave him the means to rise in the world. The result was that he became the most protected poet in England, and, as such, the most free
from constraints. This respect nevertheless incorporated a distinct element of favour and remained precarious.

Despite his ambivalence towards patrons and patronage, the importance of patrons in Pope's career is demonstrated by his lifelong efforts to win favour. He was not, from the *Iliad* onwards, as so many commentators have assumed, independent. The *Iliad* gave him financial independence and made his name but he remained, in large measure, dependent on his patrons for the bolstering of his reputation as the English Homer. Furthermore, when he had done with major subscription ventures in 1725, his next direction in poetry necessitated a new and very specific kind of support from his patrons: he needed them as shields against likely legal action in the wake of the publication of the *Dunciad*. Beyond such important career issues, Pope's continued anxiety to maintain good relationships with his patrons originated in his desire to belong to their particular social class: in Pope's own words, he liked living 'among the Great' (*Sat. II. i.*, l. 133, T. E. IV, 19). Finally, my research aims to show that perhaps Pope's strongest motive for remaining loyal to his patrons concerned his idea of what constituted a civilized society: good relationships with his patrons were an integral part of his essentially classical notion of authorship.
ii) Modern discussion of patronage in the early eighteenth century

Perhaps the most influential work on the patronage of the early eighteenth century has been Bertrand Goldgar's *Walpole and the Wits* (1976). In his study of Walpole's relationships with the writers of his day, he concentrates his attentions on Walpole's neglect of the wits and suggests that poets such as Pope and Swift were, in effect, left out in the cold by his regime. Christine Gerrard has described Goldgar's use of 'compelling evidence from newspaper attacks as well as famous literary works like Pope's *Dunciad* to show the pervasiveness in opposition writing of images of a new cultural "dark age" brought about by a Hanoverian dynasty which refused to patronize artists, and by a minister notorious for his contempt for "wits". Gerrard's description helps point to what might have made Goldgar's study so influential: he was himself convinced by the wits' compelling version of events.

Goldgar's account of the exclusion of the wits might be described as the traditional picture. Far from being no longer deemed important in the political climate of the day, as suggested by Goldgar, in the early eighteenth century, the arts were inseparable from politics and commerce. In his conclusion, Goldgar writes that the indifference to the arts of Walpole's administration resulted in a cultural shift which displaced writers, who had formerly been at ease in the world of politics:

Poets and playwrights no longer inhabited the same world as politicians, as to some extent they had been able to do in the years of the last Tory ministry; for the most part, they no longer even wrote for the political press. Against this claim that Walpole's administration displaced writers from the world of politics, one might cite Pope's involvement with politicians opposed to Walpole, the foremost being Bolingbroke, and, later, the leaders of the Patriot Opposition, and his friendships with men initially allied to the ministry, such as Burlington, as well as government stalwarts such as Walpole's chief legal adviser, Fortescue.

---

16 Gerrard, p. 48.
Walpole and his administration might have had no time for the arts, apart from building up collections of paintings, but this neglect was seized upon by the Opposition. In this connection, Goldgar observes:

It is hardly remarkable to find Walpole refusing to consider poets worthy of his attention nor to find poets responding to neglect with hostility. What is remarkable, though, is the extent to which the ministers's treatment of men of letters became itself a major motif in the propaganda of the opposition.\(^{18}\)

Gerrard has shown that this last effect of Walpole's indifference to poets is not so remarkable. In her examination of the political capital to be gained from linking the arts with Liberty, she documents how Pope became involved in 'the literary side of the Patriot campaign'.\(^{19}\) In contrast to Gerrard, Goldgar downplays the political advantage gained by writers in attacking the government and emphasizes the personal:

Walpole, in contrast to such ministers of the recent past as Godolphin, Halifax, Somers, and Oxford, refused to encourage or even to show much interest in men of letters, whose works he considered irrelevant to the serious affairs of government. Many of the writers who attacked him were moved to do so perhaps by principle, but certainly by their resentment at the preferment of the unworthy and the neglect of artistic merit on the part of the ministry, the very institution which they had formerly regarded as the source of patronage and guardian of excellence.\(^{20}\)

Writers including Pope were motivated not primarily by resentment at the injustice of 'the preferment of the unworthy and the neglect of artistic merit': such resentment, alone, could do little for them. Rather, and this again demonstrates the importance of patronage in creating literary markets, certain writers launched their attacks under the cover of patrons who were against Walpole's administration.

Studies of Pope's relationships with his patrons often tend to take one of two options: either Pope is thought of as having jettisoned his patrons once he had achieved financial independence, or else he is presented as the friend of his patrons, representing a triumph of social mobility. Both interpretations oddly echo eighteenth-century views. The first point of view is the most widely-held and gives the misleading impression that Pope came by his money easily. An inaccurate picture of his independence is also given. The two principal

---

\(^{18}\) Goldgar, p. 11.

\(^{19}\) Gerrard, p. 204. See also Gerrard's reservations about Goldgar's argument, p. 48.

\(^{20}\) Goldgar, pp. 9-10.
proponents of this point of view are R. H. Griffith and Dustin Griffin. As the author of the standard bibliography on Pope, published 1922-1927, Griffith’s views have been influential; his claims for Pope are the most extreme on the score of Pope’s supposed independence:

In his youth, he meditated upon patronage, and dismissed it as a system for his own aggrandizement. It was an obsolescent system. As other customs inheriting from the feudal organization of society decayed after the Rebellion, so patronage disintegrated through stages of a sort of stock-company patronage, which was publishing by subscription, and political-party patronage, which was the shifting of the burden of support in the reign of good Queen Anne from individual shoulders to the shoulders of the government [. . .] A dependable patron was gone, a sustaining public was not yet come.21

While Griffith is right to say that ‘a sustaining public’ did not yet exist, his description of Pope’s dismissal of patronage as ‘obsolescent’ is inaccurate. There was no such thing as ‘the patronage system’: there were many types of patronage in the early eighteenth century.

The first interpretation of Pope’s relationship with his patrons strangely takes a similar line to his contemporary enemies, except that, while his enemies presented his freeing himself from earlier patrons as base ingratitude, modern commentators have tended to follow Johnson in celebrating Pope’s supposed independence from patrons. Barbara Everett suggests that Pope’s translations ‘secured him the fortune which made him free of patrons for the rest of his life’.22 Johnson’s sharp descriptions of Pope’s supposed independence have, I think, fixed in readers’ minds a misleading image of his position: ‘Pope never set genius to sale: he never flattered those whom he did not love, or praised those whom he did not esteem’.23 Pope was not as self-assured as Johnson’s descriptions suggest.

In his extensive survey of eighteenth-century literary patronage, Griffin points out that patronage did not come to an end in the eighteenth century but continued in new forms. Nevertheless, he gives a partial picture of Pope’s obligations to his patrons and booksellers, claiming that he made himself independent of both:

Pope implicitly challenges the subordination of writer to patron, and though he lacks high birth and inherited wealth emphasizes on the one hand his affinities with the traditional patron class,

22 Everett, p. 125.
and on the other the sharp differences that separate him from other writers, the ones who are dependent, as Pope is not, on patrons or booksellers.\textsuperscript{24}

John Brewer suggests that the fortune that Pope made from his translations of Homer freed him from the booksellers, rather than his patrons, which is not entirely true: 'The subscriptions to Pope's works freed him from what he viewed as the clutches of the booksellers'.\textsuperscript{25} A reading of Pope's correspondence and Foxon's account of his business dealings make it hard to picture Pope ever thinking himself in the 'clutches of the booksellers'. It was important for him to maintain relationships with the booksellers, even in the face of serious disagreements. Jacques Carré, like Griffin, points out that new kinds of patronage were created in the eighteenth century. Carré nevertheless exaggerates in presenting the eighteenth century as a time of emancipation for the writer and is inaccurate in suggesting that Pope 'boasted of his total independence from patrons'.\textsuperscript{26}

In contrast, Rogers has emphasized the arduous nature of subscription work and the difficulty for Pope of defining a market; Rogers' persuasive account points to the importance of his patrons.\textsuperscript{27} When Pope issued his proposals for the \textit{Iliad}, as Rogers has demonstrated, his readership was by no means defined. The subscription histories of the \textit{Iliad}, the \textit{Odyssey} and Pope's edition of Shakespeare demonstrate how entirely he depended on patronage to create a market for his work. The extent to which this patronage was political in cast – the number of MP's from both parties on the subscription lists is overwhelming – also supports my argument that Pope's market was achieved by means of patronage: his targeting of MP's shows how heavy was his dependence on the people he knew to secure him subscriptions.\textsuperscript{28} Rogers' conclusion to the first part of his essay shows the difficulty involved in the subscription work:

\textsuperscript{24} Griffin, p. 128.
\textsuperscript{27} For the necessity for an artist of finding a patron, see also John Gay, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{28} Rogers reports that Pope gained 120 MP's for the \textit{Odyssey} translation, making up a fifth of the subscription and 22% of the sitting Members, 'Pope and his Subscribers', in \textit{Essays on Pope}, pp. 190-227 (p. 216) (first publ. in \textit{Publishing History}, 3 (1978), 7-36).
In my view Pope started out with a hazy sense of whom he might be reaching with the *Iliad*, and embarked on his venture with many doubts as to its feasibility. Of course, we must not confuse subscribers with readers; nevertheless, if Pope had been aware of an established reading public, he would surely have mounted the subscription with entire confidence. As it was, he had to work hard to achieve the kind of list he wanted. Again with the *Odyssey* he had to set up a long and energetic campaign to get his subscribers, often from a wholly new quarter. He was glad to utilize the help of friends where he could. Moreover, he made every effort to use his most distinguished and best-placed acquaintances to secure further subscribers: it was not the bare name of Lord Harley he wanted on the list, but that nobleman’s active promotion. Even when Pope himself became famous, he could not rely on his own prominence to swing everything his way. The work advertised by Tonson as ‘Mr Pope’s Edition of Shakespear’ fared really quite badly; the subscription was left to take care of itself, as far as Pope went, and the outcome was a relative failure. In short, the evidence assembled thus far points to the view that Pope’s audience was initially ill-defined, not wholly dependable, dissimilar in the case of different works, and required very much to be wooed. This is not the traditional picture.

Rogers’ account presents the image of Pope as client, having to put in a great deal of work in order to win his patrons’ support. Rogers’ last remark in the above quotation, ‘This is not the traditional picture’, refers to his criticism of many of Pope’s commentators, outlined earlier in his essay. There Rogers cites the reactions of major commentators on the *Iliad*: J. W. Saunders, who calls the *Iliad* ‘the success of the age’, George Sherburn, who calls it ‘an astonishingly successful subscription’, Alexandre Beljame who writes of its ‘brilliant financial success’, and Leslie Stephen, who writes that Pope ‘received a kind of commission from the upper class to execute the translation’. Stephen also suggests, in another excerpt chosen by Rogers, that Pope may be seen as ‘the authorized interpreter of the upper circle, which then took itself to embody the highest cultivation of the nation’. Rogers contends that ‘the impression left by these and other commentators is misleading in several respects. The received account exaggerates the certainty with which Pope was able to define his audience, and the ease with which he could reach his market.’

In my studies of Pope’s relationships with Burlington and Bathurst, I aim to take further Rogers’ representation of Pope as client. To borrow Rogers’ phrase, the ‘traditional picture’ of Pope’s dealings with his patrons and the literary market is misleading. Despite Pope’s persuasive rhetoric about establishing relationships of equality with his patrons, evaluation

---

29 Ibid., p. 208.
30 See also Johnson’s use of superlatives in describing the *Iliad*, *Lives of the English Poets*, III, 118-19.
of the relationships between Pope and his patrons should, I suggest, focus on Pope as his patrons' client rather than Pope as their friend: an investigation of his relations with his patrons demonstrates the gap between theory and practice. What he put forward as a proposal he probably hardly expected to see realized. His relationships with patrons were based on primarily on need; friendship came second. As I will show in my survey of patrons later in this introduction and in Chapters 2, 5 and 6, Pope's winning of his patrons was motivated by the knowledge that they could further his poetic reputation.

A second common interpretation of Pope's relationship with his patrons follows his own account of how he made his patrons his friends. In my view, this portrayal does not take into account the difficulties for Pope of sustaining relationships with even the best of his patrons, and does not give enough emphasis to the social distance in these relationships. Erskine-Hill's influential study of Pope's social world, The Social Milieu of Alexander Pope, conclusively demonstrates the importance to Pope of his patrons. Nevertheless, Erskine-Hill describes the relationship between poet and patron in terms that skirt around the contradictions of a friendship based on inequality: 'Social intercourse was on terms of strict equality and familiar friendship, but it was still understood that the more powerful man would use his wealth and influence on the poet's behalf.' The evidence that we have about the relationship between Pope and Burlington, as I will show in Chapter 3, qualifies the claim that the relationship between Pope and his patrons was 'on terms of strict equality': the social distance between poet and patron was always sharply felt. In "Avowed Friend and Patron": The Third Earl of Burlington and Alexander Pope', Erskine-Hill presents the relationship between Pope and Burlington as exemplifying the Augustan notion of friendship between patron and client, in which criticism can be voiced without offence being

---

32 The Social Milieu, p. 78.
33 For discussions of how such writers as Dryden and Milton were the underlings of their aristocratic patrons, see Michael Foss, Man of Wit to Man of Business: The Arts and Changing Patronage 1660-1750 (London: Hamilton, 1971; repr. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1988) and James Anderson Winn, John Dryden and his World (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1987). For a discussion of how poetry was perceived as the leisurely pursuit of the aristocracy in the seventeenth century, see Simon Jarvis, Scholars and Gentlemen: Shakespearean Textual Criticism and Representations of Scholarly Labour 1725-1765 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).
taken.\textsuperscript{34} I will show in Chapter 3 that this claim does not take account of the difficulties involved for Pope, or any other artist, in keeping Burlington's favour. A study of Burlington's relations with his artists suggests, I think, that it was hard not to give offence to such a man.

Mack contends that the 'friendship with Burlington was one of Pope's happiest. It was genuinely affectionate despite the difference in rank and lasted Pope's lifetime'. Mack's evidence gives partial support to his contention: Pope's early enthusiasm for Burlington's gardens and buildings, as shown in his letters, their rambles together and his complimenting Burlington in his Epistle \textit{To Burlington}; Burlington's help with building the portico for Pope's house at Twickenham and with raising funds for an Abbey monument to Shakespeare (\textit{Alexander Pope}, pp. 288-89, p. 587, p. 733). While I do not dispute the affection that existed between Pope and Burlington, I would suggest that Mack's treatment fails to address Pope's self-conscious use of the language of friendship, in his relationships with patrons, in order to create a market for his work. It is essential to take into account the novelty of a poet's claiming to be friends with his patrons. The very fact that Pope put it in writing so many times might warn the reader not to take the claim at face-value. When he claimed equality with his patrons, he was not saying that his friendships were free from social distinctions; rather he was suggesting a community of Taste. All of these manoeuvres in polite society helped to gain him a market for his work. In Chapters 2, 3, 5 and 6 I discuss the ways in which this involved the creation of a rhetorical space for his relationships with his patrons in his poetry.

In contrast to either of these two received accounts of Pope's relationships with patrons, Rogers' description is cautious: '[. . .] Pope attained in a few years financial independence and a different social rank, permitting intimacy with the great'.\textsuperscript{35} Rogers employs Pope's language for writing about his social superiors ('Envy must own, I live among the Great', \textit{Sat.} II. i., l. 133, T. E. IV, 19); furthermore, the phrase, 'intimacy with the great', appears

\textsuperscript{34} 'Avowed Friend and Patron', p. 225.
\textsuperscript{35} 'Pope and his Subscribers', pp. 190-91.
contradictory yet reflects the ambiguous nature of poet-patron relationships, where closeness could co-exist with distance. My research indicates that many of Pope's commentators have been too easily convinced by his own version of events. In his dealings with patrons, his project was never to attempt to do without patrons, but, rather, to establish a doubtful equality between patron and artist, based on the idea of friendship.

In order to understand patronage in the early eighteenth century it is necessary to know what came before. The legacy of seventeenth century patronage was not reassuring. The poets of the later seventeenth century who were not gentlemen had no more than servile status. John Dryden was the major exception amongst poets in his dealings with publishers, not only because of his success in developing the means to make a large amount of money from poetry in translation, but because he was, in many respects, Pope's model. James Anderson Winn points out that, despite his disagreements with Jacob Tonson, Dryden did quite well out of the publication of his translation of the *Aeneid*. Certainly, in the early eighteenth century, it was still the case that the best that most men of letters could hope for were relationships of uneasy dependence with patrons and unremunerative relationships with booksellers.

Apart from poets' low social status, the difficulties of earning a living as a poet in the early eighteenth century were compounded by what Saunders has called the 'stigma of print'. There was still a disdain for publication. A gentleman usually circulated his poems in manuscript form; print was considered the recourse of low-born professionals. Writing for money was considered ungentlemanly. Simon Jarvis has pointed to 'a wider paradox in Pope's position as a professional writer whose literary career none the less depended in part upon his self-construction as a disinterested gentleman'. Pope's poetry is rooted in this tradition. In his Epistle *To Dr Arbuthnot*, Pope's forward-thinking awareness that print would be the medium of the future is restrained by his knowledge that, in 1735, manuscripts still kept their gentlemanly higher status:

36 Winn, pp. 476-77.
38 Jarvis, p. 50.
But why then publish? Granville the polite,
And knowing Walsh, would tell me I could write;
Well-natur'd Garth inflam'd with early praise,
And Congreve lov'd, and Swift endur'd my Lays;
The Courtly Talbot, Somers, Sheffield read,
Ev'n mitred Rochester would nod the head,
And St John's self (great Dryden's friends before)
With open arms receiv'd one Poet more.
(ll. 135-42, T. E. IV, 105-06)\(^{39}\)

Pope's differentiation of his friends by means of their response to his early poems is telling:
all but one of the late 'great Dryden's friends' play the conventional part of patron, giving
encouragement that ranges, according to their character, from approval to generous praise.
The self-mockery in Pope's depiction of Swift's response, 'and Swift endur'd my Lays',
forestalls accusations of vanity for publishing such a list, while also showing an affection for
Swift which distinguishes him from Pope's other friends. Pope gives no direct answer to the
question 'why then publish?' — modesty forbids it. Rather, he presents the approbation of his
distinguished patrons as sufficient vindication.

With the movement of literature from the realm of learning and belles lettres to the realm
of consumption, relationships between poets and patrons underwent a dramatic change.
Patrons, the most influential readers and buyers of literature in the early eighteenth century,
were transformed from commissioners of works into consumers, as seen most dramatically
in the field of subscription publishing.\(^{40}\) Pope was instrumental in creating this shift in the
balance of power between patrons and authors. The driving force behind these
transformations was the power of new money.\(^{41}\)

---


\(^{40}\) See Brewer for an account of how the growth of subscription publishing emphasized the new role of the patron as consumer, p. 166. For a discussion of the *Tatler's* and *Spectator's* celebration of commercial modernity, see David H. Solkin, *Painting for Money: The Visual Arts and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993), pp. 29-47. See Brewer for an account of how the growth of subscription publishing emphasized the new role of the patron as consumer, p. 166.

\(^{41}\) See ibid., p. 163.
iii) Pope’s attitude to finance

With its powers of transformation and its dependence on the imagination, the new finance could be seen as a superb subject for poetry. The financial revolution created a new era of high-risk enterprise, which Pope described in the year of the South Sea Bubble as an ‘Age of Hope and Golden Mountains’ (To James Eckersall, 21 February 1719/20, Corr., II, 33). The new possibilities on offer for amassing great wealth with little effort inspired many to venture in speculation. P. G. M. Dickson traces these developments to, on the one hand, colonial expansion, and, on the other, the eighteenth-century love of gambling: ‘There was a restless spirit of economic innovation in England, particularly in London. This was due partly to the stimulus given to active men by the expansion of commerce to distant quarters of the globe, partly to an appetite for gambling fostered by the hard and uncertain conditions of life itself.’ This feverish appetite for innovation is reflected in Pope’s Epistle To Bathurst where he apostrophizes Credit, his tone at once deeply ironic and spellbound by the miraculous powers of the new finance: ‘Bless’d paper-credit! last and best supply! That lends Corruption lighter wings to fly!’ (ll. 68-69, T. E. III. ii., 93). Both Pope and Swift display a fascination with the fantastical workings of the new finance.

Swift compared the power of South Sea directors with that of magicians and necromancers. In Upon the South Sea Project, he presents the directors as wily con-men:

While some build castles in the air,
Directors build 'em in the seas;
Subscribers plainly see 'em there,
For fools will see as wise men please.  

The South Sea Bubble was a catastrophe for Pope and his friends, even if he wrote that he himself was ‘not hurt by these times or fates, (which I think escaping well)’ (To Caryll, 28 October 1720, Corr., II, 57-58). Over ten years later, Pope humorously depicted himself as still recovering from the loss of golden dreams and having difficulty adjusting to Walpole’s

---

harsh new financial measures. By trying to copy the 'equal mind' of his friend Bethel, he nevertheless strove to be 'In South-sea days not happier, when surmis'd/ The Lord of thousands, than if now Excis'd' (Sat. II. ii., II. 133-34, T. E. IV, 65). Pope's correspondence shows how, initially, the excitement of speculation had created quite a buzz amongst his circle; the crash came as a shock to everyone (see Corr., II, 38-39, 42, 48-58, 60). In March 1720 Pope had bought South Sea Stock at 180 and had sold it in July (by June, the Stock had stood at over 1000). His letters give the impression that, unlike some of his friends, he had probably not invested much (To Caryll, c. May 1720, Corr., II, 42); more to the point, it seems that he had chosen a good time to sell.44 In contrast, Gay had invested £1000 of subscription money for his Poems on Several Occasions. He had bought 'at the top of the market', in late June. By his failure to sell, he had realized about £400. As Nokes points out, Gay's real disappointment lay in the loss of his speculative gains.45 Lady Mary Wortley Montagu had also suffered losses from investments made for her suitor, Nicolas-François Rémon, on the advice of Pope and James Craggs (see Corr., II, 52 and n.).46

The dazzling new opportunities for fraud created by the new finance greatly exercised Pope. Since Credit was invisible, so now was bribery and corruption: the new 'secret Gold saps on from knave to knave' (To Bathurst, I. 38, T. E. III. ii., 88). In his Imitation of Horace, Satire II. i., Pope declares himself the scourge of such covert machinations:

Yes, while I live, no rich or noble knave
Shall walk the World, in credit, to his grave.
(II. 118-20, T. E. IV, 17)

The tone is one of warning but also points to his track-record: he has already personally seen to it that the newly wealthy who have profited by underhand means are exposed. To Burlington and To Bathurst name famous fraudsters: Peter Walter, Francis Chartres, Japhet

44 Mack gives no figures for Pope's investments in the South Sea Company; contrary to the impression given by Pope in his letters, Mack suggests that Pope might have suffered some loss of earnings, given his decision to launch two new subscription ventures, for the Odyssey and his Shakespeare, soon after the Bubble, Alexander Pope, pp. 388-89. See also Gay to Swift, 3 February 1723, The Letters of John Gay, p. 43.
46 See Isobel Grundy, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 202-09. Ehrenpreis reports that Swift bought £500 of South Sea stock but gives no account of the outcome of this purchase, II, 556-57. Williams notes that Swift had £1,000 in South Sea Stock but gives no supporting evidence, The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, ed. by Harold Williams, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), II, 114. In a letter dated 15 October 1720, Swift writes of others' losses in South Sea investments but not his own, which might suggest that, like Pope, he had had sold his stock in time, II, 360-61.
Crook, Denis Bond, Blunt, Sir Robert Sutton and Walpole himself. In *To Bathurst*, the new wealth 'raises Armies in a Nation's aid/ But bribes a Senate, and the Land's betrayed' (ll. 33-34, T. E. III. ii., 88), referring first to the founding of the Bank of England in 1694 to help finance King William's wars against France, which helped secure the nation of Holland, and secondly to Blunt's promotion of the South Sea scheme.47

Pope investigates the motives for such fraud in *To Bathurst*, speculating on the possible reasons why the directors of the South Sea Company turned to crime. Luxury, in the shape of exorbitantly-priced goods, is the most likely temptation:

What made Directors cheat in South-sea year?  
To live on Ven'son when it sold so dear.  
(ll. 119-20, T. E. III. ii., 101)

Earlier in the poem, Pope prepared the ground for this attack on the extravagance of South Sea Company directors by suggesting that the love of luxury has its origin in misplaced expectations about the powers of wealth:

What Riches give us let us then enquire:  
Is this too little? would you more than live?  
(ll. 81-83, T. E., III. ii., 94)

Without self-contradiction, Pope could regret modern financial innovations while accommodating himself to them. Pope's targets were specific: he attacked a particular kind of financial corruption and himself played no part in it. In his poetry, bribery and corruption are set against disinterestedness and independence. In his *Imitation of Horace*, Epistle II. i., modern corruption is contrasted with past vigilance against luxury, when an Englishman's values were:

To worship like his Fathers [. . .]  
To teach their frugal Virtues to his Heir;  
To prove, that Luxury could never hold;  
And place, on good Security, his Gold.  
(ll. 165-68, T. E. IV, 209)

Pope traces the volatility of the new commerce to the perfidious new practice of stockjobbing. Stocks and shares benefit a few insiders but cheat the gullible masses: 'While with the silent growth of ten per Cent./ In Dirt and darkness hundreds stink content' (Ep. I. i., ll. 132-33, T. E. IV, 289). As proof of the dangers of speculation, Pope cites financial scandals: the South Sea Bubble in 1720, caused by the greed and hubris of its directors, and the collapse of the Charitable Corporation in 1730 when its directors were found guilty of embezzlement (see T. E. IV, 289 and T. E. III. ii. 98). Apart from corrupt directors and stockjobbers, Pope made a target of another new breed of moneyed man: the crooked professional money-lender. Peter Walter, money-lender and land-steward to the aristocracy, is representative of this type, his criminal activities held partly responsible for an overturning of values. Land, once the one stable measure of things, by which a gentleman might keep his independence, has itself become as precarious as stocks and shares: 'What's Property? dear Swift! you see it alter/ From you to me, from me to Peter Walter' (Sat. II. ii., ll. 167-68, T. E. IV, 69). Criminal financial activity infects everything. The new money is made the measure of all things and its accumulation the sum of ambition:

Wise Peter sees the World's respect for Gold,
And therefore hopes this Nation may be sold:
Glorious Ambition! Peter, swell thy store,
And be what Rome's great Didius was before.
(To Bathurst, 125-28, T. E., III. ii., pp. 99-100)

Pope prophesies for the nation a nightmare vision where the reversal of moral standards achieves the ultimate bathos of such proclamations as: "'Not to be corrupted is the Shame'" and "'Nothing is Sacred now but Villany'" (Epilogue to the Satires: Dialogue I, I. 160 and I. 170, T. E., IV, 309).

---


49 See The Social Milieu, pp. 103-31.

50 Pope's note tells us that Didius was a 'Roman Lawyer, so rich as to purchase the Empire when it was set to sale upon the death of Pertinax', To Bathurst, note to I. 128, T. E., III. ii., pp. 102-03. For further targeting of Walter as corrupt steward, see Donne's Second Satire, Versified, ll. 45-104, ibid., IV, 137-43. For the inversion of values that the activities of a Walter has caused, see also Epistle I. I., ll. 77-80, ibid., IV, 285.
Widespread abuse of the new finance is presented as responsible for corruption in language: 'A Man of wealth is dubb’d a Man of worth' (Ep. I. vi, l. 81, T. E., IV, 243). The neatness of the internal half-rhyme ‘wealth’/’worth’ and the elaborate sequence of puns ('dubb’d' means both given a name and made a knight and ‘worth’ connotes money as well as merit) render the substitution of old values for new ones oddly attractive, enacting the seductiveness of the new finance and its magical powers of metamorphosis. Corruption in language results in the production of cant: ‘This new Court jargon’ and ‘The modern language of corrupted Peers’ (Ep. I. i., l. 98 and l. 99, T. E., IV, 287). In snatches of conversation between two men on the make, Pope uses the cant word ‘Cit’, short for ‘Citizen’, to indict the very society that has produced it:

BARNARD in spirit, sense, and truth abounds.
'Pray then what wants he?' fourscore thousand pounds,
A Pension, or such Harness for a slave
As Bug now has, and Dorimant would have.
BARNARD, thou art a Cit, with all thy worth;
But wretched Bug, his Honour, and so forth.
(Ep. I. i., ll. 85-90, T. E., IV, 285)

The empty honorifics of ‘and so forth’ are set pointedly against ‘all thy worth’; weighed in the balance, the rhyme shows how inconsequential such titles are and how shallow is the society that values them above true merit.

In Pope’s view, corrupt aristocrats shared the responsibility for linguistic (and, by implication, moral) corruption with Grub Street writers, who ‘scorn the Flesh, the Dev’l, and all but Gold’ (Donne’s Second Satire, Versified, l. 24, T. E., IV, 133). As elsewhere, Pope attacked a particular kind of money-making. His targets were party hacks who plagiarized to make money. When the dunces of the Dunciad accused him of attacking hack writers for being poor, his defence was that he attacked them for being bad writers. Bad writing and the poverty that is its result originate from malice, he suggests in ‘A Letter to the Publisher’ (published as part of the prefatory material in the Dunciad Variorum), since the only way that hack writers can scrape a living is by means of scurrilous attacks on people. A good

---

51 In the Dunciad Variorum, Pope attacks party hacks who are in their element in filth and slander, Book II, ll. 264-70, T. E. V, 133-34.
writer will not be poor, with the implication that poverty is a legitimate concern of the satirist when it is the product of such malice:

Not but poverty itself becomes a just subject of satyr, when it is the consequence of vice, prodigality, or neglect of one's lawful calling; for then it increases the publick burden, fills the streets and high-ways with Robbers, and the garrets with Clippers, Coiners, and Weekly Journalists. [

...]

[...]. It is not charity to encourage them in the way they follow, but to get 'em out of it: For men are not bunglers because they are poor, but they are poor because they are bunglers. ('A Letter to the Publisher', T. E. V, 15)

Hack writers, 'Weekly Journalists' (itself a pejorative phrase) are put in the same bracket as clippers and coiners, who devalued the currency.

Pope's representation of the relationship between commerce and writing is overwhelmingly negative. He attacked the commercialization of literature for producing, first, an unnatural hierarchy which made booksellers superior to authors, and, secondly, a situation where works of literature were treated as commodities. This distaste for the commercialization of book production is clear from early in his career when he mocked the mercenariness of booksellers, writing to William Wycherley of the bookseller Jacob Tonson:

Jacob creates Poets, as Kings sometimes do Knights, not for their honour, but for money. Certainly he ought to be esteem'd a worker of Miracles, who is grown rich by Poetry. (20 May 1709, Corr., I, 61)

Pope's description of Tonson's relationship with his writers prefigures his punning on 'dubb'd' in Epistle I. vi.. In Book Two of the Dunciad Variorum Pope again satirized the vanity of booksellers and the commercialization of literature in his mocking reference to 'lofty Lintot' (1. 49) and attached note about booksellers as people whose names are 'more known and famous in the learned world than those of the authors in this Poem' (T. E. V, 103). Pope probably chose Lintot because of his quarrel with him over the publication of the Odyssey (T. E. IV, 371; The Early Career, pp. 255-57). The mock-heroic games played by both authors and publishers are further used as a vehicle to assert the traditional superiority of authors to booksellers, as shown by another attached note: 'If we consider that the exercises of his Authors could with justice be no higher than Tickling, Chatt'ring, Braying, or Diving, it was no easy matter to invent such Games as were proportion’d to the meaner
degree of Booksellers’ (T. E. V, 107). In the context of such games, however, Scriblerus’ attempt to insist on any kind of hierarchy amongst dunces, whether authors or booksellers, itself appears ridiculous.

When it came to the publication of his own works, however, Pope’s response to the increasing commodification of literature was mixed. While decrying the trend, he nevertheless exploited it by fitting his works to the exigencies of the market so as to attract the widest possible readership and the largest number of purchasers. The marketing of some of his works, most clearly his translations of Homer, lay partly in their attractiveness as objects (to be used as presents), his careful projection of his own image as an author making ownership of his works a source of esteem. Pope evidently learned the importance of marketing his works for different kinds of readers from Dryden’s translation of Virgil: Winn comments on how Dryden’s Aeneid might be treated as a ‘coffee table book’ and might appeal equally to a diverse readership made up of Classicists, lovers of English poetry, theatre-goers, Jacobites and Catholics. Pope also made autobiography a selling-point, as in his Epistle To Dr Arbuthnot and his Horatian Epistles, which focus in particular on his identity as a satirist, thereby guaranteeing scandal and gossip, and the trials and rewards of being a literary celebrity.

Cultural historians sometimes seem inclined to echo the eighteenth-century lament of Pope and Swift that commerce has a destructive effect on literature. Influenced initially by Dickson but latterly by J. G. A. Pocock, studies of the period have portrayed the new commercial society as a threat to the arts since it was believed that there was a close link between commerce and corruption. In The Machiavellian Moment, Pocock describes the hostility to a credit-based economy as traceable to Aristotelian and, crucially, civic humanist values:

The advent from about 1675 of parliamentary patronage, a professional army, and a rentier class maintaining the two foregoing for its own profit, posed a threat of corruption to the whole

52 See ‘Pope and his Subscribers’, p. 200.  
53 Winn, p. 489.  
edifice, including the balance between estates or powers of which the Ancient Constitution was now held to consist, pervading it with new social types whose economic substance if not property - pensions, offices, credit, funds - defined them as dependent on the executive power and hence incapable of virtue.\textsuperscript{35}

Since the financial revolution, power in politics was not wholly confined to the government; the City, or rather, Public Credit, held ultimate power. In \textit{Virtue, Commerce and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century}, Pocock again makes the case that virtue and commerce could not be reconciled. In the past, property had guaranteed virtue by securing a citizen's independence but now, in the new society of commerce and culture, it 'was hard to see how he could become involved in exchange relationships, or in relationships governed by the media of exchange (especially when these took the form of paper tokens of public credit) without becoming involved in dependence and corruption.'\textsuperscript{36} Furthermore, the innovations of the financial revolution resulted in a fundamental change in the conceptions of society and the social personality, which were from then onwards depicted as 'founded upon commerce: upon the exchange of forms of mobile property and upon modes of consciousness suited to a world of moving objects'.\textsuperscript{37}

Pocock has had a huge influence on current cultural historians, many of whom have taken his ideas as a paradigm. John Barrell bases his discussion of the civic humanist theory of painting on Pocock. Luxury, the inevitable product of large-scale commerce, is 'the chief enemy of civic virtue and so of the stability of the civil state'; luxury also corrupts the arts, making them selfish rather than public-spirited.\textsuperscript{38} David Solkin also takes Pocock as a paradigm although he writes that he differs in his priorities, since he is more interested in studying those artists who benefited from the new commercial society than in concentrating

on what had been lost. Pope’s career demonstrates that it was possible both to lament the arrival of the new market economy and to make a profit from it.

Taking Pocock as his guide, John Brewer sets up an opposition similar to Solkin’s, between those artists and writers who opposed the new finance and those friendly to it. Brewer’s description of the cultural changes taking place centres on the effect of money on the arts:

The commercialism and modernity of the arts, the very aspects which made them more prominent, were also those which provoked most hostility. Critics like Pope looked back nostalgically to an earlier, better age, when the arts were patronized by men of taste and discernment, who broadly agreed with what constituted good art and what values it expressed. [. . .] contemporaries saw their culture as modern, not traditional, an indication that their society and way of life was changing.

Brewer catches what appears to be a contradiction in the way that writers attacked the commercialization of the arts despite the fact that, in many ways, they stood to benefit from the process. His singling out of Pope as a representative of a backward looking critic and a proponent of nostalgia is, however, misleading, since Pope had an ambivalent attitude both towards the new alliance of literature and commerce, as we will see later in this introduction and in Chapters 3 and 4, and also towards the old relationship between the arts and the aristocracy, as I will show in Chapters 4, 5 and 6.

In her study of early eighteenth-century patriotism, politics and poetry, *The Patriot Opposition to Walpole*, Gerrard also acknowledges debts to Pocock and focuses on what writers said, or believed, was the negative effect of commerce on the arts. Quoting Thomson, Gerrard comments on how he and Aaron Hill, like Pope, were ‘filled with gloomy prognostications about the decline of the arts in England, sacrificed to the commercial market-place and that “vast Temple of Corruption, under which this Generation, more than any other, worships the dirty, low-minded insatiable Idol of Self-interest”’. Gerrard comments on James Thomson’s ‘habit of quoting from the *Dunciad*’s apocalyptic ending when he claimed that “a new Gothic Night seems to be approaching, the Great Year the
Millenium of Dulness". I have reservations about Brewer's and Gerrard's portrayal of Pope as somehow nostalgic: as I will show, he was too hard-headed for nostalgia.

---

iv) Pope’s financial dealings

In *Alexander Pope: A Bibliography*, R. H. Griffith argues that Pope’s handling of money is one of the most remarkable things about him:

If Pope is not the greatest among English poets, he is the greatest advertiser and publisher among them. The conclusion of the whole matter is, that by right ways and by wrong ways Pope was a very powerful influence in developing by the beginning of the second half of the eighteenth century that ‘reading public’ in which, ever since, men of letters have moved and had their being, and by which they have lived. Thus much, to point to the significance of Pope’s business activities: the very great influence his poetry exerted over art and taste in the eighteenth century needs no comment here, being a commonplace of literary history.

Griffith’s identification of Pope’s abilities in self-promotion and self-publishing as his greatest talents coincides with Valerie Rumbold’s neat description of him as a ‘career poet’, even if he would probably have rejected this description. Pope’s projection of his self-image as a gentlemanly amateur served to disguise his professionalism.

Pope’s financial astuteness was born of necessity. He was the son of a London textile merchant so successful as to be able to retire at 42: Mack estimates that Pope’s father must have been worth about £10,000 by his retirement. The timing of Pope’s father’s retirement significantly coincides with the Revolution of 1688, and also with Pope’s birth. Apart from pure financial success, Mack points out that the political climate might have contributed to Pope’s father’s decision to retire: William and Mary’s new government’s hostility to Catholics offered few prospects for his trade as a merchant (*Alexander Pope*, pp. 21-24).

Pope seems to have learned his financial shrewdness from his father. We know from Pope’s correspondence that Pope’s father’s main investments were abroad, in the form of loans to the French government. A letter to Caryll of 23 June 1713 tells us that Pope’s family had 3,030 livres at 10% life rent on Sir Richard Cantillon’s life from midsummer 1705 and 5,220 livres at 10% on Pope’s own life from July 1707 (*Corr.*, I, 208; *The Early Career*, p. 35). This was a great deal of money, totalling, at today’s values, at least

---

65 Sir Richard Cantillon was an Irish Jacobite banker whose clients included Burlington and the exiled court: see Jane Clark, "Lord Burlington is Here", in *Lord Burlington: Architecture, Art and Life*, pp. 251-310 (p. 257). John Carswell notes that the usual rate of conversion is fourteen livres to the £1, *The South Sea Bubble*, rev. edn (first published London: Cresset Press, 1960; Gloucestershire: Alan Sutton, 1993), p. 65. Life rent is revenue or income which one receives for life. An annuity is an
£480,000 and, perhaps as much as £1.2 million. The Popes’ investments in France, however, turned out to be unprofitable, owing to the French king’s arbitrary reduction of interest rates. Pope discovered that his family’s money was not safe in France not long after he issued his proposals for the *Iliad* in October 1713. He wrote to Caryll on 9 January 1713/14:

I wish you could inform me by the most convenient opportunity how the matter stands as to the foreign affair. I suppose you had no concern in the rentes viagères. This misfortune will go near to ruin me, it being more especially my Concern than my Father’s. I shall revenge my self on the mighty monarch, by giving the more spirit to what Homer says of the injustice of kings. (Corr., I, 208)

The shock of losing a sizeable amount of his savings must have given Pope new impetus in the arduous work of gathering subscriptions. With the death of Queen Anne in 1714 and the fall of the Tories, Pope found himself in a vulnerable position as a Catholic and a Tory. The prospect of land seizures and double taxes made securing financial independence his highest priority. Rumbold has depicted Roman Catholics in the early eighteenth century as ‘a religious community which depended for survival on the continuing wealth of its constituent families’. Pope’s financial awareness and his reputation as a canny operator need to be considered in this context.

After the French reduction of interest rates, Pope went to great lengths to diversify his portfolio, looking for more secure investments. In June 1715, he wrote to Caryll to ask for advice about buying an annuity: ‘You would oblige me if you knew of any secure estate, on which I might purchase an annuity for life of about 500 l. I believe my unfortunate state of

---

See my footnote on p. 39.

67 Sherburn notes that Pope refers to an edict of the French king which reduced the interest on the debts contracted by the French government since 1702 to 4% and reducing by one-fourth the interest on French annuities granted between 1702 and 1710: Pope’s reference in the above letter to the affair’s ‘being more especially my Concern than my Father’s’ refers to the family’s annuity of 5,220 livres on Pope’s life from 1707. Whitwell Elwin notes that Pope’s fear of ruin came from a report that annuities after 1706 would be reduced by half, whereas this only applied to those dating from 1710, *The Works of Alexander Pope*, 10 vols, ed. by Whitwell Elwin and William John Courthope (London: John Murray, 1871), VI, 201n.


69 *Women’s Place*, p. 58.
health might, in this one case, [be] of some advantage to me' (Corr., I, 293). Pope's relationship with Caryll was not just one of friendship; it was a financial relationship as well. In 1710, Pope's father had lent Caryll 200l. at 5½%, again, a considerable amount of money, probably worth today at least £12,000 and, perhaps, £30,000. In the 1720s Pope's financial situation was more precarious than we might have thought, given his success in his translations of Homer. On his father's death in 1717, Pope had written to Edward Blount: 'He has left me to the ticklish Management of a narrow Fortune, where every false Step is dangerous' (Corr., I, 455). Owing to the introduction of a bill for added taxes on Catholics, he wrote to Caryll in May 1723 to ask for the loan back so that he might buy a more profitable annuity:

I see nothing but melancholy prospects for my friends, and shall be a common sufferer with you; yet I assure you, much more from my concern for the sufferings of a great number of honest and conscientious men, than from my own little part in 'em: yet if this bill passes, I shall lose a good part of my income and in this expectation I am providing the annuity I told you of, to enable me to keep myself that man of honour which I trust in God ever to be. I believe strongly you and I shall never be ashamed of, or for, one another. I know I wish my country well and if it undoes me, it shall not make me wish it otherwise. (Corr., II, 173)

Pope's attitude to the instability of his finances is uncertain. His tone is resolute and philosophical yet, understandably, betrays an underlying anxiety. The loan was eventually repaid in 1727. Against the backdrop of financial uncertainty inherent in his belonging to the marginalized Catholic community, Pope's financial success seems not merely a triumph but a necessity. His financial awareness and reputation as a canny operator also take on a new light and appear as strategies for survival, born out of common sense.

Pope is perhaps the only poet to have made a small fortune, in his lifetime, from his poetry. Other eighteenth-century poets who achieved financial success include Matthew Prior, who made £4,000 from his subscription for his Poems on Several Occasions, 1718.

---

70 This was probably the special levy ordered on all non-jurors after the Atterbury plot of 1722, requiring one-quarter of the capital of their land; a sum of £100,000 for the whole of England. In practice the levy was only asked for from Catholics. Although the collection of the levy took several years and brought in about 2/3 of what had been expected, M. D. R. Leys calls it 'a serious drain on many Catholics, as well as humiliating', Catholics in England 1559-1829: A Social History (London: Longmans, 1961), p. 119. For a discussion of Land Tax and anti-Catholic legislation see Leys, pp. 114-119. Leys dates the order for double land tax to 1692, p. 115, and refers to an act of 1717 that all Papists register their lands so that the government could make sure that due taxes and fines were paid, pp. 118-119 and p. 197. See also David Mathew, Catholicism in England: The Portrait of a Minority: Its Culture and Tradition (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1955). For further discussion of Pope's place in the Catholic community, see John M. Aden, Pope's Once and Future Kings: Satire and Politics in the Early Career (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1978).
and Gay, whose success came mainly from his plays and earned over £1,000 for *The Beggar’s Opera* and £1,200 from subscriptions to *Polly*. Pope’s money came in large measure not from original verse but from translation: his versions of Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Pope’s two translations of Homer made him about £10,000; Foxon estimates £5,000 from each. This might be thought of as the equivalent of at least £600,000 and, perhaps, as much as £1.5 million in modern terms. In his *Imitation of Horace, Epistle II. ii.*, published in 1737, Pope pays tribute to Homer in the same breath as he once again proclaims his independence:

> But (thanks to Homer) since I live and thrive, 
> Indebted to no Prince or Peer alive 
> (ll. 68-69, T. E. IV, 169)

---

74 Ibid., p. 101. Foxon notes that in 1976 the modern equivalent given for each translation was £100,000: in 1991, the General Index of Retail Prices indicated that this figure should be multiplied by 2.68 to update them to 1988, which set Pope’s total profits for both translations at £536,000. By such financial comparison, over ten years later, we might suggest a modern equivalent of about £1.5 million. Dava Sobel suggests that £20,000 would be worth several million dollars in today’s currency, *Longitude: The True Story of a Lone Genius Who Solved the Greatest Scientific Problem of his Time* (London: Fourth Estate, 1996, repr. 1998), p. 8. Sobel gives no sources: although it is likely that her figures are second-hand, they nevertheless support my earlier calculations based on Foxon’s figures as, according to her scaling-up, Pope made the modern equivalent of about £1.5 million from his translations of Homer.

It is difficult to figure out scholarly grounds for financial comparison. The general practice of multiplying an early-eighteenth-century figure by 60 seems, at first, to hold up quite well but seems inaccurately low when compared with Foxon’s calculations (we would need a multiplier of 150 to arrive at £1.5 million) and a study of eighteenth-century figures. Swift’s *Imitation of Horace*, II. viii., written in 1714 and published in 1727, begins: ‘I often wished that I had clear’ For life, six hundred pounds a year./ A handsome house to lodge a friend/ A river at my garden’s end/ A terrace walk, and half a rood/ Of land, set out to plant a wood’ (ll. 1-6, *Jonathan Swift*, p. 167). Swift’s picture of a handsome living suggests that the usual scaling-up (£600 multiplied by 60 gives a modern equivalent of £36,000) might be inaccurate, although, given his legendary frugality, such a sum might well have seemed a small fortune to him. Nevertheless, if we multiply Swift’s dream income of £600 a year by 150, the resulting figure of £90,000 seems more accurate by modern standards. In 1700 Swift had written of the ‘dismal’ living of Laracor, which amounted to about £230 a year. To Miss Jane Waring, 4 May 1700, *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift*, I, 34 and Irvin Ehrenpreis, *Swift: The Man, his Works, and the Age*, 3 vols (London: Methuen, 1962-1983) II, 13 and 97-98. A modern equivalent, using the multiplier of 150, might come to £34,500: hardly ‘dismal’. Ehrenpreis points out, however, that in Dublin at the time there were only six or seven clergymen with incomes of over £100 a year; Swift’s dismay at his salary, which was much better than average, can probably be traced to his ambition. By way of comparison, when Congreve finally secured what his biographer calls the ‘lucrative political office’ of Secretary to the Island of Jamaica, worth £700 a year, it enabled him to build up a small estate by purchase of South Sea Stock and Bank of England annuities, John C. Hodges, *William Congreve, The Man: A Biography from New Sources* (New York and London: Modern Language Association of America and Oxford University Press, 1941), p. 53. Multiplied by 150, in today’s money, Congreve’s salary would be £105,000, quite a reward for a life’s service as a party man. One of Congreve’s earlier sinecures, that of commissioner for wines, brought £200 a year, which, by the same scaling-up, would come to £30,000, making it seem perhaps overly high for what was thought of as a minor office, Hodges, p. 81. In January 1728 Pope wrote to Swift: ‘To mortify you, I acquaint you that I am a hundred pound a year richer, than when you was here; And I owe it to no Great Man’, To Swift, 7 January 1727/8, *Corr.*, II, 449. Pope’s teasing, probably concerning a new annuity, reveals the friendly financial competition that was an essential part of his relationship with Swift. A modern equivalent, multiplying by 150, might be £15,000, more than enough to make Swift mortified, considering the fact that the previous year, 1726, he had received £200 for *Gulliver’s Travels*, Ehrenpreis, III, 493-95.

The dry humour in his incidentally crediting his survival and prosperity to Homer has as its
background the fact that changes in royal, aristocratic and political patronage had given him
no other recourse but translation. Characteristically, he turned neglect into an advantage.

Before the Proposals for the *Iliad* were advertised in 1713, Pope had had just four years of
publishing his own verse: the *Pastorals* in 1709; *An Essay on Criticism* in 1711; *The
Messiah* and *The Rape of the Lock* in 1712 and *Windsor-Forest* in 1713. He made his money
from translations of Homer out of financial necessity since a market existed for Classical
translations by which he could earn a living, but not original verse. In this enterprise, his
great precedent was Dryden: in a conversation with Joseph Spence, Pope emphasized the
profit-motive in Dryden's undertaking to translate Virgil's *Aeneid* and estimated his receipts
at about £1,200 (Spence, No. 63, I, 27). Pope pointed out to Spence that the financial
success of Dryden's *Aeneid* marked a new departure in subscription publishing: 'Dryden's
Virgil was one of the first books that had anything of a subscription, and even that was
chiefly on account of the prints, which were from Ogilby's plates touched up. The *Tatlers*
were the first great subscription' (Spence, No. 62, I, 26-27). Pope makes it clear how great
a part what we would today call marketing played in the success of the *Aeneid*: subscribers
were won with the promise that an engraving would be dedicated to them, with their names
and coats of arms. The winning of subscribers was, on the whole, an exercise in subtle
flattery. Dryden, Sir Richard Steele and Pope were amongst the pioneers of this new kind of
subscription publishing.

Pope's manipulation of subscription publishing can be seen as his greatest financial
achievement. Subscription publishing in England dates from 1610 when John Minsheu was
looking to publish his multi-lingual dictionary but found no support and went on to finance it

---

74 See Penelope Wilson, 'Classical Poetry and the Eighteenth-Century Reader', in *Books and their Readers*, pp. 69-96 (pp. 82-
83).

75 For an account of how the figure for Dryden's *Virgil* must have included gifts from dedicatees or patrons see John Barnard,
'Dryden, Tonson, and subscriptions for the 1697 Virgil', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 57 (1963), 129-51.


77 For an account of Dryden's publication of the *Aeneid*, see Winn, pp. 474-84.
by means of pre-publication subscriptions. There are various different kinds of subscription publishing. One variety is the patronizing use of publishing by subscription by patrons for writers who were deserving but would not otherwise find their way into print. Such books, as F. J. G. Robinson and P. J. Wallis point out, were likely to be local concerns, examples of which are E. Pemberton’s *An Essay for the Further Improvement of Dancing* (1711), attracting 58 subscribers and Tristram Risdon’s *The Chorographical Description of... Devon* (1714), attracting 87 subscribers and Thomas Sheridan’s *An Easy Introduction of Grammar: in English. For the Understanding of the Latin Tongue* (Dublin, 1714), attracting just 29 subscribers. Roger Lonsdale comments on how the aim of subscriptions for the publication of women’s poetry from the 1730s was more often a way of rewarding a dutiful wife or mother than of launching a woman writer on a literary career.

Pope’s publication of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* belonged to another, quite different, type of subscription publishing. Robinson and Wallis describe subscription editions before the eighteenth century as predominantly ‘major ventures on the part of the publisher and printer; the subscription method was a way of assessing the possible demand and of sharing the financial responsibility’. Such subscription publication was for prestige: Robinson and Wallis comment that proposers were motivated by the ‘advertisement aspect of the list’, which was usually bound in the book. Furthermore, they stress the bankability of aristocratic names, which made subscribing a way of gaining prestige by association.

---


80 Ibid., pp. II-III; pp. 4-5.


82 Robinson and Wallis, p. II. See also Spack, pp. 47-68 (p. 50).


84 Robinson and Wallis point to Thomas Brodrick’s claim that the subscription list for his *A Compleat History of the Late War in the Netherlands* (London, 1713) was ‘the most glorious, as well as numerous, that have hitherto appear’d’, p. III.
In eighteenth-century literary subscription publishing, the most successful subscriptions were for the works of Prior, Aaron Hill and Swift, each with more than a thousand subscribers: Swift’s *Works*, 1738 (Dublin), attracted 1,033 individual subscribers subscribing for 1,340 copies; Aaron Hill’s *Works*, 1753, had 1,411 subscribers for 1,423 copies; Prior’s *Poems on Several Occasions*, 1718, attracted 1,446 subscribers for 1,778 copies. Compared with those of the big sellers, Pope’s sales figures seem modest. Nevertheless, a study of the figures in Robinson and Wallis’ survey and in its supplements reveals that, pre-1718, Pope’s *Iliad* was the second biggest selling literary work ever published by subscription, only surpassed by Steele’s *Tatler*. Robinson and Wallis list five subscription editions for Pope: the *Iliad*, 1715, attracted 574 subscribers for 653 copies; the folio edition of the *Odyssey*, 1725, attracted 597 subscribers for 844 copies; Pope’s edition of the *Works of Shakespeare*, 1725, published by Tonson in quarto, attracted 412 subscribers for 418 subscriptions; a second subscription of Pope’s *Shakespeare*, published in Dublin in octavo format, attracted 149 subscribers for 161 copies; Pope’s *Works* of 1736, published in London and Dublin in duodecimo format, attracted 233 subscribers for 270 copies in Ireland.* Foxon points out the significance of multiple subscriptions as both ‘a form of patronage’ and also a way of acknowledging favours. As we have seen, it is also likely that they were a way for patrons to stock up on presents to give to friends.

The singularity of Pope’s first subscription venture, the *Iliad*, deserves emphasis.

Although David Nokes describes the subscription edition of Prior’s *Poems*, which made

---

86 Richard Steele’s *Tatler*, Volume I, listed in Robinson and Wallis as *The Lucubrations of Isaac Bickerstaff, Esq.* (London: to be delivered to subscribers by Charles Lillie, and Joseph Morpew, 1710), published in octavo, attracted 733 subscribers for a total of 802 copies, p. 4. After Pope, the next biggest seller is John Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, a posthumous fourth edition, followed by Joseph Addison’s and Sir Richard Steele’s first collected edition of *The Spectator* then Dryden’s *Virgil. Paradise Lost* (London: by Miles Flesher, for Richard Bentley and Jacob Tonson, 1688) attracted 538 subscribers for 562 copies in folio;Dryden’s *Works of Virgil, Containing his Pastorals, Georgics, and Aeneis* (London: for Jacob Tonson, 1697) attracted 352 subscribers, ibid., p. 2; *The Spectator*, Volume III (London: for S. Buckley & J. Tonson, 1713) attracted 402 subscribers, ibid., p. 5.
87 Ibid., pp. 11-12, p. 19. The format of the *Iliad* was folio and quarto; the prices LP 14s and 25s bound; 12s and 21s stitched, ibid., p. 5. Foxon writes that the ordinary paper or pott copies sold at 12s. stitched or 14s. bound; the large paper or demy at one guinea stitched or 25s bound, p. 56. No prices are given in Robinson and Wallis for the *Odyssey*, nor for the editions of *Shakespeare* and the *Works*. Foxon writes that subscribers for the *Odyssey* paid 5 guineas for the six volumes and the price to the public was 6 guineas, p. 91. The 1737 Letters are not in Robinson and Wallis’ survey or in its supplements.
88 Foxon, p. 100-01. There were thirty-five subscribers for five or ten copies for the *Odyssey*. Foxon points out that even if they drew a single copy, they were each giving Pope 25 or 50 guineas, together they presented Pope with 1,200 guineas. Subscribers for 10 copies of the *Iliad* included Bathurst, Chandos, 2nd Earl of Oxford, Walpole and Carteret (these last two were credited with sets in exchange for their gift of £200). For further information on multiple subscriptions, see Wallis, 255-86 (pp. 261-62).
£4,000, as 'the perfect business model', Pope's *Iliad* better deserves this description. Pope exploited the commercial possibilities of subscription publishing by driving hard bargains with his bookseller, Bernard Lintot, to maximise his share of the profits from his work. Foxon points out that these hard bargains had their origin in the terms of the contract which guaranteed that poor sales still rewarded Pope while Lintot suffered disappointing profits. The publication of the *Iliad* in six annual volumes rather than in one volume meant that Pope could negotiate an especially good deal with Lintot. The printing of the whole of the *Iliad* amounted to £1,800 in addition to Pope’s 1,200 guineas for copyright, making a total of £3,000, in Foxon’s words, ‘a truly formidable figure’. Multiplied by 150, a modern equivalent might be £450,000. Since the sales of the first volume would pay for the second volume and so on, Lintot could be persuaded to pay Pope more in advance. Subscribers could also be charged more money because they were paying in instalments. Pope’s profits came mainly from the subscribers, since the price of their copies was six times more than the cost of printing. The profits from the translations gave him a reputation for financial cunning: Lady Mary Wortley Montagu observed that he had ‘Outwitted Lintot in his very trade’. All the while, Pope professed an antipathy for business that seems to contradict his success: ‘In a word, the world and I agree as ill, as my soul and body, my appetites and constitution, my books and business’ (To Caryll, (? December 1715), *Corr.*, I, 322).

Rogers has described the labour of ingratiation involved in finding subscribers. Rogers has demonstrated how heavily Pope relied on his friends to secure subscriptions for him. Pope’s greatest successes were achieved by means of his friends’ contacts rather than his own: in the case of the *Iliad*, Swift probably gained for him the Harley family; in May 1714, with the issuing of the new proposals, Jervas contacted the Duke of Devonshire and his circle as part of the drive to widen the geographical base; in June 1714, Gay obtained for

---

89 *John Gay*, p. 289.
90 Foxon, p. 51
91 Ibid., pp. 92-98.
93 See ‘Pope and his Subscribers’ and my earlier summary of Rogers’ findings, pp. 20-21. See also Erskine-Hill’s description of Caryll’s help with the subscription for the *Iliad, The Social Milieu*, pp. 78-79.
Pope his only royal subscription, that of Princess Caroline; in January 1715, Simon Harcourt's 'present' to Chandos of an advance copy prompted him to subscribe for 10 copies. The fragmentation of his original audience, owing to old age and death, forced Pope to begin again with his subscription for the *Odyssey*. Little is known, however, about how he made this subscription such a success, increasing the number of his subscribers by more than 30 and the number of subscriptions by almost 200, compared with the *Iliad*. The securing of the King and the Prince and Princess of Wales was a tremendous achievement; the King very rarely subscribed to any kind of work. Pope's edition of Shakespeare was a different case entirely to his translations of Homer since the subscription was for Tonson's benefit only: in Rogers' words, it was 'lower in quality as well as quantity'.

The identities of the subscribers for Pope's works have been fully discussed by Rogers, Griffith and Matthew Hodgart. Rogers generally agrees with Griffith's analysis of the aristocratic and official element of the list. For the *Iliad*, Rogers counts 17 dukes and 7 duchesses, 10 colonels and 2 Irish bishops; the *Odyssey* boasts more aristocrats overall, with 23 dukes and 7 duchesses, more clergymen, although less army. Pope's Shakespeare gained 9 dukes and 2 duchesses but was otherwise weak on peerage and knights, compared with the *Odyssey*. Rogers points out that the subscription list for the *Iliad* was exceptional in showing three men of 'unmistakable genius': Wren, Newton and Marlborough. A great number of major statesmen appeared on the lists for the translation of Homer. Earlier in this introduction I have mentioned the targeting of MP's: the 120 MP's for the *Odyssey* made up a fifth of the subscribers and 22% of the sitting members; there were also about 75 MP's for the *Iliad* and about 40 for the Shakespeare list. The list of MP's for the

---

95 Ibid., p. 207.
96 Ibid., p. 215; see also Griffith's description: 'The subscription list is one of fashionabilities', Vol. I, Pt. I, 41.
97 Hodgart counts 21 dukes and duchesses for the *Iliad*, and estimates that the peerage accounts for about 30% of subscribers. He also points out that a fair number of the 'Esquires' on this list 'belonged to the landowning gentry', such as Pope's friends the Blounts and the Carylls, pp. 25-34 (pp. 25-26, p. 29).
98 'Pope and his Subscribers', p. 213-16. I agree on the whole with Rogers' findings, with the exception of a few of his figures: for the *Iliad*, I counted 5 duchesses and 13 colonels; for the *Odyssey*, 24 dukes and 8 duchesses; for Pope's *Shakespeare*, 8 dukes and 3 duchesses.
99 Ibid., p. 215.
100 Rogers lists as examples of men who 'became Lord Treasurer of its equivalent': Harley, Newcastle, Pelham, Carlisle, Shrewsbury, Sunderland, Compton and Walpole, ibid., p. 217.
101 See my earlier discussion, p. 20.
translations of Homer covered the political spectrum: although there were more Whigs on the list for the *Odyssey* than for the *Iliad*, both lists contained a similar number of Jacobites. Rogers suggests that these figures for the representation of MP’s point to ‘what might be called the meritocratic aspect of the list’. Amongst other distinguished subscribers for Pope’s translations of Homer were such figures as Chesterfield, Mrs Howard and the Duchess of Marlborough and patrons of the arts Chandos, Burlington and Edward Harley. Performers, composers and a large number of Pope’s fellow-writers also featured on these lists. Rogers points out that family loyalties were very important: a number of the greatest families in the country subscribed, including what Rogers calls the ‘Churchill-Spencer-Godolphin’ nexus, the Pelhams, the Harcourts and the Harleys.

For my purposes, it is interesting that the most prominent weakness of Pope’s subscription lists was the lack of representation in the field of commerce. There were other disappointments: in the case of the *Iliad*, first Swift’s contacts in Ireland brought little success there and, secondly, the Universities were poorly represented. The Oxford colleges provided 10 subscriptions and, although Prior gained Pope many subscribers amongst Cambridge men, neither he nor Broome could persuade any of the Cambridge college libraries to subscribe. The subscription for the *Odyssey* brought Pope greater success with the Universities: 13 Oxford colleges and 4 Cambridge colleges subscribed (the Cambridge subscriptions were probably thanks to Broome, whom Pope had pressed to double his efforts). The weaknesses of Pope’s lists demonstrate as much as their strengths the labour of ingratiation involved in achieving successful representations amongst the nation’s elite. As Rogers comments in his conclusion to ‘Pope and his Subscribers’, ‘mounting a subscription was an exceedingly tricky and uncertain business’.

---

102 Hodgart estimates that about 85 of the MP’s on the list for the *Iliad* were Tory and 70 Whig, and of the peers, about 76 were Tory and 40 Whig. Hodgart draws particular attention to the generous subscriptions made by Pope’s Roman Catholic friends and their contacts, pp. 25-34 (pp. 30-31).


104 Ibid., pp. 201-04, p. 218, p. 221-23.

105 Ibid., p. 225.
To return to the profits from the *Iliad*, Pope's bargain was hard because Lintot did not succeed in selling all of his copies; the deal had looked quite fair in theory, with Lintot set to receive a return of £728 per volume against his payment to Pope of £367, the average cost to Lintot per volume for the subscribers' quartos (a combination of copyright and cost of production), making a profit of £361 - so that the returns were divided equally between them. Poor sales to the trade led to a reduction in the printing order from 1,750 to 1,000 copies for volumes II to VI and still further poor sales led to a fall in Lintot's profits, whereas the terms of the contract left Pope unscathed. Pope was given 200 guineas in copyright payment for each volume, making a total of 1,200 guineas, and control of the 650 subscribers' copies; Lintot was to pay for the engraving of headpieces, tailpieces, and initial letters as well as for their printing. The terms extracted from Lintot meant that Pope made much more money from fewer patrons than a conventional publishing deal would have allowed. Pope earned £5,320 from the *Iliad*: for this sum, a conventional deal would have required him to have found perhaps 1,000 subscriptions instead of 650. Lintot failed to recoup his considerable outlay from sales of folios to the trade. In the contract for the *Odyssey*, Lintot was to pay Pope less than half what he had paid for the *Iliad*; Pope was to be given 50 guineas in advance and a further 150 guineas for the first three and the last two volumes, making 350 guineas copy-money. Pope was also to pay for the engravings. The contract nevertheless turned out to be another hard bargain owing to Lintot's suffering poor sales for the folios and duodecimos. Where commentators have focused on Pope's social adeptness in gaining subscribers for his translations of Homer, Rogers points out that, for the *Iliad*, 'Pope's "triumph" was largely financial rather than social'.

Pope's final subscription venture was the publication of his *Letters* in 1737. Probably against his inclination, he was persuaded to publish by subscription by Allen, who had offered to subsidize the *Letters*. Allen sought the prestige associated with a subscription
edition. Pope’s letter to Allen of 14 July 1741 shows that he had probably been reluctant to publish by subscription in 1737: ‘I have done with expensive Editions for ever, which are only a Complement to a few curious people at the expense of the Publisher, & to the displeasure of the Many’ (Corr., IV, 350). Pointing out the limitations of subscription publishing in 1741, Pope both shows how canny he had been to exploit those limitations in his favour, by counting on the losses that his publishers would suffer, and also attempts to show Allen that the desire to be associated with this type of subscription is foolish. For all his success in subscription publishing, by 1737, Pope had done with it: subscription publishing had been useful to him at a transitional point in his career; beyond that point, he acted as his own publisher.

We can see Pope’s manipulation of subscription publishing as the beginning of his taking control of the production of his own works; in this regard, apart from the profits, what seems to have been most valuable for him was the notion of exchange in subscription publishing. In what was a crucial transition, he extended this notion of exchange to all his relationships with patrons. What was being exchanged in this new poet-patron relationship? Pope’s patrons received reflected glory and prestige, while he could picture himself as having a special relationship with his patrons that went beyond money. Pope’s stays in the country houses of his patrons exemplify his notion of exchange in his relationships with patrons. While Pope enjoyed for free the fine living of the nobility, his patrons had the gratification of having so celebrated a poet stay in their country houses. It would seem that a patron’s hospitality was often partly motivated by the desire for fame. This is exemplified by Lord Harcourt’s putting his country house, Stanton Harcourt, in Oxfordshire, at Pope’s disposal in the summer of 1718 for his work on the Odyssey. Sherburn notes that Carruthers records that ‘on a pane of red stained glass, in his lofty chamber at Stanton Harcourt, Pope inscribed the fact that “In the year, 1718 Alexander Pope finished here the Fifth Volume of Homer”’ (Corr., I, 484n.).

Before he could aspire to their friendship, Pope had to earn the respect of his patrons. An examination of the more tangible benefits that he gained from his relationships with his
patrons shows that gifts were welcome but not money. To a large extent, Pope's attitude towards money is characteristic of his age. People were highly sensitive to the issue of obligation, especially where money was involved. Pope shared the commonly held prejudice against writing warped by political or financial alignment, as is evidenced in his poetry. In his Epistle To Dr Arbuthnot, he lists as equal targets for his scorn 'A hireling Scribbler, or a hireling Peer' (l. 364, T. E. IV, 122). In his Imitation of Horace, Satire II. i., he proudly declares himself 'Un-plac'd, un-pension'd, no Man's Heir, or Slave' (l. 116, T. E., IV, 17), suggesting that real honesty in writing can only be achieved in the present age by means of freedom from political and financial allegiance. In addition, he was exceptionally scrupulous about obligations as potential threats to his autonomy. The loans that he took out with his friends and patrons are examples of ways in which he benefited financially from his friendships without money actually changing hands. In a letter to Caryll of 19 November 1712, after enquiring about the interest agreed by Caryll on the loan of 200l. taken out with his father, Pope writes that he mentions money only on his father's command and concludes the discussion: 'I plead this excuse for suffering any consideration so dirty as that of money to have place in a letter of friendship, or in any thing betwixt you and me'(Corr., I, 155). The scrupulousness of his tone and the niceness of his wording show how delicate money-matters could be between friends. 

In order to distinguish himself from the world of hacks and dunces, Pope took a firm stance against receiving payment from patrons; nevertheless, at various points in his career, rumours abounded that he had indeed accepted money from them. The Chandos affair was the most famous instance in his career concerning rumours about his having taken money from his patrons: I discuss this in Chapters 2 and 4. By the publication of the first Epistle Of the Use of Riches, the Epistle To Burlington, in 1731, he had built up an impressive track-record of refusing gifts and pensions. Early in his career, he refused two offers of pensions from the Whigs: in 1714, at the time when he was working to generate interest in his Iliad,
he refused an offer of a pension from Charles Montagu (1661-1715), Earl of Halifax. On 3 December 1714, Pope wrote to Halifax:

Your Lordship may either cause me to live agreeably in the Towne, or contentedly in the Country; which is really all the Difference I sett between an Easy Fortune and a small one. (Corr., I, 271)

About 1718 he refused a pension of £300 a year from Secretary James Craggs. On the score of Craggs’ offer of a pension, there were rumours that Pope had indeed accepted a present of some South Sea Stock (Spence, No. 229, 1, 99-100).

Pope’s sensitivity about gifts of money did not, however, stop him from finding ways of bypassing embarrassment and reaping the benefits: in 1725 he refused John Lord Carteret’s gift of £200 for the Odyssey by converting it into a subscription by crediting Walpole, as the king’s Lord Treasurer, with ten sets. Pope effectively turned a gift of money into an exchange. By such machinations, he could just about maintain the moral highground in rejecting Carteret’s offer:

I take myself to be the only scribbler of my time, of any degree of distinction, who never received any places from the Establishment, any pension from the Court, or any presents from a Ministry. I desire to preserve this honour to my grave.

(To Carteret, 16 February 1723, Corr., II, 160)

In 1729, Pope’s correspondence shows his annoyance at Swift’s attempts to find him a pension, especially as Swift had asked Carteret, whom he had already turned down, and George Bubb Dodington (1691-1762), later Lord Melcombe, the Whig patron whom Pope held up to special ridicule.

In 1730 Pope refused to accept £100 from Katharine Darnley Sheffield, Duchess of Buckingham, in the wake of a falling-out with her. The estrangement between Pope and the Duchess had begun with his refusal of her demand that he should flatter the late Duke of Buckingham (an important patron of Pope’s whom I describe later in this introduction) in his prefatory inscription for Buckingham’s Works. The second point of difference between Pope

that it refers to a rebuff, To the Duchess of Marlborough, 18 January 1941/2, Corr., IV, 381. See Rumbold for the rumour that Pope accepted money to suppress Atossa, Women’s Place, p. 204 and 204n.

111 See Griffin, p. 135.

112 I can find no evidence as to the size of the pension Halifax offered. It is possible that Pope’s affectation of nonchalance about money and his subtle mockery of Halifax in the above letter, while professing himself grateful, forestalled any offer. In
and the Duchess also concerned his refusal to resort to flattery: in 1729, the Duchess asked him to revise her own ‘Character’ of herself and then, when he had done so, she took offence. These were services for which she knew he would not wish to accept money. It seems that the Duchess was deliberately provoking him.

Apart from his defence of his autonomy and integrity, the care with which Pope guarded his privacy is clearly shown in his rejection of his friends’ advice to convert to Anglicanism in order to secure a place. On 8 December 1713 he replied to a letter of Swift’s which contained a proposal for giving him 20 guineas to change his religion. He mocked Swift’s proposal by asking him to set up a ‘Change of my Faith, by Subscription’, which he joked would be more profitable than a translation of Homer. Since the autumn of 1713, Swift had been one of the most active promoters of the subscription to the Iliad (The Early Career, p. 72). Referring to Halifax’s subscription for ten sets of the Iliad, Pope teased Swift by offering as proof of his acceptance of the proposal a request that Swift attempt to ‘prevail with my Lord Treasurer, and the Ministry, to arise to the same Sum, each of them, on this pious Account, as my Lord Halifax has done on the prophane one’ (Corr., I, 199). After Pope’s father’s death in 1717, Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester, assumed that he would now freely convert to Anglicanism for reasons of self-interest (Atterbury to Pope, Corr., I, 451-52). With courteous wit, on 20 November Pope replied that he still had his mother to think of and, on grounds of theology, there was no reason to change. On a worldly level, although Pope acknowledged that ‘all the beneficial circumstances of life, and all the shining ones, lie on the part you would invite me to’, he told Atterbury that neither his health nor his inclination fitted him for politics; finally, he described himself as ‘a Catholick, in the strictest sense of the word’ (Corr., I, 454). It seems strange that his friends should have

---

this letter Pope goes on to indicate that Halifax wished to give him life-long patronage – to make him ‘easie all my Life’ – but this still leaves doubt over whether a small or a handsome pension was on offer.

113 See Women’s Place, pp. 174-75. Rumbold points out that the Duchess of Buckinghamshire made a potentially dangerous would-be patron, p. 187.

114 See Pope’s letter to Caryll, 12 February 1729/30, Corr., III, 91, concerning a bill for £100 that the Duchess had anonymously sent him for unnamed services. The episode is mysterious, but Pope returned the bill by means of Bathurst, as we see in his letter to Caryll, 16 June 1730, ibid., III, 116. In previous years, Pope had been engaged in editing the collected works of her late husband, the Duke of Buckinghamshire, for which he had been paid.

115 Swift’s letter to Pope containing this proposal is not included in the collected correspondence of either Pope or Swift.
assumed that he would convert: that they so misjudged him probably tells us of the privacy of his faith, a faith that he continued to practise, even after his mother's death.116

It is worth pointing out that, at this stage in the history of men of letters, Pope was the exception among poets by not being in a servile position with regard to his patrons. Dependency was still the norm in the early eighteenth century.117 Gay is perhaps the prime example of a poet who lived in dependency throughout his entire career. Pope's career makes a pointed contrast with that of Gay, who spent his whole life chasing after places, surviving by living in his patrons' houses, first in the service of the Duchess of Monmouth and lastly with the Duke and Duchess of Queensbury. Nokes presents a convincing picture of Gay's 'habit of dependence', the weakness of his will seeming to have made it natural that he would drift from patron to patron.¹¹² Gay's friends continuously teased him about his dependency but there is a tacit acknowledgement in their reproofs that there was little chance that he would change his ways; his temperament and situation combined to make independence an unrealizable ideal.

At the opposite end of the scale to Gay, Joseph Addison built his career on dependency with great success, rising to become Secretary of State in 1717 with an income of about £10,000 a year.¹¹³ Addison's rewards were for his services to government. By the age of 24 he had found patrons in Charles Montagu, later 1st Earl Halifax, and Sir John Somers; later patrons included Charles Spencer, 3rd Earl of Sunderland and Thomas, 1st Earl of Wharton.¹¹⁴ Gay's dependence on private patrons, his only recourse on being disappointed in his search for government patronage, seems, in contrast, old-fashioned and perhaps desperate. In a smaller way, William Congreve also did well from government. His particular patrons included Charles Montagu, later Lord Halifax, who helped him to his first government appointment as one of the Commissioners for Licensing Hackney Coaches, and Sir Richard

---

116 Women's Place, p. 42.
118 John Gay, p. 480.
120 Ibid., esp. p. 34, p. 121, pp. 150-64. See also Foss, p. 139.
Temple, later Viscount Cobham, whom Congreve often visited at Stowe. Once he had made his name, Congreve lived off sinecures for the rest of his life. Edward Young gained financial support from politicians and well-known patrons, amongst them, Dodington, and was probably helped to a pension of £200 a year by Walpole. Both Daniel Defoe and Prior benefited from the patronage of Robert Harley. Defoe was released from Newgate prison by Harley in 1703 and thereafter maintained a correspondence with him; Harley’s patronage of Defoe was distant and unreliable but nevertheless shaped his career. Prior had a successful diplomatic career before he was imprisoned in the Tower on the fall of the Tories. On his release two years later, in 1716, Edward Harley took Prior under his patronage by way of thanks for his protection of the 1st Earl of Oxford during Prior’s questioning by a secret committee to investigate corruption and treason in the previous ministry. To assist him in his financial difficulties, Edward Harley and Bathurst set up the highly successful subscription for his poems, in which Pope, Gay, John Arbuthnot and Erasmus Lewis were also involved; in 1720, Edward Harley gave Prior half the money necessary to buy a country estate, Down Hall in Essex. Richard Savage found his first patron in Lord Lansdowne; from 1726 to 1730 Anne Oldfield, the famous actress, gave him £50 a year; from about 1728 until 1735 the Earl of Tyrconnel gave him £200 a year; Savage’s ultimate lack of success with patrons, however, led to Pope’s organization of a subscription for him in 1739 from which he received £50 a year. Pope was exceptional in claiming that his patrons were friends. Most artists of the early eighteenth-century were very much the dependants of their patrons.

121 Hodges, pp. 53-54, pp. 81-87, pp. 98-102, p. 104; Foss, p. 140, p. 142.
v) Satirical representations of patronage in Pope's poetry

Pope’s poetry demonstrates his ambivalence about patrons and patronage: patrons are often the butts of his satire, despite his own success in attracting patrons. In the Epistle To Dr Arbuthnot, the ridiculous figure of Bufo is a composite character, probably drawn, in part, from Halifax and Dodington:


Proud, as Apollo on his forked hill,  
Sate full-blown Bufo, puff’d by ev’ry quill;  
Fed with soft Dedication all day long,  
Horace and he went hand in hand in song.  
His Library, (where Busts of Poets dead  
And a true Pindar stood without a head)  
Receiv’d of Wits an undistinguish’d race,  
Who first his Judgement ask’d, and then a Place:  
Much they extoll’d his Pictures, much his Seat,  
And flatter’d ev’ry day, and some days eat:  
Till grown more frugal in his riper days,  
He pay’d some Bards with Port, and some with Praise,  
To some a dry Rehearsal was assign’d,  
And others (harder still) he pay’d in kind.  
Dryden alone (what wonder?) came not nigh,  
Dryden alone escap’d this judging eye:  
But still the Great have kindness in reserve,  
He help’d to bury whom he help’d to starve.  
(ll. 231-48, T. E. IV, 112-13)\(^\text{126}\)

Pope attacks complacency and lack of discrimination in the portrait of Bufo. The effect of this lack of discrimination is not only the neglect of merit and even greatness, as represented by Dryden, but the encouragement of bad writing. The empty flattery of the ‘undistinguish’d’ wits serves only to increase the patron’s pride: patronage is presented as an

---

\(^{126}\) Pope’s line, ‘He help’d to bury whom he help’d to starve’, is a specific reference to Halifax’s treatment of Dryden. Winn describes how Halifax, who had ‘once lampooned The Hind and the Panther, but who had more recently been acting as patron, helped defray the expenses of [the] first burial’, p. 512. Similarities between Pope’s Bufo and Swift’s portrait of Halifax in his Libel on Dr Delaney (1735) support the idea that Halifax was one of the sources. Pope’s portrayal of Halifax’s patronage of wits echoes Swift’s portrayal of Halifax’s patronage of Congreve: see Libel on Dr Delaney, ll. 33-38, Jonathan Swift: The Complete Poems, p. 405. In 1695 Halifax, to whom Congreve had dedicated The Double Dealer in 1693, obtained for him the post of commissioner for licensing verse, at a salary of £200. Dodington also seems a likely source, as ‘Bufo’ is similar to the ‘Bubo’ of To Burlington, deriving from ‘Bubb’, Dodington’s original surname. In a note to line 20, Butt identifies ‘Bubo’ as ‘George Bubb, who later took the name of Dodington and finally became Baron Melcombe (1691-1762), satirized as “Bubo” (Latin for owl) and “Bufo” (Latin for toad) in Epistle To Dr Arbuthnot’, T. E. III. ii., 138. In To Burlington, Taste is described as a curse which ‘Bids Bubo build’ (l. 20), ibid.: Dodington’s mansion at Eastbury, Dorset, was built by Sir John Vanbrugh, whose architecture countered that of Burlington. From Pope’s repeated use of variations of ‘Bubo’, it would seem that Dodington was one of his most important models for his portraits of corrupt patrons. For Pope’s sensitivity about Dodington, whose name occurs only in the clandestine volume of the Pope-Swift correspondence, see Corr., III, 81n. For further mentions of Dodington in Pope’s poetry see the Epilogue to the Satires, Dialogue I, l. 12 and l. 68, T. E. IV, 298, 303 and One Thousand Seven Hundred and Forty (1740), l. 55, ibid., IV, 334. See also The Political Journals of George Bubb Dodington, ed. by John Carswell and Lewis Arnold Dralle (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965).
institution that corrupts both patron and poet.\textsuperscript{127} For most of the portrait Pope laughs at follies rather than attacks vice. His image of patron-as-toad puffed up to the maximum with the shameless flattery of literary sharpers suggests that we cannot take any of this seriously, an impression strengthened by the joke that it is no wonder that Dryden kept his distance. The modulation in tone, however, in the last couplet, from droll to chillingly serious (yet, at the same time, ridiculous), reminds the reader that aristocrats' neglect of their true responsibility to the arts will be judged by the harshest standards.

Pope projected an image of himself as a poet who deplored patronage that was purely mercenary because he blamed it for producing bad writing.\textsuperscript{128} There are few mentions of 'patron' in Pope's poetry; I can only find one example of its use which is not mocking or derogatory.\textsuperscript{129} We see one of Pope's earliest portraits of poet-patron relationships in the patron-tickling contest in the \textit{Dunciad}:

\begin{quote}
He chinks his purse, and takes his seat of state;  
With ready quills the dedicators wait;  
Now at his head the dext'rous task commence,  
And instant, fancy feels th'imputed sense;  
Now gentle touches wanton o'er his face,  
He struts Adonis, and affects grimace:  
Rolli the feather to his ear conveys,  
Then his nice taste directs our Operas:  
Welsted his mouth with Classic flatt'ry opes,  
And the puff'd Orator bursts out in tropes.  
\textit{(Dunciad Variorum, Book II, ll. 189-98, T. E. V, 124-25)}\textsuperscript{130}
\end{quote}

The mock-heroic contest is a metaphor for patronage that is not just mercenary but vacuous. Pope shows the caricatured patron to be more interested in country sports than in the arts; his facial expressions, a grin and a stare, suggest low intelligence and he is so inarticulate that Dulness has to translate these expressions into words.\textsuperscript{131} The absurdity of such a figure being a patron of the arts and an arbiter of taste is underscored by a tone that warns of the dangers of such nonsense. The irony of the description, 'his nice taste directs our Operas', rests on a

\textsuperscript{127} Pope's financial independence enabled him to adopt an attitude of superiority towards those poets who were dependent on patrons for money: see, for example, the \textit{Dunciad Variorum}, Book III, ll. 291-92, T. E. V, 184.
\textsuperscript{128} See \textit{Peri Bathous}, or \textit{The Art of Sinking} for Pope's depiction of an inverse universe, where the topsy turvy is a metaphor for the corrupting effects of commerce on literature.
\textsuperscript{130} See I. 188n: tickling with a feather was a synonym for flattery, T. E. V, 124.
\textsuperscript{131} \textit{The Dunciad in Four Books}, p. 178 (notes to ll. 192-94).
knowledge of what Pope thought of opera: in Book IV of the Dunciad, Italian opera is personified as 'a Harlot form soft sliding by,/ With mincing step, small voice, and languid
eye' (ll. 45-46, T. E. V, 345). The mercenary nature of dedications merges with sexual
innuendo.\textsuperscript{132} When the contest is won by means of sexual favours, Pope spells out, in his
guise as Scriblerus, the lesson to be learnt: 'The satire of this Episode being levelled at the
base flatteries of authors to worthless wealth or greatness, concludes here with an excellent
lesson to such men; That altho' their pens and praises were as exquisite as they conceive of
themselves, yet (even in their own mercenary views) a creature unlettered, who serveth the
passions, or pimpeth to the pleasures of such vain, braggart, puft Nobility, shall with those
patrons be much more inward, and of them much higher rewarded' (T. E. V, 127). The
analogy between writing for money and prostitution, both literal and figurative, is a
conventional one, but one given special emphasis by Pope as, for example, in his Epistle To
Oxford, where he describes his Muse as 'No Hireling [. . .] no Prostitute to Praise' (l. 36, T.
E. VI, 240).\textsuperscript{133}

Given his lifelong courting of his patrons, Pope's often hostile representation of poet-
patron relationships and his mocking use of 'patron' seem astonishing. Nevertheless, it is
likely that his attacks on patrons are not as outrageous as they appear to a modern reader. In
his Epistle To Dr Arbuthnot, by making the figure of Bufo a patron reminiscent of Halifax
and Dodington, he makes clear that his reference is to the way in which, owing to the
influence of commerce, conventional forms of patronage have become corrupt:

\begin{quote}
May some choice Patron bless each gray goose quill!
May ev'ry Bavius have his Bufo still!
So, when a Statesman wants a Day's defence,
Or Envy holds a whole Week's war with Sense,
Or simple Pride for Flatt'ry makes demands;
May Dunce by Dunce be whistled off my hands!
\end{quote}
(ll. 249-54, T. E. IV, 114)\textsuperscript{134}

\textsuperscript{133} See also Swift, A Libel on the Reverend Dr Delany, ll. 21-28, where poets are compared to pimps, kept by patrons to pander to their vicious minds by means of empty flattery Jonathan Swift, pp. 404-05.
\textsuperscript{134} See, some lines later, Pope's characterization of 'Sporus' as 'That Fop whose pride affects a Patron's name', l. 291, T. E. IV, 116: Sporus, the character of Lord Hervey, was a figure of corrupt patronage: I deal with this particular portrait in connection with the Chandos affair in Chapter 4. Lord Hervey features again in Pope's Donne's Fourth Satire, Versified (1733) as 'Fannius', l. 179, ibid., IV, 41. See also Pope's minor verse composition To Oxford Upon a piece of News in MIST, that the Rev. Mr. W. refuses to write against Mr. Pope because his best Patron had a Friendship for the said P., written in 1728, where Pope mocks the terminology of Wesley and Mist's Weekly Journal, 'his best Patron', contrasting it with his own 'friendship'
Halifax was one of the leading figures in the financial revolution. In 1692 he was appointed a lord of the treasury and in 1694 introduced the Tonnage Bill, by which a loan was raised to finance the French war: the Bank of England was established by this bill. In the same year he was promoted to Chancellor of the Exchequer and in 1697 he was made First Lord of the Treasury. He was created Baron Halifax in 1700. Halifax was a patron of Pope’s *Pastorals* and his *Iliad*.135 Pope’s mockery of Halifax on account of his vanity and his uselessness as a literary critic, as reported by Spence, is less interesting for what it tells us of Pope’s opinion of Halifax than for what it reveals about Pope’s talent for self-promotion.136 Pope pictures himself reading his *Iliad* to three highly-esteemd writers, Addison, Congreve and Samuel Garth, and ‘the famous Lord Halifax’, the odd one out (Spence, No. 204, I, 87-88).137 Pope’s intimate friendship with Garth is signalled by Garth’s suggestion that he take no notice of Halifax’s quibbles, as sure enough, at a later reading, Halifax enthusiastically praises those unaltered passages which he assumes, at his suggestion, have been carefully revised. Pope’s putting the story into circulation was another publicity scheme. Brewer’s comment seems to me to miss the mark: ‘Pope may have mourned the passing of the patron but he was still eager to advertise his superiority to him.’138 There was no such thing as a generic ‘patron’ in the early eighteenth century: patronage itself was in a state of flux. What Pope was advertising was not so much his superiority to Halifax as his association and intimate friendship with distinguished men of letters and the esteem they held for him.

The uncertainty of Pope’s project to establish a culture of friendship rather than dependence in his relationships with all of his supporters, and especially his patrons, is

---

135 Halifax subscribed for ten sets of the *Iliad*, at six guineas a set, Pope’s *Works*, ed by Elwin and Courthope, VII, 4. Despite Pope’s mockery of Halifax, we find what seems to be a contradictory attitude in his *Epistle to the Satires, Dialogue II*, published in 1738. Pope names Halifax as a ‘worthy Man’ whose removal from the Court has endeared him to him, both mocking his own love for outsiders and also showing some esteem for Halifax, ‘Thus SOMMERS once, and HALIFAX were mine’ (l. 77), and, in his note to this line, praise for Halifax which is, nonetheless, ambiguous, as a ‘Peer, no less distinguished by his love of letters than his abilities in Parliament. He was disgraced in 1710, on the Change of Q. Anne’s ministry’, T. E. IV, 317.


137 Rumbold points out how valuable was Addison’s approval, *The Dunciad in Four Books*, p. 47.

138 Brewer, p. 163.
registered in his poetry. Where he could freely criticize fictional patrons who maintained
corrupt and outdated forms of patron-poet relationships, he had to tread carefully when
writing about his own relationships with his supporters. In seeming contradiction, his boldest
declarations of independence are often circumspect in tone:

   Above a Patron, tho' I condescend
   Sometimes to call a Minister my Friend
   (Epistle To Dr Arbuthnot, II. 265-66, T. E. IV, 114)

Pope's claim to be 'Above a Patron' is strangely deflated by the tongue-in-cheek tone of
'tho' I condescend' which alerts us to the fact that we should not take Pope entirely at face-
value. In the Epilogue to the Satires, Dialogue II, published in 1738, Pope's claim to
friendship with his patrons should be read in the context of Opposition politics:

   Names, which I long have lov'd, nor lov'd in vain,
   Rank'd with their Friends, not number'd with their Train;
   And if yet higher the proud List should end,
   Still let me say! No Follower, but a Friend.
   (ll. 90-93, T. E. IV, 318)

Pope's claim to be 'No Follower, but a Friend' is daring in view of the fact that he refers
here to Frederick, Prince of Wales. In stating this claim, however, he seems to be allying
himself with the Opposition, to which Frederick had defected in the previous year, which
stood by the values of patriotism and liberty. The directness of Pope's address to Frederick
in 1738 contrasts with his ironic deference the previous year to George II in his Epistle To
Augustus, which opens: 'While You, great Patron of Mankind, sustain/ The balanc'd World,
and open all the Main' (ll. 1-2, T. E. IV, 195). Frank Stack describes the phrase 'great Patron
of Mankind' as 'patently absurd' and points out that 'the "Main" was open chiefly to
Spanish raiders'. 'Patron of Mankind' is repeated from The Temple of Fame, where it
refers to the heroic Marcus and alludes to Dryden's praise of Augustus as 'The Patron of the

---

Mack comments on Pope’s restraint, mockery and ‘genuine regret’; there is no occasion for a poet to ‘rise to epic strains’ in the England of 1737.

The vehemence with which Pope declares his independence and boasts of not being a place-seeker (although we might question his ingenuousness in view of the fact that he was barred from holding a place at court or in government on grounds of religion) is matched by his assiduousness in pursuing favour with his chosen patrons. Pope saw that the greatest opportunity lay with those new patrons whose wealth made them independent, for the most part, of government. Many of his patrons, amongst them Burlington and Bathurst, were later to align themselves with the new Opposition.

---


142 *The Garden and the City*, p. 206.
vi) Overview of Pope’s relationships with his patrons

In this final section of my introduction I will give an overview of Pope’s patrons in order first to show how Burlington and Bathurst emerge as his most important patrons and, secondly, to chart the changes taking place in the institution of patronage at the time. One of my aims is to chart the shift from patron as commissioner to patron as consumer. Pope’s courting of patrons throughout his career shows how much, in the early eighteenth-century, patronage mattered to poets, in particular, when it concerned the business of forging a reputation. The poet-patron relationship, as fashioned by Pope, had much to offer both parties. Pope gained considerable benefits, both tangible and intangible, from his patrons, while they, for the most part, gained the intangible benefit of esteem. Pope’s patrons enabled him to do many things that would have been impossible without their support. The benefits he gained from them were extensive and the kind of invaluable help that could not be bought: introductions; esteem shown in the form of frequent and extensive hospitality, presents and services ranging from Bathurst’s helping to distribute the *Dunciad* to Burlington’s supplying all of the building materials for his house in Twickenham; support of his every endeavour, including in the instances of Peterborow and Bathurst, his interest in gardening; most impressively, legal protection of his work. Apart from the separate value of each of these benefits, it may be said that, taken as a whole, they helped Pope to build his formidable reputation.

If we were to draw a graph of Pope’s career, it would show a remarkably steady rise in the world: from his Catholic neighbours and Dryden’s circle to Addison’s circle to the Scriblerus Club to a broad spectrum of wealthy and aristocratic patrons. Many commentators have assumed that the steadiness of Pope’s ascent suggests assurance and ease; this is, however, not necessarily the case. He found his earliest patrons amongst the older generation of literary gentlemen, most notably Sir William Trumbull, and his Catholic neighbours, Caryll and Anthony Englefield: these were his early mentors and supporters. Between 1704 and 1705, when he was 17, Pope made the acquaintance of Dryden’s circle who often met at
Will's coffee house: William Wyckerley, William Walsh, William Congreve, George Granville, Henry Cromwell and Samuel Garth. At about this time he also met Nicholas Rowe and the painter Charles Jervas. Many of Pope's first friends and patrons were elderly and, to them, at seventeen, he must have been something of a prodigy (The Early Career, p. 47). Pope used his acquaintance with the late Dryden's circle to form, by association, a reputation for wit and elegance. In 1709, he inscribed on the fly-leaf opposite the first page of the original manuscript of his Pastoral, which was to be his first publication:

This Copy is that wch past thro ye hands of Mr Walsh, Mr Congreve, Mr Mainwaring, Dr Garth, Mr Granville, Mr Southern, Sr H. Sheers, Sr W. Trumbull, Ld Halifax, Ld Wharton, Marq. of Dorchester, D. of Bucks. &c.

Sherburn comments: 'it is an astonishing list' (The Early Career, pp. 53-54). Pope's choice of his manuscript as the place to point out that his supporters were distinguished men of letters and patrons cleverly located his poetry in the gentlemanly, amateur tradition still dominant at this time. By means of this extraordinary list, he launched his career: powerful evidence of the importance of patronage in the early eighteenth century.

By 1711 Pope had established for himself a reputation as a promising young poet and, about this time, he met the leading contemporary writers Steele and Addison. This marked a new era in his career: he contributed to Steele's Guardian, proving himself adept at the urbane and witty style of modern journals. About this time, he also met Gay, Fortescue and Rev. Thomas Parnell: that Fortescue was a staunch Whig and one of the Whigs' chief legal advisors shows that, at this time, party was no obstacle in Pope's making of influential friends. Despite his determination to keep his independence, his potential as a political writer became the main reason for Addison's support. After the cooling of his friendship with Addison, which I look at later in this introduction and in Chapters 4 and 6, Pope met the members of the Scriblerus Club, Swift, Arbuthnot, the 1st Earl of Oxford and Bolingbroke, the new circle of Tory wits and power-brokers. In October 1713 Pope issued his proposals

---

143 Dryden died in 1700. Pope never made his acquaintance.
144 In a note to Spring, Pope emphasizes the difference in age between himself and Trumbull, perhaps exaggerating a little, putting himself as 'under sixteen' and Trumbull as 'over sixty' at the time of their first acquaintance, T. E. I, 59-60.
for the *Iliad*, from this point onwards projecting an image of himself as a gentlemanly scholar and poet whose pen was not for hire. At about this time he also met Halifax (who, like Addison, attempted to bring him over to the Whigs) and the Duke and Duchess of Buckinghamshire, famous patrons from the previous era, and the 2nd Earl of Oxford and Bathurst, well-known patrons who were his contemporaries, all of whom subscribed to his *Iliad* and were important supporters of his project.

In 1714, the year in which he published his five-canto version of *The Rape of the Lock*, he enlarged his acquaintance with the wealthy, the powerful and the aristocratic, seemingly regardless of politics, including the Whigs Burlington, Charles Mordaunt, 3rd Earl of Peterborow, Chesterfield, Craggs, Richard Temple, Viscount Cobham and Carteret and the Tories Viscount Simon Harcourt, former attorney-general and Lord Chancellor, and Atterbury. In public life, if not, perhaps, in private, Pope placed an emphasis on friendship above party divisions and forged links with Walpole and his administration. Pope could also count among his subscribers George I, George II, Frederick, Prince of Wales, Townshend and Walpole. Mack writes that, thanks to Fortescue’s influence, Pope was on good terms with Walpole from the middle to the late 1720s and sometimes attended Walpole’s Sunday dinners at his house in Chelsea (*Alexander Pope*, p. 501). On 12 March 1729 Walpole effectively acted as Pope’s patron by presenting the *Dunciad Variorum* to the King.  

In 1734, Pope met Allen, who presents the strange and thought-provoking case of a friend who aspired to be Pope’s patron yet, despite his generosity, remained, in Pope’s eyes, a friend. Allen was a self-made man and one of the new plutocrats. A Bath businessman, Allen made his fortune from Bath stone, incidentally supplying Pope with much of the material for his grotto; before this, Allen had revolutionized the postal service and it was his admiration for Pope’s letters that had led to their acquaintance. His modest origins made him the exception among Pope’s friends. Although he played the part of patron to Pope, ultimately Pope denied him this status. It would seem that Pope felt that he was

undeservingly claiming the rights of a patron.\footnote{Pope’s estrangement from Allen mainly concerned what Pope seems to have considered his ill-treatment of Martha Blount at a time when she, Pope and George Arbuthnot were Allen’s guests at Bath during the summer of 1743. For further details, see The Social Milieu, pp. 204-40 and Benjamin Boyce, The Benevolent Man: A Life of Ralph Allen of Bath (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1967).} Interestingly, such behaviour forms a pattern in Pope’s life; he seems to have fallen out with those few friends or acquaintances who tried to force themselves upon him as patrons: Halifax, Addison and the Duchess of Buckinghamshire. In each case, he resisted the attempt to make him a hireling. The one close friend who tried to impose a patron’s demands upon him was Caryll; Pope judged that he was unworthy of being his patron and there was a cooling-off between them.\footnote{As with Allen, Pope appears to have found fault with Caryll insofar as he failed to live up to his patriarchal ideal. There was a cooling-off between Pope and Caryll over what Pope saw as Caryll’s insensitivity towards a vulnerable woman, Anne Cope, the sister of Caryll’s first cousin, Philip Caryll. When Caryll wrote to complain of Pope’s neglect, it made matters worse, as shown by Pope’s response: see Pope to Caryll, 2 April, 1722, Corr., II, 112. See The Social Milieu, pp. 74-78; pp. 87-92.} Such fallings-out suggest the difficulty of sustaining relationships with patrons and friends who offered support. There were mutual fears and jealousies in each relationship which needed careful handling.

This brief listing of Pope’s friends and patrons gives some support to his claim to have counted as his friends ‘the Greatest and Best of All Parties’ (‘A Letter to the Publisher’, T. E. V, 19). All of the above could count as his patrons since they all supported his poetic career. Nevertheless I suggest that there are shades of what a patron is: there are distinctions to be made between different kinds of patron. Many of Pope’s ‘patrons’ are little more than subscribers. It was to Pope’s advantage to extend the term ‘patron’ to all of his supporters: by this means he both removed the stigma of sycophancy and heightened the appeal of belonging to his readership, a privileged group of people. This strategy was, however, limited to this one specific instance, the gathering of subscriptions for the Iliad. Later on, in his Preface to the Iliad, Pope makes distinctions between friends, subscribers and patrons, reserving the highest praise (expressed in the language of obligation) to those patrons who ‘have done most Honour to the Name of Poet’. The method by which he draws distinctions appears, at first to be a conventional hierarchy, beginning with the commoners. He first of all acknowledges the support of his friends Addison, Steele, Swift, Garth, Congreve, Rowe and Parnell, whom he calls ‘Gentlemen’. He then proceeds to ‘the Great’, all of whom are...
aristocrats except Stanhope, the current Secretary of State. At this point, Pope's Preface stops reading like a list of subscribers in reverse. In his category of 'the Great', he makes a further distinction between plain subscribers and 'the most distinguish'd Patrons and Ornaments of Learning'. For Pope, as for his readers, a patron was known by reputation. Of particular interest is his yet further singling out of those patrons to whom he was most indebted as those who have best promoted his poetic reputation: 'Among these it is a particular Pleasure to me to find, that my highest Obligations are to such who have done most Honour to the Name of Poet' (T. E. VII, 23-24). Pope names Buckingham as such a patron.

Pope then proceeds to acknowledge his gratitude to well-known patrons of poets from across the political spectrum: Halifax, Bolingbroke, the Earl of Carnarvon (James Brydges, later Duke of Chandos) and Mr Stanhope. Pope then returns to the help given by his friends, singling out Mr Harcourt, son of the late Lord Chancellor. His final use of 'Patrons' blurs the distinctions between the help given by friends and that given by the Great, both subscribers and those with the reputation of patrons: 'In short, I have found more Patrons than ever Homer wanted' (T. E. VII, 25). The very nature of subscription publishing encouraged a loose application of the term; Pope's promotion of the Iliad netted subscribers by virtue of the flattering idea that any subscriber was automatically, at least, to some degree, one of his patrons, and, also, by means of the subscription list, brought into association with the Great. In this light, being Pope's patron was a cause for self-esteem and also invited the esteem of others.

In actual fact, away from the turmoil of gathering subscriptions, to Pope's mind, his subscribers were by no means his patrons: he was highly selective about who he thought deserved the honour of being considered his patron. We might also say that many of those whom we might think of as his patrons had an avuncular role and, as such, were not really, in his view, patrons; Caryll and Jervas belong to this category. Fellow writers like
Wycherley and Swift were friends rather than patrons. So also, Steele and Addison were literary acquaintances rather than patrons.\textsuperscript{148}

In the early eighteenth century, owing to the fact that poetry was still perceived as a gentlemanly occupation, Pope still had to employ seventeenth-century tactics to win favour. Harold Love describes how a seventeenth-century man of parts might rise in the world in terms of the ‘search for advancement’, whereby he might ‘place [his] talents at the service of a patron’. He adds that success ‘depended vitally on the ability to predict the future – to know whose star was rising and whose declining at court and how commodities were likely to perform on the exchange. Moreover, that knowledge had to be possessed if possible before and certainly no later than the rest of one’s community.’\textsuperscript{149} Pope was superb at predicting success in his friends’ careers: to take three examples, Fortescue became Master of the Rolls, Burlington became an arbiter of taste and Bathurst became one of the leaders of the Opposition campaign against Walpole in the House of Lords. Noticeably, Pope’s worldliness can be seen in his treatment of those friends and patrons whose influence or usefulness waned and who needed him more than he needed them: he either broke with them, as with Addison and Halifax, or distanced himself, as with Caryll and Allen.

Pope’s patrons can be distinguished by wealth and status: in eighteenth-century parlance, they were ‘the Great’. In view of the fact that, in the Preface to the \textit{Iliad}, he reserved the highest praise for them, I suggest that his patrons are to be found among the ‘Great’ who could best further his reputation as a poet: Trumbull (1639-1716), Buckingham (1648-1721), Peterborow (1658-1735), Bolingbroke (1678-1751); Burlington (1695-1753), Bathurst (1684-1775), and the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Earl of Oxford (1689-1741).

\textsuperscript{148} The evidence of this introduction clearly shows that, in his dealings with Pope and with those patrons whom they had in common, Swift’s status was that of writer, not patron. For an account of Wycherley’s friendship with Pope see \textit{The Early Career}, pp. 50-54. For Caryll’s avuncular role, see \textit{The Social Milieu}, pp. 72-102: Erskine-Hill points out that, by 1722, Caryll’s friendship and favours, most evident in his promotion of the \textit{Iliad}, had limited use for Pope. Jervas was also active in the promotion of the \textit{Iliad} and, during this time, put his London home at Pope’s disposal. Jervas gave Pope lessons in painting and Pope returned his favours by promoting Jervas in his poem, \textit{To Belinda on the Rape of the Lock}, written 1713, and his \textit{Epistle To Mr. Jervas}, written about 1715, which opens in an atmosphere of intimacy that establishes Jervas as friend and fellow-artist, not patron, T. E. VI, 156. Pope’s correspondence with Addison and Steele is friendly yet there is a distance and lack of trust which makes him the acquaintance rather than the friend of these writers. Pope denies them the status of patrons and is chary about whether or not they are his friends, as they appear to doubt his friendship: an early letter of Pope’s to Steele is familiar and light-hearted in tone, assuming the equality of friendship, 16 November 1712, \textit{Corr.}, I, 154. Writing to Addison in 1714 on the subject of the growing rift between them, Pope asserts that there are no ulterior motives to his friendship, \textit{Corr.}, I, 263.

\textsuperscript{149} Love, p. 192.
Were Pope's patrons politically motivated? He had a high value as a propagandist and publicist, yet prided himself on his disinterested, non-Party stance. Nevertheless, for all his declarations of independence, is it possible to look to politics for the reasons why certain patrons supported him? Although his claims to be above politics might, in part, account for the indeterminacy of his political alignment - born a Tory, he later endorsed the Whig Patriot Opposition - it is also worth noting that the early eighteenth century was a time of flux in politics: the formation of the two-party system was still fairly recent.

Despite the uncertainty of political alignment in early eighteenth century Britain, we can discern various political groupings in Pope's patrons. Trumbull and Allen were Protestant Whigs, as, ostensibly, were Burlington and Peterborow. When, however, Burlington went into Opposition in 1733, it was as a Tory; it is likely that he was secretly Jacobite and also, possibly, Catholic, as I discuss in Chapter 4. Bathurst, one of the chief Tory statesmen, was a Protestant; Bolingbroke was ex-leader of the Tories and notoriously deistic. Both would later play important parts in the Opposition campaign against Walpole.

Nominally, Buckingham was a Protestant Tory but his Catholic sympathies and affiliations made Pope's association with him and his editing of his collected works highly dangerous. Other patrons of Pope's associated with Jacobitism were Bolingbroke, Secretary of State to the Pretender during the 1715 Rebellion; the 2nd Earl of Oxford, whose father, Robert Harley, had directed the Jacobite Plot of 1716-1717 from the tower; Bathurst, who had been Jacobite until after the Atterbury Plot in 1722; Peterborow, by the circumstantial evidence given in an anecdote of Pope's, where Pope alleges that, in 1715, Peterborow would have been ready to be general of the expedition to bring in the Pretender (Spence, No. 257, I, 113). Excluding Trumbull, of Pope's six main patrons, all might be


151 Susan Jenkins points out that Burlington supported the Tory candidate in the 1734 general election in Yorkshire, 'Lady Burlington at Court', in Lord Burlington - The Man and his Politics: Questions of Loyalty, ed. by Edward Corp (Lewiston, Queenston and Lampeter: Edwin Mellen , 1998), pp. 149-79 (p. 161).

152 The Duchess of Buckingham was a natural daughter of James II and one of her half-brothers was one of James' main agents. See Clark, pp. 251-310 (p. 274).

153 For Bathurst's distancing himself from the Jacobite cause, see Atterbury to Pope, 15 October 1721, Corr., II, 87; see also 'Alexander Pope: The Political Poet in his Time', p. 128 and 134-35, and G. V. Bennett, 'Jacobitism and the Rise of Walpole', in Historical Perspectives, pp. 70-92 (p. 78).
counted as, to some extent, Jacobite. The subscription lists of the *Iliad* might give some indication as to how far Pope’s patrons were motivated by politics in their support of him. Matthew Hodgart detects a ‘Tory-Jacobite tendency among the subscribers’.

The new subscription for the *Odyssey* was less Roman Catholic. It yet remains only a tantalizing possibility that Pope himself was Jacobite. If he indeed had secret Jacobite leanings, it is likely that he shared the feelings of many Catholic and secretly Jacobite families living in Britain since the exile of James II who were uneasy about the prospect of Jacobite attempts to seize power and hoped that the rebels would meet either with complete success or complete failure, so as no longer to endanger them.

Jacobitism apart, those members of ‘the Great’ whom Pope acknowledged as his patrons, like Bolingbroke, Buckingham, Peterborow, the 2nd Earl of Oxford, Bathurst and Burlington, were all opposed to Walpole’s government. All of Pope’s patrons were outsiders in politics when he first developed friendships with them; Burlington is the only patron of Pope’s who had not been driven out of power. His patrons nevertheless had sufficient influence to help him in his career: they all did things for him which went beyond words of encouragement. It is worth briefly surveying the benefits that he received from patrons to see how the different kinds of help offered demonstrate the changes that were taking place in the nature of authorship and how these changes are reflected in his poetry and prose.

Trumbull, Buckingham and Peterborow belong to the pre-Revolutionary world and are part of the aristocratic, amateur tradition in poetry. As well as serving in public office, they

---

154 See Rumbold on Pope’s resolute stance against being ‘drawn into the role of Jacobite court poet’, *Women’s Place*, p. 192; see also J. H. Plumb for the suggestion that, since the Tories were tarred with Jacobitism and Catholicism, it was in Walpole’s interest to suggest that the country was swarming with subversive Jacobites, *Sir Robert Walpole. The King’s Minister* (London: Cresset Press, 1960), p. 46.

155 Hodgart, pp. 25-34 (p. 31).

156 See ‘Pope and his Subscribers’, p. 218.

157 In *The Social Milieu*, pp. 97-100, Erskine-Hill describes the ‘probably correct view that Pope was no Jacobite’ as resting on several statements that he was not ill-disposed on dynastic or religious grounds towards the Hanoverian establishment’, p. 97, found in the following letters of Pope to Atterbury, 20 November 1717, *Corr.*, I, 454; to Viscount Harcourt, 21 June 1723, ibid., II, 175; to Swift, 28 November 1729, ibid., III, 81. Aden takes a similar line, describing Pope’s ‘rejection […] of militant Jacobitism’ on the basis of his letters to Atterbury and to Harcourt cited by Erskine-Hill, p. 179. In ‘Alexander Pope: The Political Poet in his Time’, Erskine-Hill argues that Pope was not opposed to the prospect of a Stuart restoration; he further describes Pope’s dealings with Jacobite friends and acquaintances in ‘Under which Caesar? Pope in the journal of Mrs Charles Caesar, 1724-1741’, *Review of English Studies*, New Series, 23 (1982), 436-44. See also Douglas Brooks-Davies’ argument that the *Dunciad* is ‘susceptible of a Jacobite reading’, *Pope’s *Dunciad* and the Queen of Night: A Study in Emotional Jacobitism* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985), p. 166. Brean S. Hammond supports Brooks-Davies’ reading in *Pope and Bolingbroke: A Study of Friendship and Influence* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1984), p. 94. Clark describes Pope and Dryden as ‘both Jacobite sympathisers’, pp. 251-310 (p. 297). Carré is more tentative and describes Pope as
were also 'men of parts' and, as such, saw it as an accomplishment both to encourage poets and to write poetry themselves. Sir William Trumbull, the former Secretary of State to William III, was Pope's neighbour at Binfield and his first patron. It is very likely that Pope met Bolingbroke early through Trumbull since he was also Bolingbroke's patron. About 1700 the Popes moved from London to Binfield, Windsor Forest, complying with the anti-Catholic laws that required Catholics to live at least 10 miles from London. Trumbull had retired from public office in 1698 and had settled at Easthampstead Park, Windsor Forest. As an Anglica
first entrance into the world of dedications; after Trumbull's death in 1716, Pope stopped writing conventional dedications. We might contrast Pope here with Dryden, who never wrote without a dedication.161

Pope's correspondence appears to give Trumbull considerable importance amongst his patrons. Trumbull's letter of 9 April 1708 suggests that he first encouraged Pope to embark on the translation of the *Iliad*: Trumbull acknowledges receipt of Pope's translation of the 'Episode of Sarpedon', professes himself ill-equipped to give an opinion because he is not himself a poet but nevertheless goes on to express his complete approval 'both as to the versification and the true sense that shines thro' the whole'. He then exhorts Pope to continue with his undertaking to translate Homer: 'that you wou'd proceed in translating that incomparable Poet, to make him speak good English' (Corr., I, 45). Pope's publication of this letter in 1735, establishing that Trumbull first encouraged him in his translation of Homer and forming part of a correspondence which showed Trumbull the first to recognize his talent, does not initially seem to square with his decision, in his Preface to the *Iliad* of 1720, to credit the far more impressive name of Addison, who had died the previous year, as first having spurred him on to begin his labours: 'Mr Addison was the first whose Advice determin'd me to undertake this Task, who was pleas'd to write to me upon that Occasion in such Terms, as I cannot repeat without Vanity' (T. E. VII, 23).162 Pope's replacement of Addison with Trumbull in 1735 makes as much sense as his desire to associate Addison rather than Trumbull with the project in the Preface of 1720. By 1735, Pope's differences with Addison were public knowledge; by crediting Trumbull he could erase the debt of obligation expressed in the Preface and, at the same time, project an image of himself as a poet who wrote at the request of friends, thereby rooting himself in the amateur, gentlemanly tradition.

161 Pope's early styling of dedications broke with convention. We might contrast Pope's plain dedication of *Spring* to Trumbull, 'To Sir William Trumbull', with Dryden's first dedication to his first patron, Sir Robert Howard, attached to his prefatory poem for Howard's *Poems*: 'To my Honored Friend, Sr Robert Howard, On his Excellent Poems', 1660, where flattery is embedded in the styling.

Pope's final dedication for the *Iliad* is to Congreve (1670-1729). After thanking his collaborators, William Broome and Parnell, Pope concludes his notes with a tribute to Congreve:

For what remains, I beg to be excused from the Ceremonies of taking leave at the End of my Work; and from embarrassing myself, or others, with any Defences or Apologies about it. But instead of endeavouring to raise a vain Monument to my self, of the Merits or Difficulties of it (which must be left to the World, to Truth, and to Posterity) let me leave behind me a Memorial of my Friendship, with one of the most valuable Men as well as the finest Writers, of my Age and Country: One who has try'd, and knows by his own Experience, how hard an Undertaking it is to do Justice to Homer. And one, who (I am sure) sincerely rejoices with me at the Period of my Labours. To Him therefore, having brought this long Work to a Conclusion, I desire to Dedicate it; and to have the Honour and Satisfaction of placing together, in this manner, the names of Mr CONGREVE, and of

A. POPE.
(T. E. VIII, 578-79)

There is an artfulness in Pope's *il maggior fabbro* style: he writes with a modesty that forbids modesty and, in effect, promotes himself in a far more effective way than any more direct method. In his analysis of Pope's preface to his 1717 *Works*, Paul Hammond points out how Pope's rhetoric, in seeming contradiction, claims both modesty and greatness.\(^{163}\)

In view of the fact that Congreve had less claim to the dedication than most of Pope's patrons, indeed he was hardly more than a literary acquaintance, it would seem that Pope was thinking about fame rather than any living patron. Pope chose to single out a fellow-author and, most significantly, a refined one. When he wrote of the 'Honour and Satisfaction' he received from Congreve's acceptance of his dedication, we might ask what he thought Congreve's name attached to his work meant. It was twenty years since Congreve had written for the stage yet he was still generally admired as one of the wittiest men in the country. Incidentally, a further reason for Pope's choice of Congreve might have been that his retirement from writing plays meant that he was not a rival. It is likely that Pope's dedication was a way of signalling that, although he had been laboriously engaged in translation for years, he still belonged to the same tradition as Congreve: that of the clever, elegant and witty man of letters.\(^{164}\) Pope's choice of dedicatee might furthermore have been

---


\(^{164}\) Congreve had been one of the first supporters of Pope's *Pastorals*, recommending them to Tonson; his continued promotion of Pope's reputation is clear from Pope's letter to Congreve, 16 January 1714/15, *Corr.*, I, 275. Pope’s final note in the *Iliad* further emphasizes the importance of his choice of him as dedicatee, Book XXIV, i. 934n., T. E. VIII, 575. As to the intimacy of their friendship, Pope's and Congreve's letters to each other became warmer after the dedication of the *Iliad*, in later years,
Reading his dedications and tributes, what we are witnessing is the building of a reputation.\textsuperscript{166}

John Sheffield, third Earl of Mulgrave, afterwards first Duke of Buckinghamshire and Normanby (1648-1721), referred to by Pope as ‘Buckingham’, appears to have been important to him as the representative of ancient virtue. Buckingham was one of the first to praise Pope’s \textit{Pastorals} and Pope celebrates his patronage in \textit{An Essay on Criticism} (1711) where he refers to him as one of those few who:

\begin{quote}
\textit{[.. .] restor’d Wit’s Fundamental Laws.}
Such was the Muse, whose Rules and Practice tell,\par
\textit{Nature’s chief Master-piece is writing well.} \par
(ll. 722-24, T. E. I, 323)
\end{quote}

In his note to line 724 Pope shows his admiration for Buckingham’s wit by explaining that he refers to the opening lines of Buckingham’s \textit{Essay on Poetry}: ‘Of all those arts in which the wise excel,/ Nature’s chief masterpiece is writing well’ (ll. 1-2). He also draws attention in this note to Dryden’s praise of this \textit{Essay} in his Dedication to the \textit{Aeneid} and its author’s character in \textit{Absalom and Achitophel}: Buckingham appears as ‘Sharp judging \textit{Adriel} the Muses friend,/ Himself a Muse – In Sanhedrins debate/ True to his Prince; but not a Slave of State’ (ll. 877-79).\textsuperscript{167} In contrast to Buckingham’s relationship with Dryden, Pope asserts that his relationship with Buckingham is based on friendship: ‘Our Author was more happy [than Dryden], he was honour’d very young with his friendship, and it continued till his death in all the circumstances of a familiar esteem’ (T. E. I, 323-24). Judging from Pope’s correspondence with Buckingham as collected by Sherburn, Pope’s picture of a friendship of ‘familiar esteem’ was exaggerated. There is reason to think that their correspondence seems slight – only two letters from Pope to Buckingham and five letters from Buckingham to Pope – and their manner of address to each other does not go further than formal respect.

\textsuperscript{165}Congreve’s tone is affectionate as well as respectful, despite the formality of his use of the language of obligation, 6 May [1727], Corr., II, 433.
\textsuperscript{166}See Erskine-Hill, ‘Heirs of Vitruvius: Pope and the Idea of Architecture’, in \textit{The Art of Alexander Pope}, ed. by Erskine-Hill and Anne Smith (Plymouth and London: Vision Press, 1979), where he compares Dryden’s praise of Congreve as ‘the best Vitruvius’ with Pope’s command that Burlington ‘Jones and Palladio to themselves restore,/ And be whate’er Vitruvius was before’, pp. 144-56 (p. 144). Congreve is thus lineal to Dryden’s lost laureateship if right is to prevail.
\textsuperscript{167}See Brewer, p. 164.
\textsuperscript{168}The Works of John Dryden, II, 31. Buckingham was a patron of Dryden, who dedicated to him his tragedy of \textit{Aurengzebe}. Buckingham was a strong supporter of Dryden in his bid for the Laureateship in 1668.
The simplest explanation for the distance in their relationship is the difference of forty years in their ages; nevertheless, while he profited from their association, Pope had deeper reservations about Buckingham's qualifications as a patron.

At some time before 1716 Buckingham played the part of patron as commissioner when he asked Pope to compose choruses for his version of Shakespeare's Julius Caesar; in 1717 he contributed seventeen poems to Pope's Miscellany: Poems on Several Occasions (1717) and prefixed complimentary verses to the Works of 1717. In these verses Buckingham criticizes the current age as a 'censorious time,/It self a Subject for satiric Rhime', and is wittily self-deprecating about his own talents as a poet reluctant to publish again: 'after so much undeserv'd Success,/ Thus hazarding at last to make it less'. His praise of the Iliad ('so wonderful, sublime a thing') is no more than that due from all poets yet Buckingham praises the work only because he can at once 'commend/ A good Companion, and as firm a Friend.' In return, Pope wrote four couplets of praise and gratitude, first printed in his own Works of 1717 and later prefixed to his edition of Buckingham's Works (1723):

Muse, 'tis enough: at length thy labour ends,  
And thou shalt live; for Buckingham commends.  
Let crowds of criticks now my verse assail,  
Let D - s write, and nameless numbers rail:  
This more than pays whole years of thankless pain;  
Time, health, and fortune, are not lost in vain.  
Sheffield approves, consenting Phoebus bends,  
And I and Malice from this hour are friends.  
(T. E. VI, 188)

Pope appears to praise Buckingham as representative of some nobler age. We might question Pope's sincerity; it is hard to rule out the thought that this is shameless flattery.

Buckingham came from a distinguished family and might well have been for Pope an important representative of a once-great Britain. Buckingham's father, the 2nd Earl of Mulgrave, had been a member of Cromwell's Council; the 2nd Earl's grandfather had distinguished himself in the battle of the Spanish Armada and had been created Earl of

---

168 Pope's Works included two choruses that he had contributed to Buckingham's tragedy of Brutus (printed 1723).
169 Buckingham, 'To Mr. Pope, on the publishing of his Works', The Works of Mr. Alexander Pope (London, 1717), I.
Mulgrave at the coronation of Charles I. Spence records a conversation he had with Pope about the 'nobleman look' which Pope described as 'that look which a nobleman should have; rather than what they generally have now'. Pope continued: 'The Duke of Buckingham (Sheffield) was a genteel man, and had a great deal the look you speak of. Wycherley was a very genteel man and had the nobleman look as much as the Duke of Buckingham' (Spence, No. 588, I, 244-45). Pope neither wrote a character of Buckingham nor addressed a poem to him, but, about 1736, he did write an epitaph for Edmund, Buckingham's son, who had died aged nineteen. The Epitaph's closing quatrain pays tribute to Buckingham by referring to his line as a 'Race, for Courage fam'd and Art' that has long given 'Chiefs or Sages' to Britain (l. 11, l. 13, T. E. VI, 362). Again, Pope honours Buckingham's ancestry rather than the man himself, creating a distance between himself and his patron and emphasizing his formal role as a poet privileged to address the Great.

Buckingham began his career as a soldier, became a highly distinguished Tory courtier, commander and statesman, and was also a poet, making him ostensibly Pope's most literary patron. Buckingham's career reads like a rollcall of honours; once he had distinguished himself in battle, despite the twists and turns of political fortune, he always recovered and retained high political favour. It is clear that, for reasons of prestige, Pope at first wished to associate himself as closely as possible with Buckingham, as in his Works, 1717, where the complimentary verses of his friend, Simon Harcourt, celebrate Sheffield as the patron who had formed Pope's genius, imagining Pope in a triumphal procession led by 'Buckingham's Muse': 'Thus young Alcides, by old Chiron taught,/ Was form'd for all the miracles he wrought.' Nevertheless, Spence records Pope as saying: 'The Duke of Buckingham was superficial in every thing, even in poetry, which was his forte' (Spence, No. 462, I, 199).

171 Spence adds that Pope gave as other examples of men who had this look Peterborow, Bolingbroke, Lord Hinchinbroke and the Duke of Bolton.
172 Pope's reluctance to write a character of Buckingham might be attributed to political caution and to personal reservations. One possible reservation of Pope's concerning Buckingham's combination of politics and poetry is hinted at in his Essay on Criticism. Pope's description of the corrupt age of Charles II as one where, amongst other things, 'Statesmen Farces writ' (I. 538), T. E. I, 298, seems to be an allusion to Buckingham's part in the writing of The Rehearsal (1671).
We see an example of Pope's judgement of Buckingham as superficial in his involvement in the *Iliad*. Pope asked him to criticize the translation of the early books of the *Iliad*. In 1718, he also asked him for his opinion on a quarrel between the rival French translators of Homer, Mme Dacier and Houdart de la Motte. However, when Buckingham happily obliged in the form of his essay-letter 'On the late dispute about Homer' (August 1718, *Corr.*, I, 485-87), Pope took issue with him on several points. In his letter, Buckingham praised Dacier's prose translation of Homer over la Motte's verse translation of the same, criticizing la Motte for the vanity of endeavouring 'to out-do Homer himself' by means of alterations, omissions and additions. Pope completely contradicted Buckingham in his letter of 1 September 1718 by praising la Motte and calling Dacier superficial. Pope also mocked Buckingham for exaggerating the passion of the quarrel.

Having criticized la Motte for criticizing Homer, Buckingham had criticized Homer for having Hector flee at the first sight of Achilles. In his reply of 1 September, Pope showed real interest in Buckingham's remark and promised to draw up a special paper giving his opinion on the subject for when they next met, thereby giving an indication of a respect and friendship which seems at odds with his low opinion of his judgement. Pope nevertheless ended the letter by comparing Buckingham's judgement unfavourably with Peterborow's. Hector, according to Pope, could be excused for running because, first, he was sure that he was about to be killed and, secondly, he was depressed because he was supporting a bad cause; to back up his case, Pope referred to Peterborow for the circumstances in which a hero might take fright: 'But I can tell your Grace, no less a Hero than my Lord Peterborow, when a person complimented him for never being afraid, made this answer; “Sir, shew me a danger that I think an imminent and real one, and I promise you I’ll be as much afraid as any of you”' (*Corr.*, I, 492-93). Buckingham's lack of judgement is set against the common sense of Peterborow, who is also shown to be the true hero of the two of them. There seems to be something more than mere rebelliousness in Pope's fault-finding with Buckingham, who, after all, was really doing him a favour by helping to promote his *Iliad*. 
It is possible that Pope's belittling of Buckingham's poetry in his remark to Spence has its origins in his criticism of certain poetry-writing aristocrats who were, in his opinion, no more than amateur writers. In an early letter to Cromwell, Pope set out his criteria for seriousness in writing, using Crashaw as an example of an amateur: 'I take this Poet to have writ like a Gentleman, that is, at leisure hours, and more to keep out of idleness, than to establish a reputation: so that nothing regular or just can be expected from him [... ] no man can be a true Poet, who writes for diversion only' (17 December 1710, *Corr.*, I, 109-10). Pope's precedent was Dryden, who had quarrelled with Rochester on the same grounds, and had reproached Lord Dorset for laziness: "'Tis a general Complaint against your Lordship, and I must have leave to upbraid you with it, that, because you need not write, you will not."¹⁷³ In 1743 Spence records that Pope dismissed the poetic efforts of both Dorset and Rochester: 'He [Lord Dorset] and Lord Rochester should be considered as holiday writers – as gentlemen that diverted themselves now and then with poetry, rather than as poets.' Pope's mocking tone ('holiday writers') signals his disapproval of aristocratic poets; his brusqueness is such that Spence felt the need for a softening note: 'This was said kindly of them, rather to excuse their defects than to lessen their characters' (Spence, No. 459, I, 201). Pope was probably thinking of neither of these things; rather his remark asserts the superiority of the true poet over the aristocratic patron who dabbled in poetry, recalling his line in the *Imitation of Horace*, Epistle II. i., 'The Mob of Gentlemen who wrote with Ease' (l. 108, T. E. IV, 203).

Charles Mordaunt, 3⁰ Earl of Peterborow (1658-1735), appears to have been, for Pope, not merely the representative of a glorious past but a true nobleman himself. Peterborow's reputation is as a great Whig commander: opposed to James II, he had taken part in William III's invasion. Nevertheless, just before the Tories came to power in 1710, Peterborow, though a Whig, became the Tories' hero, in opposition to John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough. The previous Whig ministry had supported Peterborow's fellow commander

¹⁷³ *Discourse concerning the Original and Progress of Satire*, *The Works of John Dryden*, IV, 7. For Dryden's quarrel with Rochester, see Winn, pp. 307-09.
in the Spanish campaigns, Lord Galway, rather than Peterborow, whom they had recalled: the result was that the question of military merit became highly political. From 1707, the Tories published pamphlets and poems celebrating Peterborow’s heroism with the result that, to the Tories, he became the representative of a truly public-spirited nobleman, entirely free from the mercenariness of Marlborough: such an image must have appealed to Pope.174

Peterborow is the adventurer amongst Pope’s patrons. He is also the most unconventional, though still canny enough to have had a distinguished career. The ancient lineage of his family and its powerful connections gave him considerable advantages, although he was not, by all accounts, a wealthy man.175 In terms of character, Peterborow and Pope had quite a lot in common. Peterborow was impetuous, an impression supported by a letter from Swift to Archbishop King, dated July 12 1711: ‘Your Grace knoweth he is a Person of great Talents, but dashed with something restless and capricious in his Nature.’176 I discuss Pope’s reputation for impetuosity in connection with Bathurst in Chapter 6. In his Memoirs of an Infantry Officer, Captain George Carleton gives Peterborow’s vivacity as his main characteristic.177 Bishop Burnet describes him as ‘a man of much heat, many notions, and full of discourse: he was brave and generous: but had not true judgment, his thoughts were crude and undigested: and his secrets were soon known.’178 Pope also shared with Peterborow a love of undercover operations and hoaxes. Peterborow’s love of political intrigue is shown in the affair of the ‘lemon letters’, letters written in lemon juice in which he was accused of having betrayed to the French secrets of the Committee which had advised Queen Mary, and in 1696 in the Fenwick case, in which Peterborow appears,

175 See ibid., I, 14-16.
176 The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, I, 237.
unsuccessfully, to have tried to have used the trial of a known Jacobite, Sir John Fenwick, as a means of exposing secret Jacobites, including Marlborough, Admiral Russell, Sidney, Earl of Godolphin and Charles Talbot, Duke of Shrewsbury, all eminent Whigs. William Stebbing contends that Peterborow saw the case as a way of restoring himself to favour by shaming King William into abandoning his false friends; since 1692 Peterborow had been estranged from the King. It seems likely that Peterborow's involvement in the case was mainly an attempt to disgrace his competitors for the King's favour, in particular, Marlborough, with whom Peterborow was to sustain a lifelong rivalry. For a man of Peterborow's temperament, as Frank S. Russell suggests, the Fenwick case probably also presented an irresistible opportunity to live dangerously. As Commander-in-Chief of the allied forces in Spain between 1705 and 1706, Peterborow owed his success to his highly effective Intelligence Services and to a bravery often hard to distinguish from phenomenal risk-taking.

Peterborow was not only a great military hero but a great horticulturalist. According to Mack, he was 'a collector of botanical rarities' and introduced the tulip tree to England (Alexander Pope, p. 373). As strange as it might appear, it was in gardening, rather than poetry, that Peterborow played the Renaissance role of patron as commissioner in his relationship with Pope. In the 1720s, Peterborow, together with Bathurst, was responsible for Pope's involvement in the design of the gardens at Marble Hill, home of Peterborow's friend, Henrietta Howard, later Countess of Suffolk. Peterborow's support of Pope's designs for the gardens was perhaps the greatest service that he did for Pope: I discuss this in Chapter 6. From 1731, Pope spent weeks at a time at Peterborow's seat, Bevis Mount, near

---


179 For accounts of the Fenwick case, see Stebbing, pp. 26-42, and Russell, I, 100-17.

180 Carleton, pp. 80-81 and p. 91. See also Stebbing, esp. p. 70, pp. 78-80, pp. 84-80, pp. 94-95.

181 At about this time, Peterborow's intimacy and sympathy with Pope is shown in his having acted as an ally against Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. Peterborow's love poem, 'I said to my heart', is addressed to Henrietta Howard and names her as 'Sappho'. Pope later used 'Sappho' as a name for his derogatory portraits of Lady Mary. When Lady Mary complained in a letter to Peterborow, he, as Rumbold reports, resorted to 'Pope's favourite argument in convicting his victims out of their own mouths, "If the cap fits, wear it"', Women's Place, p. 158. See also Stebbing, p. 217. For discussion of the relationship between Peterborough's love poem and Pope's *Epistle To a Lady*, see: Grundy, 'Pope, Peterborough, and the Characters of Women', Philological Quarterly, 48 (1969), 184-200.
Southampton, helping him to create his gardens. The house, overlooking Itchin Ferry and the Southampton river, was leased for £14 a year. To Mrs Howard, he characterized the house as an antitype of the great houses of Marlborough and Walpole: ‘my palace, which has put the public to no expense’. Colin Ballard writes that Peterborow called Bevis Mount his ‘Blenheim’ and decorated his garden with old flags and cannon, which he said were all the spoil he had gained from Spain. In the Inquest into the Defeat in Spain in 1711, the Lord Keeper praised Peterborow for the way in which he accepted public thanks ‘unattended with any other reward’, this public praise also an attack upon Marlborough, who had been a rival in the army. Like Trumbull, Peterborow became for Pope an example of virtuous retirement and exclusion. In August 1723, Pope teases Peterborow for his lack of employment, owing to the current political situation, first comparing it with his own: ‘Why shou’d a man who all his life does nothing, be ash’md to write of nothing? and that to one who (thanks to the present, firm, & self-sufficient flourishing State of Great Britain) after having conquered Spain in 3 weeks, has now nothing to do?’

Most probably on account of his great affability, his legendary vivacity, his generosity and his fabulous adventures, Peterborow was loved by writers – he could count Gay, George Berkeley (who was also his secretary), Voltaire, Arbuthnot and Swift amongst his friends. Stebbing describes him as a well-known ‘patron of letters’.

---

182 Pope’s stays at Bevis Mount were as follows: 1731 visit; 1733 summer visit of about three weeks; 1734 farewell to Peterborow, August – September (six weeks); May 1736, two weeks; also October visit to finish the garden.

183 Colin Ballard, *The Great Earl of Peterborough* (London: Skeffington, 1929), p. 271. Russell comments: ‘to the honour of [Peterborough], though perhaps not as an example of his prudence, […] in a pre-eminently corrupt and self-seeking age he was a poorer man by far at the close of his public life than he was at its commencement’, I, 16. The family house of Drayton in Northamptonshire had been left to the old Earl’s only daughter, the Duchess of Norfolk; despite legal suits, Peterborow failed to secure it for himself.

184 William Cobbett, *Parliamentary History of England*, 12 vols (London: R. Bagshaw; Longmans, 1806-12), VI, 982; Foot points out that Peterborow was called home by Sunderland, Marlborough’s son-in-law, and replaced by the Huguenot General, the Earl of Galway, despite the fact that, in the Wars of Spanish Succession, they had fought as a team against France, p. 183-84.

185 Ballard tells of how, in about 1728, Voltaire was one of the guests at Peterborow’s London house in Parson’s Green. Peterborow’s fiery temper appears in his quarrel with Voltaire, imagining that Voltaire had swindled him, p. 272. Swift records his delight at how Peterborow marked him out for special attention in the midst of a distinguished company that included Bolingbroke and the Duke of Ormonde. The occasion was when Peterborow called at Oxford’s house on his return from over a year’s travels in 1713, *Journal to Stella*, ed. by Harold Williams, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948), 10 January 1713, II, 589-600. Peterborow’s sympathy with Swift’s financial difficulties during his time in London, between 1707 and 1714, is clear from his having urged him in 1711, despite Swift’s reluctance and embarrassment, to secure for himself the rewards he deserved for his work on the *Examiner*: see Peterborough to Swift, 18 April 1711, *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift*, I, 219, and Swift to Peterborough, 4 May 1711, ibid., I, 227.

186 Stebbing, p. 215.
mentioned that Peterborow protected Pope by agreeing to act as a shield against possible legal action in the *Testimonies of Authors* that precede the *Dunciad*. Pope seems also to have been able to count on Peterborow’s support for his friends: in 1735, Pope persuaded him to subscribe for Samuel Wesley’s *Poems on Several Occasions* (To Samuel Wesley, 21 October [1735], *Corr.*, III, 504). When he was in town, Pope often stayed at Peterborow’s house at Parson’s Green; Peterborow would also put his house at Swift’s disposal when he was away. Pope’s habit of staying at his friends’ and patrons’ houses while he worked on his translations of Homer makes it significant that Peterborow is one of the noblemen in whose homes Dryden stayed during his translation of the *Aeneid*; Dryden thanks him for his hospitality in his ‘Postscript to the Reader’ of 1697.

For both Pope and Swift, Peterborow was like a character from romance. Swift mythologizes him as ‘Mordanto’, a modern-day knight errant in the tradition of Don Quixote, flying from place to place despite his physical slightness: ‘A skeleton in outward figure./ His meagre corpse, though full of vigour,/ Would halt behind him, were it bigger.’ Peterborow was famous for sending couriers ahead of him and, despite having set off a few days later, arriving before them; quite a feat given the condition of the roads and the dangers of robbers and highwaymen. Swift’s playful exaggeration in his portrait is caught by Pope in his picture of Peterborow’s taming his garden ‘Almost as quickly, as he conquer’d Spain’ (*Sat.* II. i., l. 132, T. E. IV, 19). At his final farewell to Peterborow on his leaving England for Lisbon for reasons of health, Pope also testified as to his wasted appearance yet extraordinary vitality: ‘No Body can be more wasted, no Soul can be more alive’. As a parting present, Peterborow gave Pope the watch he had received from Victor Amadeus, the King of Sicily (To Swift, November 1735, *Corr.*, III, 509). As with Buckingham, after Peterborow’s death, Pope continued to do services for his widow, Anastasia Robinson,

188 See *Journal to Stella*, 31 May 1712, II, 535.
189 See Ballard, p. 92. Winn only mentions Peterborow’s patronage of Dryden in an incidental note, p. 625, n. 43.
191 I discuss this portrait of Peterborow in Chapter 6.
formerly an opera diva, whom Peterborow had met when he was sixty and she was twenty
(*Alexander Pope*, p. 373).

As something of a man of letters himself, having written a commentary on Barclay’s
*Apology for the Quakers* and annotated Burnet’s *History*, as well as having been a member
of the Society of Brothers, Peterborow set a high value on his writer-friends, as his
correspondence shows. In Spence’s anecdotes, Pope’s admiration for him interestingly
concerns his letter-writing, marvelling at his ability to dictate letters to nine amanuenses at
once: ‘One perhaps was a letter to the Emperor, another to an old friend; a third to a
mistress, and a fourth to a statesman, and so on. And yet he carried so many and so different
connections in his head all at the same time.’ Pope also compared Peterborow with
Bolingbroke on the basis of their letters: ‘Lord Peterborow was not near so great a genius as
Lord Bolingbroke. They were quite unlike. Lord Peterborow, to instance in the case just
mentioned, would say pretty and lively things in his letters; but they would be rather too gay
and wandering. Whereas was Lord Bolingbroke to write to the Emperor or to the statesman,
he would fix on that point which was the most material, would set it in the strongest and
finest light, and manage it so as to make it the most serviceable to his purpose’ (Spence,
Nos. 255 and 256, I, 112-13).

Bolingbroke (1678-1751) is the transitional figure amongst Pope’s patrons, in that he
appears to have played the parts of both commissioner and consumer. Born ten years before
the Revolution, he appreciated its constitutional advantages yet remained loyal to a vision of
England ruled by landowners, with aristocratic prerogative as the highest authority.
Bolingbroke appears the most shadowy figure amongst Pope’s patrons and, at first, it seems
difficult to account for the sway that he had over Pope. Brean S. Hammond describes their
‘friendship, bordering on idolatry’ as originating in their similar position as outsiders in
society. A. D. Nuttall pictures Bolingbroke for Pope as the embodiment of ‘reason, civility

---

192 This Society was formed by Bolingbroke in 1711 to bring together leading politicians and authors as a rival to the Whig
Kit-Kat Club, *Alexander Pope*, p. 505; *The Early Career*, p. 73.
and a high social gloss’, adding ‘surely all this could only assist his reputation’. Jacobite yet Deist, Tory yet a man of the Enlightenment, ready to pledge his allegiance to the Hanoverians yet a supporter of the Stuarts, he is a magnetic and curious figure. Biographers testify to Bolingbroke’s vitality and his tremendous ability, but, in his dealings with Pope, there is a kind of mystery that must derive from the secrecy enforced upon him by his position as one-time Jacobite Secretary of State and by Pope’s wise desire not to advertise their association too strongly.

Erskine-Hill refers to Pope’s ‘constant admiration of Bolingbroke’. Spence records Pope as saying: ‘Lord Bolingbroke is something superior to anything I have seen in human nature. You know I don’t deal much in hyperboles: I quite think him what I say.’ Pope also described him as ‘much the best writer of the age’ (Spence, Nos 274 and 270, I, 121 and 119). Bolingbroke was clearly an impressive figure and Pope’s circle appear to have had an exalted view of him. There is nevertheless some humour in their praise of Bolingbroke as paragon, as shown in Gay’s letter to Swift on the reception of *Gulliver’s Travels*. Bolingbroke ‘is the person who least approves it, blaming it as a design of evil consequence to depreciate human nature, at which it cannot be wondered that he takes most offence, being himself the most accomplish’d of his species, and so losing more than any other of that praise which is due both to the dignity and virtue of a man.’ He was of a rakish disposition, noted for his hard-drinking and womanizing, which seem to have contributed to his glamour in Pope’s eyes. From a reading of Pope’s correspondence, however, he and Bolingbroke seem to have had opposite personalities: most markedly, Bolingbroke had an earnestness, devoid of irony, that Pope attempted to emulate in his letters to him, sometimes to the point of parody.

It is hard to discover exactly what tangible benefits Pope gained from Bolingbroke: theirs seems to have been a friendship of mutual esteem. His loyalty to Bolingbroke might originally have been influenced by Swift’s admiration. Swift wrote to Stella in 1712: ‘The

---

195 *The Social Milieu*, pp. 271-72.
Secrty is much the greatest Commoner in Engld, and turns the whole Parlmt, who can do nothing without him, and if he lives & has his health, will I believe be one day at the Head of Affairs. I have told him sometimes, that if I were a dozen years younger, I would cultivate his Favor, and trust my Fortune with his.197 Nevertheless, Swift was eventually disappointed by Bolingbroke and, in some ways, Bolingbroke seems to have brought Pope nothing but trouble.198 Before Bolingbroke fled to France, on the accession of George II, he spent a few days with Pope. During this time, Pope might have received his permission to give him special place in his Preface to the Iliad: ‘That such a Genius as my Lord Bolingbroke, not more distinguished in the great Scenes of Business, than in all the useful and entertaining Parts of Learning, has not refus’d to be the Critick of these Sheets, and the Patron of their Writer’ (T. E. VII, 24; Alexander Pope, p. 507). This daring acknowledgement, published over ten weeks after Bolingbroke’s flight to France in March 1715, testifies to Pope’s devotion.

In 1725 Bolingbroke returned from exile in France and settled at Dawley Farm, Middlesex.199 Pope made frequent journeys between Twickenham and Dawley Farm (Alexander Pope, p. 511).200 His longer stays with Bolingbroke were his summer visits to Dawley in 1733 and 1734. Like Trumbull, his own early patron, Bolingbroke took it upon himself to make suggestions to Pope as to poems that he should write. Bolingbroke’s four Letters or Essays addressed to Alexander Pope, Esq., on the subjects of human knowledge, philosophers, monotheism and authority in matters of religion, were the product of their conversations, largely from 1725-35.201 The four essays are prefaced by an introductory letter to Pope where Bolingbroke takes credit for having asked him to begin his Moral Epistles. He defends Pope against attacks launched on him for his Epistle To Burlington and

197 23 February 1711-12, Journal to Stella, II, 495.
198 At the outset of his biography of Bolingbroke, Dickinson writes of ‘the fundamental instability which [he] exhibited throughout his career’, p. 2.
199 For Bolingbroke’s persona as a farmer-philosopher at Dawley Park, see Bolingbroke to Harcourt, 22 March 1725, Corr., II, 290; see also Pope to Swift on how Bolingbroke had his hall painted with rakes and spades to make it more like a farm, 28 June 1728, ibid., II, 503.
200 See also Brean S. Hammond, p. 38.
201 Dickinson, p. 162.
urges him to ‘pursue your talk undauntedly’, no matter what might be the dangers of reprisal. Such an injunction seems reckless, given the precarious nature of Pope’s position.

Bolingbroke’s writings for *The Craftsman*, which he launched with William Pulteney in 1726, can be seen as his greatest achievement. Bolingbroke’s talents were entirely suited to the noisy new age of newspaper journalism. It seems likely that his writings for *The Craftsman*, which amounted to a fifth of the 500 articles, won Pope’s admiration. Bolingbroke seems to have had three main aims in his writings: first, he wrote on issues designed to unite the disparate elements hostile to Walpole; secondly, he tried to destroy the old distinctions between Whig and Tory that kept the opposition divided; thirdly, he tried to create a new party that he presented as a defender of liberties in an attempt to ‘out-Whig the Whigs’.

Besides his likely involvement of Pope in writing for *The Craftsman*, Bolingbroke also persuaded him to use his poetic talents for the sake of the Patriot Opposition. Bolingbroke’s suggestions had the tone of commissions. It was his suggestion that Pope embark on his *Imitations of Horace*; he suggested starting with *Satire* II. i., published February 1733. Spence makes the beginnings of Pope’s Horatian imitations appear casual, quoting Pope as saying:

> When I had a fever one winter in town that confined me to my room for five or six days, Lord Bolingbroke came to see me, happened to take up a Horace that lay on the table, and in turning it over dipped on the First Satire of the Second Book. He observed how well that would hit my case, if I were to imitate it in English. After he was gone, I read it over, translated it in a morning of two, and sent it to the press in a week or fortnight after. And this was the occasion of my imitating some other of the Satires and Epistles afterwards. (No. 321a, I, 143).

Stack demonstrates that Pope’s involvement with Horace had deeper roots. The first *Imitation of Horace* ‘began as a defence of the satire of the Epistles to Burlington and

---

203 Erskine-Hill points out that *The Craftsman* ‘is still so little known, yet so important in moulding opinion during Walpole’s regime’, *The Social Milieu*, p. 269.
Bathurst, but [ . . ] became much more': the significance Satire II. i. lies in its being 'the beginning of Pope's quite conscious creation of a poetic persona, doing what Horace had supremely done before him'. Bolingbroke's proposal that Pope write An Essay on Man, published 1733-34, was less helpful to Pope's career: Bolingbroke's Deism led to suggestions that Pope's poem was evidence that he too was Deist.  

An Essay on Man is dedicated to Bolingbroke and contains Pope's lofty praise:

When statesmen, heroes, kings, in dust repose,
Whose sons shall blush their fathers were thy foes,
Shall then this verse to future age pretend
Thou wert my guide, philosopher, and friend?
(IV, II. 387-90, T. E. III. i., 165-66)

In his Imitation of Horace, Satire II. ii., published 1734, Pope plays tribute to Bolingbroke and Peterborow as 'ancient friends, (tho' poor, or out of play)' (l. 139, T. E. IV, 65). By his Imitation of Horace, Epistle I. i., published January-March 1738, it seems that Bolingbroke's pointing of Pope towards satire was one that he might perhaps have regretted. Bolingbroke is the Epistle's addressee but the poem opens with mock-annoyance at his request for verse: 'Why will you break the Sabbath of my days?' (l. 3) At the close of the poem, Pope puts an ironic spin on the famous praise from An Essay on Man:

Careless how ill I with myself agree;
Kind to my dress, my figure, not to Me.
Is this my Guide, Philosopher, and Friend?
(II.175-77)

Pope's complaint to Bolingbroke that he ought to be stricter with him is undercut by the humorous tone. Pope teases him for his over-fastidiousness and yet still regards him as his
'Guide, Philosopher, and Friend'. Pope's humorous regret suggests that not even Bolingbroke, his greatest friend, will admonish him when he needs it, such correction being something that friends will not perform.

Pope then teases Bolingbroke by mocking his philosophical ideal of the great man. After his description of the wild incoherence of his own mind, Pope complains that Bolingbroke only cares about the minutiae of his appearance, not his character:

This, He who loves me, and who ought to mend?  
Who ought to make me (what he can, or none,)  
That Man divine whom Wisdom calls her own,  
Great without Title, without Fortune bless'd,  
Rich ev'n when plundered, honour'd while oppress'd,  
Lov'd without youth, and follow'd without power,  
At home tho' exil'd, free, tho' in the Tower.  
In short, that reas'ning, high, immortal Thing,  
Just less than Jove, and much above a King,  
Nay half in Heav'n - except (what's mighty odd)  
A Fit of Vapours clouds this Demi-god.

(II. 175-88, , T. E. IV, 293)

Bolingbroke's failure to help Pope to live up to his ideal of greatness blurs with Bolingbroke's own failure himself to do so: the implication is that such an ideal is impossible to achieve. Pope's list of noble seeming-contradictions has an oddly deflating effect. The poem ends with an image of failure, which, despite Pope's leavening of wit, must have been galling for Bolingbroke. As a politician without power, Bolingbroke was essentially a failure.²⁰⁷ Swift seems to have shared Pope's opinion about Bolingbroke's shortcomings: in 1736 Swift wrote to Pope of Bolingbroke's health and fortune, adding that he was 'so long a Squanderer of both' (Corr., IV, 45). The significance of Epistle I. i. lies in Pope's turning his patron, Bolingbroke, from a would-be commissioner of verse to a consumer, whom the poet dares to tease for taking on so lofty a role as Renaissance patron.

Pope's determination to position Bolingbroke as his friend rather than his patron is shown in July 1738 when Bolingbroke returned to England to sell Dawley and was his guest at Twickenham until the middle of April 1739. At this time Bolingbroke was viewed by the

²⁰⁷ Bolingbroke would have been about sixty at the time Epistle I. i. was written: Dickinson characterizes him as a man ruled by an ambition that did not fade until the late 1740s, when he was in his mid to late 60s, with the death of Prince Frederick, p. 290. See also Pope's warning to Bolingbroke that his high ideals were impractical: Bolingbroke had urged Pope to dedicate himself solely to writing but Pope rejected this unworlly encouragement, 9 April 1724, Corr., II, 227. There is further
Walpole administration as its greatest foe. In his *Epilogue to the Satires, Dialogue II*, published May-July 1738, Pope links Bolingbroke and Walpole, giving the former tacit praise and the latter ambivalent compliments. In compliance with the times, Pope mockingly agrees to tell lies: ‘St JOHN has ever been a wealthy Fool – /But let me add, Sir ROBERT’s mighty dull/ Has never made a Friend in private life,/ And was, besides, a Tyrant to his wife’ (ll. 132-35, T. E. IV 320-21). The last line refers to Walpole’s disregard of his wife’s infidelities. Pope then brings the two together, the former as his friend (whom he has just openly praised as ‘All-accomplish’d’, l. 139) and the latter as, at one remove, his enemy in a story about a night when he, Bolingbroke and Bathurst were dining at Twickenham and stones were thrown at his windows:

What? shall each spur-gall’d Hackney of the Day,
When Paxton gives him double Pots and Pay,
Or each new-pension’d Sycophant, pretend
To break my Windows, if I treat a Friend;
Then wisely plead, to me they meant no hurt,
But ‘twas my Guest at whom they threw the dirt?
Sure, if I spare the Minister, no rules
Of Honour bind me, not to maul his Tools;
Sure, if they cannot cut, it may be said
His Saws are toothless, and his Hatchets Lead.
(II. 140-49, T. E. IV, 321)

During his stay with Pope, Bolingbroke was introduced to Frederick, Prince of Wales: the outcome of the meeting was *The Idea of a Patriot King*, written December 1738. Bolingbroke entrusted Pope with a copy of the manuscript, with a commission to print up ten copies for private circulation among close Opposition friends. Like Bolingbroke, Pope aspired to the ideal of a nonparty, national and patriarchal monarchy.208

The tensions in Pope’s friendship with Bolingbroke are made clear by two unpleasant episodes which occurred after Pope’s death. H. T. Dickinson writes that Pope had had printed a secret edition of *The Idea of a Patriot King* of about 1500 copies which Bolingbroke tried to destroy.209 Bolingbroke’s reluctance to publish was not confined to The

---

208 See *The Dunciad in Four Books*, p. 255, ll. 175-88n. In her introduction, Rumbold comments that, although the attacks on absolutism in Book IV of *The Dunciad* allude to Bolingbroke, Pope’s failure to hint at a celebration of his programme suggests Pope’s thorough disillusion, p. 11.

209 Dickinson, pp. 280-81.
Idea of a Patriot King: his Letters on the Study and Use of History had been written in 1735 but it was not until 1738 that Pope managed to persuade Bolingbroke to let him have several copies printed from the original manuscript to circulate among Bolingbroke’s intimate friends. Bolingbroke’s attitude towards the publication of his own works contrasts sharply with Pope’s. In January 1749 The London Magazine began a serialisation of The Idea of a Patriot King, which forced Bolingbroke to publish an official version. In his Advertisement he accused Pope of a breach of trust and of altering the text without permission; his accusations were seen as in poor taste by Spence and William Warburton. To make matters worse, entrusted with Pope’s papers, Bolingbroke took offence at Pope’s portrait of ‘Atossa’, believing it to be a malicious and ungrateful attack on his old patroness, Sarah Churchill, Duchess of Marlborough. Rumbold comments: ‘It was a cruel irony that Bolingbroke’s assumption, after the poet’s death, that “Atossa” represented a betrayal of her generosity should have provided so bitter an epilogue to the relationship.’

Bolingbroke’s pique at what he saw as Pope’s duplicity probably betrays a certain rigidity in his view of their relationship; it seems likely that he had expected a loyalty and obedience from Pope that was indistinguishable from the old deference that a poet was expected to show his patron. Where Bolingbroke still, to a large extent, had played the role of patron as commissioner of works, Pope’s relationships with younger patrons demonstrate the shift from patron as commissioner to consumer, from a world governed by dedications and deference to one fashioned by Pope in terms of exchange and equality.

Burlington, Bathurst and the 2nd Earl of Oxford played a more dynamic part in Pope’s life and poetic career than the earlier patrons in this survey. None wrote poetry themselves but they encouraged poets. Most importantly, they lacked Bolingbroke’s qualms about the new print culture: all were involved in the publication of Pope’s works and gave vital assistance

210 Ibid., p. 250. Events proved right Pope’s perception that The Idea of a Patriot King was Bolingbroke’s most powerful work. Dickinson argues that the success of the Opposition in bringing about Walpole’s fall came from its appropriation of Bolingbroke’s archetype of the Patriot King. Had Bolingbroke acted on Pope’s insight and gone ahead with publication, he might perhaps have achieved some real success in his political career, pp. 258-264.


212 Women’s Place, p. 207. See also Alexander Pope, pp. 746-50.
in his legal and financial affairs; Burlington himself undertook the publishing of his own works on architecture; Oxford was an obsessive bibliophile and established the greatest collection of books in the country, the Harleian Library.

Edward Harley, 2nd Earl of Oxford (1689-1741), was the son of Robert Harley, the former first minister. Like his father, the 2nd Earl of Oxford was a bookish aristocrat; where he differed was in his lack of real political ambition. In 1707 he married Henrietta Cavendish Holles, the only child of the Duke of Newcastle; a measure of the brilliance of the match is the rumour that she was once about to be betrothed to the Electoral Prince of Hanover, the future George II. The marriage was the result of the 1st Earl’s ambitious match-making. Thanks to his wife’s fortune, the 2nd Earl of Oxford’s library at Wimpole became one of the finest in the country, run by his formidable librarian, Humphrey Wanley.213

Oxford’s library proved very useful for Pope on several counts: first, as an aid for his publications, secondly, for the specific purpose of protecting his work and thirdly, as an invaluable part of his strategy for publishing his letters without being accused of vanity.214 On this last count, the first instance was the matter of Wycherley’s papers. In 1729, Pope persuaded Oxford to allow Wycherley’s papers to be deposited in the Harleian Library and subsequently named him as the publisher of The Posthumous Works of William Wycherley, Esq., Vol. II. Pope had written to Oxford about having forseen ‘some dirty Trick in relation to my Friend Wycherley’s papers which they were publishing’, expressing a desire first to secure the papers and, secondly, to have them published by Oxford in order to do justice to ‘the Memory of a Man, to whom I had the first obligations of Friendship, almost in my childhood’ (To Oxford, 6 October 1729, Corr., III, 56). Oxford generously agreed to the

213 For Oxford’s absorption in collecting, see British Library, Add. MS 70470 for his letters to Wanley about their purchases, esp. his letter of 19 March 1716/17, ibid., which shows Oxford’s anti-Oxford and Cambridge stance in the wake of his failure to secure certain books from their colleges. His postscript to his letter of 28 June 1718 reveals his expensive taste, ‘I would have no printed Books bought but what extremely good & rare’, ibid. See also his letters about his collection of coins and medals, 18 December 1715, BL, Add. MS 70469, and 10 May 1717, BL, Add. MS 70470. For Oxford’s dealings via Wanley with particular agents in the book trade, see his letters of 16 June 1718, BL, Add. MS 70470, and 4 December 1720, BL, Add. MS 70471. For Oxford’s affectionate concern for Wanley, see his letter of 1 August 1721 where he chides Wanley for not informing him of the desperate state of his finances, BL, Add. MS 70471; see also his letter of condolence of 4 January 1721/22 and his letters enquiring about Wanley’s health, esp. those dated 8 March 1721/2, 24 September 1724 and 29 September 1724, ibid.

214 See Kernan for a description of the library, pp. 255-56.
proposal, allowing Pope to claim that he had released Wycherley’s papers without Pope’s consent.215 After Pope’s publication of Wycherley’s Works, he continued to deposit letters in the library, where Oxford’s scribes made transcripts of them.216 The second phase of Pope’s surreptitious publication of his letters began in 1735 when, under the alias ‘P. T.’, Pope sent some of the letters to Edmund Curll, again claiming that they had been released for publication by Oxford, without his consent. Curll published the letters in 1735, prompting Pope’s own publication of his letters in 1737.217

Pope’s use of Oxford’s library for the protection of his work concerned the copyright of the Dunciad. In 1728 Oxford’s amanuenses made copies of the Dunciad for him. Love describes this activity as evidence of Pope’s awareness of the danger that a text in uncontrolled circulation could be ‘piratically propelled into print’.218 Apart from the possibility that copies of the works made were kept in the Harleian library as some kind of safeguard against piracy, Pope most likely asked Oxford to set his amanuenses to work for him purely for convenience. Pope asked for these favours with a charm and intimacy that brought him still greater familiarity with Oxford: ‘I have reason to be ashamed of the trouble I have given you, & the Employment even of your Amanuensis, who has so many better things to do with your own papers. I will not send the next book [Book II of the Dunciad] till next week, and hope about that time to have the pleasure of waiting on you myself, to thank your Lordship for the kind favour you did me here, & those you are continuing to do me, daily’ (17 July 1728, Corr., II, 506).

215 See Sherburn for a description of how Pope’s strategy for publishing his letters worked: ‘If the letters were deposited there, if two or three of Lord Oxford’s amanuenses were employed from time to time to copy them, the public might easily believe that some transcripts had got out of Pope’s control, into the hands of the enterprising Curll, and so were published. Lord Oxford cooperated in this scheme, and it is fair to assume that after 1729 he must have known what Pope’s plans were with regard to publication. In November, 1729, Pope writing to Swift about the Wycherley letters, which had just been printed (by Pope!) in the second volume of Wycherley’s Posthumous Works, says that “the booksellers have got and printed [them], not without the concurrence of a noble friend of mine and yours”’, ‘Pope’s Letters and the Harleian Library’, A Journal of English Literary History, 7 (1940), 177-87 (p. 178).

216 Sherburn’s ‘high confidence’ in the transcripts from Oxford’s library is a testimony to the considerable care taken by Oxford and his scribes, Corr., I, pp. xii-xiii. In ‘Pope’s Letters and the Harleian Library’, Sherburn also points out that ‘the minute nature of many corrections shows Oxford’s extreme care’ and has no doubt that the transcripts are ‘in most cases as careful as transcripts are ever likely to be’, p. 179 and p. 181.

217 Pope’s decision to use Oxford’s library to deposit manuscripts was a reaction to Curll’s publication of his letters to Henry Cromwell in 1726 and Theobald’s bringing out in 1728 of poems by Wycherley which Pope had advised him not to publish. For a history of this episode see Sherburn, Corr., I, pp. xii-xv, see also Foxon, p. 131.

218 Love, p. 72.
Pope wrote an enormous number of letters to Oxford but most are brief requests for favours and written quite plainly as seems to have suited Oxford, whose own epistolary style was straightforward. The impression gained from their correspondence is that Pope could always rely on Oxford's readiness to grant his requests. It is not certain that Pope ever visited Oxford's seat, Wimpole, but he appears to have stayed at Down Hall, the house that Oxford had helped Prior buy.\(^{219}\) As to presents, Oxford often sent a collar of brawn and, in 1727, for Christmas gave Pope a gold cup and salver (Corr., II, 268, 270, 465, 470; III, 78, 83, 245, 267, 334). Oxford was probably especially generous to Pope because of Pope's having known his father, the 1st Earl; in a similar way, it is likely that Pope's admiration for the 1st Earl kept him loyal to his son. Swift's loyalty to the 2nd Earl was also probably motivated by respect for the 1st Earl's memory. But where Swift had loved the 1st Earl of Oxford, and sought to transfer that love to his son, Pope had merely admired the 1st Earl and maintained a distance in his friendship with the 2nd Earl. In December 1721, while the 1st Earl of Oxford was imprisoned in the tower, Edward Harley acted as an intermediary for Pope's Epistle To Oxford, published as a prefix to his edition of Parnell's poems. On the 1st Earl's death, Pope wrote to the 2nd Earl: 'No man honour'd the last Earl of Oxford more; no man loves the present better' (22 May 1724, Corr., II, 233). More than anything else, the 2nd Earl of Oxford may be characterised as a devoted son. The 1st Earl of Oxford always expressed the most tender affection for his son as well as the greatest solicitude: his letters suggest his suspicions as to the weakness of his son's character.\(^{220}\) This mixture of love and fearfulness bound his son to him in complete loyalty, obedience and respect, but also created an emotional dependency which appears to have left him bereft on his father's death.\(^{221}\) With

\(^{219}\) Rippy, p. 39.

\(^{220}\) See BL, Add. MS 70382 for the 1st Earl of Oxford's letters to his son, esp. those dated 24 May 1709, f. 15, 9 September 1713, ff. 22-23, 24 October 1713, ff. 38-39, 25 November 1714, ff. 79-80, 22 March 1714/15, ff. 130-31, [217] March 1715, f. 132, 1 January 1716/17, f. 139, 31 December 1717, f. 162, 14 April 1719, f. 198, 14 July 1719, f. 201; see also BL, Add. MS 70383, esp. those letters dated 10 March 1719/20, ff. 3-4, 2 April 1720, f. 5, 19 January 1721/2, ff. 80-81, 28 January 1721/2, f. 83, 3 April 1722, f. 98. See also the 1st Earl of Oxford's particularly touching letter of advice on his son's first term at university, dated 29 October 1707, BL, Add. MS 70237.

\(^{221}\) See the 2nd Earl's letters to his father, esp.: 1 March 1719/20, 27 March 1720, 25 July 1720, 18 July 1721, 24 January 1721/2, 27 January 1721/2, 3 February 1721/2, 3 April 1722, BL, Add. MS 70237.
the death of his father in 1724, followed in 1726 by the death of his librarian, Wanley, the 2nd Earl began to go adrift, showing a gargantuan extravagance that exhausted his wife's great fortune and brought him into terrible debt. He died in 1741, aged 52. In 1743 his famous library was sold. The manuscripts collection formed the core of what is now the British Library.

Although Pope did not address a poem to Oxford, he praised him in To Bathurst, which I discuss in Chapter 5. Pope's note omits all mention of his extravagance and acknowledges his generosity: 'This Nobleman died regretted by all men of letters, great numbers of whom had experienc'd his benefits'. Pope also praised the Harleian library in this note, calling it 'one of the most noble Libraries in Europe' (To Bathurst, l. 243n., T. E. III. ii., 112).

Oxford's ruin casts a new light on Pope's Epistles Of the Use of Riches, with their emphasis on the responsibilities incurred by the wealthy; the restraint in the above note about Oxford's death might hint at Pope's own failure to guide Oxford towards a better use of his wealth.

Pope's persuasion of Burlington, Bathurst and Oxford to act as publishers of the Dunciad Variorum of 1729 is, I think, the clearest example of how, even after he had achieved financial independence, Pope still needed his patrons. It also shows how far poet-patron relationships had come, that he could ask his patrons to act simultaneously as publishers and protectors of his work. Closely involved as he was in Pope's battles against his pirates and rival booksellers, Oxford wrote to Pope on 27 May 1728 to warn him that Curll had advertised a 'Key' to the Dunciad and adding 'I wish the True one was come out' (Corr., II, 496). Pope responded by working on the variorum edition, using footnotes to explain some but not all of its hidden meanings (see Corr., II, 502n.). Foxon writes that it is likely that he had intended to publish the Dunciad Variorum by the end of 1728. Delays meant that by the end of the year he wrote to Burlington to express the fears of himself, his

printer, John Wright, and his publisher, Lawton Gilliver, 'lest if the Printer & Publisher be found, any [legal] Action could be brought'. After the banning of Polly, Gay's sequel to The Beggar's Opera, Pope was keen to distance himself from Gay: '[...] I am grown more Prudent than ever, the less I think others so' (Corr., III, 3-4). Burlington arranged for Pope to consult his lawyer, Nicholas Fazakerley, and, from this point onwards, Pope made sure that Burlington, Oxford and Bathurst were closely involved in the publication of the poem.

After the quarto edition of the poem had been presented to the King and Queen by Walpole on 12 March, Burlington, Oxford and Bathurst circulated it privately, as Foxon says, 'on the assumption that no Dunce would dare to bring their lordships to a court of law for publishing it.' Pope then asked Oxford 'to send about 20 books to Cambridge, but by no means to be given to any Bookseller, but disposed of as by your own Order at 6s. by any honest Gentleman or Head of a House' (27 March [1729], Corr., III, 26). On 8 April Pope wrote to Caryll to say 'I understand that now the booksellers have got 'em by the consent of Lord Bathurst' (Corr., III, 31). Two days later the edition was advertised in the press with Gilliver as publisher. The day after Gilliver's publication of the octavo, 18 April, Pope wrote to Oxford to ask him to sign, along with Burlington and Bathurst, a certificate accompanying it, on the grounds that Gilliver had refused to bring out a second edition without further protection (Corr., III, 31n.).

Burlington's letter to Pope of 2 November 1729, enclosing the signed indenture, gives an indication of the trust and ease of their relationship:

enclosed I send you the paper which I signed with that pleasure, that I shall always take, in every thing where I can be of the least use to you. I am very sorry to find your cold continues, I hope you keep warm, which I take to be the only remedy in this dismal season. I intend to call upon you in a day or two, and will have more leisure, than I can have now, for both dinner and company wait for me. I am dear Sir your most affecte. / humble servant/ Burlington

Kent is much your servant, pray my sincere compliments to Mrs Pope
(Corr., III, 67)

Just as the exchange of letters shows the understanding and mutual respect we might expect to find in friendship, it also shows the unequal relationship of patron and artist in the terms

223 Foxon, p. 111.
of address. As elsewhere, there is irony in Pope’s use of the language of compliment: the implication is that he and Burlington are beyond such patterns of behaviour. By complimenting Burlington for being party to this irony, he still defers to him.

In his letter of thanks to Burlington, sent by return of post, Pope writes:

“The favour you permitted me, of making use of your name on this occasion, I take as a very distinguishing one, as it makes you in some degree Author & Proprietor of my Follies, or (which perhaps is worse) Partaker & Promoter of my Resentments: Both at least are great proofs of Friendship in you.

(2 November 1729, Corr., III, 67)

His expression, ‘Partaker & Promoter of my Resentments’, raises the question: to what extent was Burlington’s alliance with Pope damaging to Burlington’s career? In the various skirmishes in which they were involved, only Pope seems to emerge with his reputation and standing intact.

Foxon thinks it probable that the three lords did not publish the declaration that Pope had given them but, to save exposing themselves to publicity, instead bought the copyright soon after 18 April in order to protect Gilliver. His evidence is that, in May, Gilliver brought a Chancery action against four pirates; at this time he did not own the copyright but soon would. In the event, no Dunce dared to take legal action, but, after Pope had assigned the copyright to Burlington, Oxford and Bathurst, he then asked them to sign an indenture assigning it to Gilliver for £100 shortly before the publication of the second edition (To Burlington, 2 November 1729, Corr., III, 67 and 67n.). The effect of Pope’s manoeuvres was that the dunces did not dare to sue the noble lords who were now the Dunciad’s publishers.

The manner of publication of the Dunciad Variorum could not have happened before the eighteenth century and illustrates the transition between amateur and professional, manuscript and print traditions in poetry. One of the aims of this survey of patrons has been to chart the changes that took place in Pope’s relationships with his patrons that have a direct bearing on changes in the nature of authorship. His older patrons issued commissions and

---

provided introductions and recommendations; in return, he gave them dedications and formal praise, often couched in ambiguous terms. His later, younger patrons showed a novel readiness to participate in the publishing process of his works, in matters as hands-on as distribution and as complex as copyright and legal protection, favours which he returned, in Oxford’s case, with modest praise in verse and annotation and, as I will show, in Burlington’s and Bathurst’s cases, in more subtle forms appropriate to friendship and gentlemanly equality. Patronage clearly still mattered a great deal in the early eighteenth century. What is new and particularly interesting about Pope’s relationships with his younger patrons is that, from this point onwards, as I will show in my close studies of his relationships with Burlington and Bathurst, a poet’s relationship with his patron might be determined not solely by need but by need and friendship.
2. Sanctifying Expense: Pope, Burlington and Taste

i) The historical background

In the following three chapters on Pope’s friendship with Richard Boyle, 3rd Earl of Burlington and 4th Earl of Cork, I will examine closely the two main charges for which their enemies attacked them, as a way of investigating the nature of their relationship and the benefits that Pope gained from Burlington’s patronage. These two main charges were lack of taste and ingratitude. The first charge concerned what was perceived as Pope’s and Burlington’s arrogance in drawing up rules for Taste; the second charge concerned Pope’s and Burlington’s alleged ingratitude to the Court and its administration. Most of the attacks appeared to have been inspired by Pope’s publication in 1731 of his Epistle To Burlington, a poem which celebrates Burlington’s architectural career and imagines him as the patron of a renaissance in the arts; the attacks centred on Pope’s mocking depiction of Timon, an extravagant patron allegedly based on James Brydges, 1st Duke of Chandos, one of the subscribers for his Iliad. I intend to play the devil’s advocate by paying close attention to the charges made by Pope’s and Burlington’s enemies. This might help to counter-balance much of what has been written about Burlington, which tends towards admiration. It should also help determine exactly how Pope achieved his financial success, since the suspicious nature of his enemies draws attention to manoeuvres that a modern reader might overlook.

By 1731 Pope had established himself by his translations of the Iliad and the Odyssey as the most celebrated poet of the age. Burlington had also achieved many of his ambitions. His reputation as a patron of arts was unrivalled: he was recognized by his friends, admirers and dependants, and grudgingly by his enemies, as a leading arbiter of Taste. In terms of architecture, he had the transformation of Burlington House and the construction of Chiswick House to his credit as his chief private works and, in 1731, he had completed the Assembly Rooms at York. He had already, by means of patronage, turned the tide of taste in architecture from Baroque, as represented by Sir Christopher Wren and Sir John Vanbrugh,
to Palladianism. The most striking example of the power Burlington wielded in patronage was his purging of the Office of Works, which I discuss later.

The early eighteenth century was a battlefield of Taste, where the fighting was at once about aesthetics and about politics. The ousting of Baroque and the still more ornate rococo by Palladianism represented a triumph of simplicity over ostentation. Burlington was later to develop his own austere neo-Classical style. Against the vulgar display of the new Whig country houses, lavish in scale, ornamentation and expense, Burlington and Pope set the restraint of Andrea Palladio and Inigo Jones, who first introduced Palladio to England. Behind this movement was the Classical idea that a house represented its owner. The minimalism of Palladio and the Ancient World, symbolized by Chiswick, was presented as superior to the showy mansions of the moneyed men, as represented by, amongst others, Marlborough's Blenheim, the Duke of Devonshire's Chatsworth, Chandos' Cannons and Walpole's Houghton.

Pope's attention in his Epistle To Burlington is turned on one of Burlington's main targets, the false imitators of Palladio, whom Pope describes in a letter to Burlington of 4 April 1731 as 'the Common Enemy, the Bad Imitators & Pretenders' (Corr., III, 188). Pope is credited with having coined the adjective 'Palladian' -- the date given in the Oxford English Dictionary is 1731, the year that the Epistle To Burlington was published. In the Epistle, 'Palladian' is charged with mockery, its very coinage showing how the movement has become a mere fashion; to have built something in the costly Palladian style has become essential in fashionable society. Pope ridicules the showy imitators who perversely take the simple style of Palladio and make it vulgar: the 'Palladians' extravagantly and absurdly, for example, make 'Garden-gates' into 'Arcs of triumph' and proudly catch cold at a 'Venetian door', designed to create ventilation in Italy but wholly inappropriate in an English climate.

---


2 See Colen Campbell's Introduction to his Vitruvius Britannicus, 1715.

3 For a discussion of Burlington's role in this change in the perception of architecture, see Jacques Carré, 'Burlington's Public Buildings', in Lord Burlington and his Circle, pp. 60-68 (pp. 65-66).
(l. 30 and l. 36, T. E. III. ii., 140). Here Pope addresses Burlington as both the British source of inspiration for neo-Classicism in architecture and oddly, also, indirectly responsible for the blundering imitators:

You show us, Rome was glorious, not profuse,
And pompous buildings once were things of Use.
Yet shall (my Lord) your just, your noble rules
Fill half the land with Imitating Fools;
Who random drawings from your sheets shall take,
And of one beauty many blunders make;
Load some vain Church with old Theatric state,
Turn Arcs of triumph to a Garden-gate;
Reverse your Ornaments, and hang them all
On some patch’d dog-hole ek’d with ends of wall,
Then clap four slices of Pilaster on’t,
That, lac’d with bits of rustic, makes a Front.
Or call the winds thro’ long Arcades to roar,
Proud to catch cold at a Venetian door;
Conscious they act a true Palladian part,
And if they starve, they starve by rules of art.
(ll. 23-38, T. E. III. ii., 139-40)

The satire in the above lines does not seem to fit with the panegyric of the poem’s ending, with its emphasis on empire. In the background seems to be the idea that now England is at peace, it can devote its energies to the polite arts:

You too proceed! make falling Arts your care,
Erect new wonders, and the old repair,
Jones and Palladio to themselves restore,
And be whate’er Vitruvius was before:
Till Kings call forth th’Idea’s of your mind,
Proud to accomplish what such hands design’d [ . . . ]
These Honours, Peace to happy Britain brings,
These are Imperial Works, and worthy Kings.
(ll. 191-96, 203-04, T. E., III. ii., 155-56)

Pope’s remarks pay the highest tribute to Burlington, by being the tribute that would most have pleased him. By urging him to be whatever Vitruvius was, Pope establishes an architectural lineage: Burlington – Jones – Palladio – Vitruvius. This is the true line against which pretenders will be measured.¹ One of the aims of this chapter is to discover why satire and celebration combine in an epistle supposedly written by a poet in praise of his patron.

¹ See also Murray G. H. Pittock’s suggestion that Pope uses a sophisticated coding that is both pro-Stuart and possibly pro-Jacobite in the above climax to the Epistle To Burlington, ‘Classical Jacobite Code in the Age of Burlington’, in Lord Burlington – The Man and his Politics, pp. 137-47 (pp. 139-40).
Pope's and Burlington’s claims to Taste are central to their relationship and were perceived by their enemies as such. Burlington used Pope to promote his architectural and artistic designs, which were intrinsically political. Pope, in turn, profited by his association with Burlington, who, alone of his patrons, had the political influence not only to shield him from his enemies but to keep him firmly placed in those networks of patronage that could find a use for him. For an understanding of how Taste was at once intrinsically political and inseparable from money, as a ‘use of wealth’, to borrow Pope’s title for his epistles To Burlington and To Bathurst, we need to look at Burlington’s reputation as a patron of the arts. By coincidence, 1715, the year of Pope’s first written reference to Burlington in a ‘tavern-poem’ called A Farewell to London, also saw the beginning of the Palladian Revival, launched by the publication of the first volume of Colen Campbell’s Vitruvius Britannicus and Giacomo Leoni’s translation of Palladio’s I Quattro Libri dell’Architettura. Burlington subscribed for both publications.5 In 1716 he commissioned Campbell to begin re-modelling Burlington House, making it ‘the first neo-Palladian town house’.6 In the coming years, the lodgers at Burlington House included Handel, Gay, William Kent (Burlington’s protégé who turned from painting to a polymathic career in architecture, gardening, furniture design and interior decorating), the Italian sculptor, Giovanni Battista Guelfi, and the Italian composer, Giovanni Battista Bononcini. When he was in town, Pope often stayed at Burlington House. It is worth drawing a connection between Gay’s description of Burlington’s ‘fair palace’ in Trivia, a rival perhaps to St James, and what might be interpreted as Burlington’s attempt to outdo and shame the royal court by the excellence of the artists under his patronage.7

A letter written in 1732 from Kent to Burlington suggests that they saw themselves as ahead of their time. Kent looks to contemporary France and Renaissance England as standards by which to measure England’s modern backwardness in matters of Taste:

---

6 Harris, p. 20.
7 Trivia, Book Two, I. 493, John Gay: Poetry and Prose, I, 157: I discuss this poem in my subsequent chapter on friendship. For Burlington’s patronage of Handel, see Wilton-Ely, pp. 15-20 (p. 16). For an account of George II’s neglect of the arts, see
I have had just now with me a French bookseller, brought me the French Antiquities, beginning with William the Conqueror. He says he wonders what the matter with the English, but his observation has been that we are a hundred years behind them always. (I think for a Frenchman he's in the right) as for what you and I do, it may be esteemed a hundred years hence, but at present does not look like it. By what I see doing in the arcade in Covent Garden, Inigo thought proper to add a portico of the Tuscan order, but these wise heads have put an Ionic expensive portico in the rustic arches, for an entrance into the absurd building they have made, but so far they be in the right being of a piece of what these asses have done –

Kent's evidence here for how little attention is paid to his and Burlington's attempt to revive the style of Jones and Palladio is the ill-advised alterations made to Jones' arcade in Covent Garden. Here, Kent is relaying to Burlington the kind of news that, as I will later show, he was most eager to hear: stories of modern offences against Taste. Burlington, Kent and Pope all drew attention to the perversity of modern Taste, whereby modern architects made travesties of Palladian aesthetics by means of vulgar alterations. The propaganda of the Burlington circle against 'pretenders' was political as well as aesthetic: corruption in architecture points to corruption in morals and politics.

The Palladian Revival was to establish Palladianism as the Whig style. In his introduction to his *Vitruvius Britannicus* of 1715 Campbell mainly addressed himself to a Whig party that was newly in power and his aim seemed to be to persuade the Whigs to unite the party by means of a new national style. Burlington's project was, however, quite different from Campbell's. It is significant that amongst what few remarks on architecture that we have of Burlington's, his highest praise is for Palladio. Burlington's own style was to become increasingly Classical; his enthusiasm for Palladio had its source in his admiration for the Ancients. Where Campbell wrote in superlatives about the Banqueting House being 'the first Room in the World', Burlington's annotations to his copy of Palladio's *I Quattro Libri Dell'Architettura* show that he reserved this kind of praise for Palladio. Burlington's annotations on the fly-sheets to the design of the Palazzo Thiene, Vicenza, focus on its importance as modern architecture that encompasses a wealth of architectural styles:

If any of Palladio's designs can claim a preference to the rest, this in my opinion has the best title to it, it is certainly the most beautiful modern building in the world, there is hardly any

---

Gerrard, p. 48, p. 63; for a discussion of Frederick's patronage of the arts, see ibid., pp. 46-47, p. 51, pp. 53-54, pp. 56-67, pp. 245-46.
3 Gay to Burlington, 16 November, 1732, Chatsworth MS 206.0.
part of Architecture that does not enter into it, and it is the best school that ever was for rusticks.10

The ‘rustic’ or ‘tuscan’ style was the most simple architectural style of ornamentation of the time, taking its place below the doric for plainness. Where Campbell was carving out a career for himself by appearing to answer Shaftesbury’s call for a British architecture, Burlington’s project seems not to have emphasized Britishness but rather looked to Italy and the Ancient World for the best models for Taste.11 Although in 1716 Burlington employed Campbell to work on re-modelling Burlington House in the Palladian style, replacing the Tory Catholic James Gibbs, later Pope’s architect, by 1719 he had rejected him, as John Harris writes, ‘for inferior invention’.12 Burlington’s reservations were the result of his own close inspection of Palladio’s buildings in Venice and Vicenza on his Italian tour of 1719; from this point onwards, he became an architect in his own right, employing Henry Flitcroft, his first draughtsman and clerk of works, and, later, Stephen Wright, to redraw his own designs.13

At this point it is useful to consider Burlington’s own extraordinary influence in networks of patronage. Brilliantly placed, he was a master at using patronage to create a market for Palladian work. The investigation carried out by Howard Colvin into his influence in the Office of Works, the body responsible for the commissioning of public works of architecture, helps to show how much patronage mattered. The power of Burlington’s influence in the Office of Works is astonishing. Within one year of the death of Vanbrugh, he had campaigned with extraordinary success to sweep the old Office of Works of Baroque place-holders and to install pro-Palladian candidates. His great success was the appointment to the surveyorship of the Hon. Richard Arundell, who was indebted to him for his seat in

11 See Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury, A Letter Concerning the Art, or Science of Design, Written from Italy, on the occasion of the Judgment of Hercules, To My Lord **** (1712).
12 Clark speculates Gibbs might have been replaced because he had become too dangerously associated with Jacobitism, pp. 251-310 (p. 275). Gibbs appears to have blamed Campbell for slandering him, Terence Friedman, James Gibbs (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1984), p. 10; see also pp. 8-12. Harris, p. 19; see also pp. 41-42.
13 Ibid., p. 64.
Parliament as the Member for Knaresborough. With Arundell in control of the Office of Works, the appointments of Kent, Flitcroft and other of his candidates followed.

Nicholas Hawksmoor’s remarks to Lord Carlisle on the affair suggest the amount of persuasion involved and reveal the extent to which Burlington and his friends had the ear of Walpole:

[. . .] there is prodigious pressing Sr R. Walpole; by my Ld Devonshire Ld Burlington, and many other’s, for painters, poets and other the virtuosos to Succeed Sr John Vanbrugh.  

The impression is that Walpole placed Burlington’s interests above his own in allowing Arundell the surveyorship. Walpole’s own favourite, Thomas Ripley, who had supervised the building of Houghton in the Palladian style, was the only candidate not backed by Burlington who was given a place: the Comptrollership. Once in office, Arundell seems to have been free to appoint Burlington’s candidates. Colvin’s conclusion gives a sense of how determined Burlington was to promote decent building, as he understood it:

The exercise of patronage is, of its nature, imperfectly documented. It was a matter of private confabulation, of reciprocal obligations, of tacit but unpublicised understandings. There can, however, be no real doubt that the entry into the Office of Works of all Burlington’s architectural protégés, Kent, Flitcroft, Garrett and perhaps Ware, formed part of a deliberate campaign to infiltrate, with Arundell’s help, what I have called the heart of the English architectural establishment.

Having considered Burlington’s extraordinary influence in certain circles, it is worth asking the question: where did Burlington’s money come from? This is a question that has not been much investigated. The best account is by Dana Arnold in her essay ‘It’s a wonderful life: Richard Boyle, 3rd Earl of Burlington’. Arnold’s account suggests that his wealth came from a combination of land and government appointments. To summarize Arnold’s findings, in 1715, he was made Lord Treasurer of Ireland and Lord Lieutenant of the East and West Ridings of Yorkshire. After the accession of George II, he was made

---

15 For discussion of Houghton and Palladianism, see: Colvin, pp. 97-101 (p. 99); Harris, p. 86; Summerson, p. 329, p. 331; Brewer, pp. 627-28.
16 Colvin, pp. 97-101 (p. 100).
Privy Councillor in 1729. It is likely that all of these posts produced some kind of renumeration. In 1730 he was made Knight of the Garter, an honour for which Pope wrote him a letter of mock-condolence:

My Lord,— I have try’d to wait upon you, unsuccessfully; It was to Condole with you for being made Knight of the Garter, having known you to be so many Better Things before. Some of them, I think, will be rememberd, longer than that you had this Honour; if either marble or Virtue can long remain — However, Princes are honourd for having plac’d Honors justly, & it will be said that King George the Second made the Earl of Burlington Knight of the Garter, &c. I need not say I am too good a subject to Envy Him this; or too sincerely Your Lordships Friend & Honourer not to be Pleasd he has done it: being so truly/ My Lord,/ Your most Obedient faithful Servant/ A. Pope

Pray, if you dare, tell my Lady B. I know you are Embrac’d by something better than a Garter. (Corr., III, 111)

This letter shows Pope’s anti-Hanoverian stance, with which Burlington must have had some sympathy. Pope does not so much applaud George II’s honouring of Burlington, as recognize it, while acknowledging that George II will gain unwonted credit. There is also perhaps a note of humorous surprise in that this is a case of a Hanoverian actually doing the right thing. Pope’s postscript appears flippant but is a deft compliment to Burlington and his wife, the Countess Dorothy Savile Burlington, daughter of William, 2nd Marquess of Halifax.

In May 1733 Burlington resigned from all of his government and court appointments and went into Opposition over the Excise Bill. Apart from seeing the benefits at this point of joining the increasingly powerful movement against Walpole, his reason for resignation seems to have been connected with patronage. George II appeared to have broken his promise to give him the privy seal, which was instead given to Henry Lowther, Viscount Lonsdale, ‘an opposition peer who was thus brought over to the court’. The privy seal had previously been held by the Duke of Devonshire, whom George II had made lord steward. Burlington later married his daughter, Charlotte, to the Duke of Devonshire’s son, William, Lord Hartington.

19 The Political Career of the Third Earl of Burlington, pp. 210-11. See also Jenkins, pp. 149-79 (p. 161).
Burlington had family estates in London, Middlesex, Yorkshire and Ireland. From 1710, he made money from developing the land at the back of Burlington House. Arnold gives evidence that his Irish estates generated at least £15,000 a year: this was from lands mortgaged or leases sold. In the course of answering her question 'how did he afford it all?', Arnold points out his position at the top of the list of absentee landlords in 1729:

Substantial amounts of revenue were removed from Ireland to fund his building activities and patronage of the arts. Financial crises punctuated Burlington's life and the revenues from his Irish lands must have been very welcome. This did not go unnoticed. Thomas Prior's *List of Absentees of Ireland and the Yearly Values of their Estates and Incomes spent Abroad*, begun in 1729 and published annually thereafter, lists Burlington as the largest single absentee. This is calculated upon the rank of the individual and the amount of money they took out of Ireland each year, in Burlington's case around £15000.

In giving this evidence, Arnold seems to reserve judgement on Burlington. It would be interesting to know whether, despite his absenteeism - he never visited Ireland, although he often expressed a wish to do so - he was, in fact, a good landlord: to my knowledge, there is no study of Burlington as Irish landowner and landlord. Arnold's view on Burlington and Ireland seems limited to pointing out that the sales of land show how important his architectural projects were to him. Arnold's essay ends by avoiding the question of whether the source of his money in any way affects our assessment of his architecture and his patronage of the arts:

[Burlington's] relationship with Ireland suffered because of his ambitious programme of patronage across all the arts which left him without resources to implement any work there. [. . .] This brief essay gives only a glimpse of the richness of Burlington's life and work. The following chapters discuss certain aspects of Burlington in greater depth. But it is already clear that it was a wonderful life!20

The pairing of Burlington's profits from Ireland with the phrase of Arnold's title, 'it's a wonderful life', appears incongruous. There is, I think, a beguiling quality to Burlington and his circle: their charm often seems to make modern readers reluctant to explore their less admirable aspects. While Burlington's achievements are clearly impressive, his ruthlessness in pursuit of his aims needs to be considered. Apart from Burlington's involvement in Ireland, his enrichment from government appointments might seem to compromise Pope. It

---

20 Arnold, pp. 5-14 (p. 11, pp. 13-14).
is possible that Pope's knowledge of where Burlington's money came from might account, in part, for his determination not to be seen to be in his pay, but, rather, as his friend.

Burlington's wealth enabled him to establish himself as patron and architect between 1720 and 1721, when he bought up nearly all the architectural designs of Jones and Palladio's drawings, thereby obtaining the means to become the authority on Palladio. The display of wealth involved in buying up the Palladio material demonstrates the closeness of the relationship between wealth and Taste. As Timothy Connor shows in his essay, 'Burlingtonian Publications', his spectacular purchases were not motivated by a desire to make available to the public Palladio's works by means of publication. Connor takes as evidence the three works from the Burlington stable: Kent's *Designs of Inigo Jones* of 1728, Isaac Ware's *The Designs of Inigo Jones and Others*, 1739, and Vardy's *Designs of Inigo Jones*, 1744. Of these works, Connor remarks that 'in the case of Kent, Ware, and Vardy, the purpose was to demonstrate that they were all in touch with the fount of correct taste at Burlington House.'

Burlington's own *Fabbriche Antiche Disegnate da Andrea Palladio* of 1730 was a limited edition. There were no dealings with booksellers and no subscription list, so it would seem that he paid for the publication himself. Connor's characterization of these books is critical: 'They may present an ideal, but they do not present a programme, and not all make any attempt to reach an audience.' In Connor's view, Pope's Epistle *To Burlington* spread Burlington's ideas more widely than any of the publications Burlington oversaw. Connor sees as unreasonable Burlington's irritation at the inferior imitators of Palladio:

> The publications of Lord Burlington and his circle appealed to a small group of connoisseurs, who could already appreciate Palladian architecture, or who wished to appear to do so. But to make contact with the multitude, with the many creators of Georgian architecture, was in most cases no part of their purpose. The major exception to this is perhaps Ware's Palladio, for no fewer than 52 per cent of the subscribers to that work were artisans. But as far as the publications of Burlington's collections are concerned, although the plagiarists, whom Pope referred to as the 'Common Enemy, the Bad Imitators and Pretenders', may justly be censured, [... ] they were given little help. Some sort of a Rule of Taste there may perhaps have been in this period, but the role of this group of books in its creation and implementation was, at most, indirect.\(^2\)

\(^1\) Timothy Connor, 'Burlingtonian Publications', in *Lord Burlington and his Circle*, pp. 52-59, (p. 55, pp. 57-59).
I would argue that Burlington’s need to acquire Palladian designs and drawings has a parallel in the way he treated the artists he patronized: by installing his artists at Burlington House, he also, in some sense, acquired them. If we accept that in buying Palladian designs, his motive was ownership rather than any desire to spread the gospel of Palladianism (itself a vulgar undertaking), this affects the way we should think about his influence on the national Taste. By restricting access, he could control the way in which Palladio’s ideas were used. He could also complain about the hordes of pretenders who got it wrong in their would-be Palladian buildings. In this context, Pope’s Epistle To Burlington appears all the more remarkable. By making public the debate on Taste in his Epistle To Burlington, Pope was bringing aristocratic notions of Taste to a wider audience and helping to make art commercial. While appearing to serve his patrons, Pope’s commercial instinct led him to help to wrest control from them.

In his writings, Burlington is as much drawn by the satirist’s impulse as Pope: he writes because something is wrong. Much of what Burlington writes concerns the failure of modern manners, as measured against a classical standard of elegance. His annotations to his copy of Palladio’s I Quattro Libri show two objects of concern. One is taste, the importance of this being that the hallmark of what is true Palladio is excellent taste: this is how you distinguish Palladio from his imitators. The second object of concern, which is more fully treated in his notes, is his irritation at alterations made by inferior architects to Palladian buildings. Writing about the Villa Foscari or Malcontenta on the Brenta, he is scathing about what he assumes to be Foscari’s changes to Palladio’s design. Burlington’s description shows how completely he identified with Palladio:

it is easy to see how much he was cramped in the Execution of this design by the Portico, which stands upon a plain brick stucco wall, whereas he intended a beautiful pedestal to the whole. and the windows which are 4 – p – high, 6 – p – ½ diameter are set in but 4 – 0 the top of the house is finished in the middle with a plain attic wall and pediment and not in the manner that it is published and in the back front under the great ivory there is a rustic arcade 11 – p – high, 6 – p½ – in the vane, and the pilasters but 1 – p – 1 – 0 – but as the present Sigr Foscari is a great Architect in the modern way (as may be seen by the many monstrous buildings in his gardens) I conclude that they are his alterations.22

22 I Quattro Libri dell’Architettura (1601 edition held at Chatsworth), annotations by Lord Burlington, p. 50.
On the flysheet to a design on page 19, he writes:

This is the only house in Vicenza that is quite finished by Palladio, and one plainly sees, by the ornaments and exquisite taste that is in the most minute part of it, that he executed his design without restraint.

But underneath this note is the regret:

The present owner of it has done it great injury by enlarging the chamber doors, and dressing them in a most extravagant manner; but those in the salon have escaped.23

Coupled with this censure for those architects who foolishly altered existing Palladian Renaissance buildings in Italy is a scorn for modern imitators of Palladio who get it wrong, as shown in his introduction to Fabbriche Antiche:

Non posso alla fine, far a men d’asserire che gli studj di si grand’Uomo debbano essere tanto più stimabili, quanto opportunissimo Presente all’Ètà nostra, di cui niun’altra forse dimostrò mai maggiore disposizion a dispendiose Fabbriche; nè produsse più ignoranti Pretenditori che guidano altrui fuor delle vere Traccie di tanto bell-Arte.

I cannot fail to assert that the studies of such a great man should be all the more estimable because they are opportunely relevant to our age, than which none other, perhaps, ever showed a greater readiness for constructing expensive buildings; nor produced more ignorant pretenders who lead others astray from the true paths of such a fine art.24

Palladio is presented as important because Burlington’s age, perhaps more than any other, has shown itself to have a taste for expensive buildings and has also produced the greatest number of ignorant pretenders to Taste. Burlington’s recommendation of the study of Palladio seems to be motivated by a reproach to the ignorant wealthy, yet his very decision to write this introduction in Italian seems again to go against any real attempt to influence Taste.

Much of Burlington’s irritation at ‘pretenders’ in architecture can be traced to his irritation at breaches in the unwritten code of manners. I would argue that this impatience with ‘pretenders’ was genuine, in that he aspired to be one of the most correct men of his time, and only later did it acquire political significance. Taking people to task for pretension in architectural matters was a way of marking off the gentlemen from the fools and the rogues,

23 Ibid., p. 19.
24 Lord Burlington, Fabbriche Antiche Disegnate da Andrea Palladio Vicentino (London, 1730). I am very grateful to Professor John Lindon of University College London for his translation of this passage.
the tasteful from tasteless. Opposition rhetoric increasingly accused the Walpolian Whigs of being at best, stupid, and at worst, dishonest. As ‘new money’, they were also seen as inferior for not possessing the manners, or, in other words, the pedigree, of the landed aristocracy.
ii) Pope's Epistles Of the Use of Riches

Pope seems to have operated on the principle that friendship was one of the most effective ways of winning and keeping Burlington's favour. An analysis of Burlington's concerns and his few architectural remarks helps to show something of his character, which Pope carefully gauged in writing his Epistle To Burlington. A knowledge of Burlington's preoccupations should help towards an understanding of how the poem is shaped by the patron. In a letter to Burlington dated 4 April 1731, Pope enclosed the draft epistle, entitled 'Of Taste', and referred to their discussion about the poem appearing as a preface to Burlington's planned folio volume of Palladio's designs. The emphasis in Pope's letter is on the due esteem and deference he accords his patron:

I send you the Inclosed with great pleasure to myself. It has been above ten years on my conscience to leave some Testimony of my Esteem for your Lordship among my Writings. I wish it were worthier of you. As to the Thought which was just suggested when last I saw you, of its attending the Book, I would have your Lordship think further of it; & upon a considerate perusal, If you still think so, the few Words I've added in this paper may perhaps serve two ends at once, & ease you too in another respect. In short tis all submitted to your own best Judgment: Do with it, & me, as you will. (Corr., III, 187)

As well as a 'Testimony', the poem can be looked at as a kind of present and, in both style and selection of subjects, Pope takes careful account of Burlington's taste: he aims to please.

By using the epistle form, Pope made his poems both moral lessons and letters, assuming the equality of friendship and a gentlemanly equivalence, while also flattering his patrons. The hortatory role derives from the classical idea that it was the poet's privilege to instruct from the vantage-point of his learning and his insight into the literature of other ages. We see this in the prefatory material to the Iliad and the Odyssey: in An Essay on the Life, Writings, and Learning of Homer, the Iliad is said to contain 'Lectures of general Concern to Mankind, proper for the Poet to deliver and Kings to attend to; such as made Porphyry write of the Profit that Princes might receive from Homer [. . .]'; Pope's extracts from Bossu's A General View of the Epic Poem and of the 'Iliad' and 'Odyssey' include the notion that epic poems are created 'to form the Manners' (T. E. VII, 71-72; T. E. IX, 4-5).
We need to know something of Pope's original grand scheme for the *Moral Epistles* in order to understand their evolution and so to attempt to answer the question: why was he so engrossed by the *Moral Epistles* and, in particular, the Epistles *Of the Use of Riches*? The *Moral Epistles* were first designed to form part of a greater philosophical work: his *Opus Magnum*, as he described it to Swift in January 1734 (Corr., III, 401). Pope had first written to Swift about his project in 1729 when he outlined his 'system of Ethics in the Horatian way' (Corr., III, 81).25 His plan for this work, as set out in the 'Advertisement' to the 1744 edition of the *Epistles to Several Persons*, suggests that the *Moral Epistles* were originally part of a yet more ambitious project for his *Essay on Man*. This scheme comprised of four books: the first book was to treat of 'Man in the abstract', the subject of the four epistles of *An Essay on Man*, published between 1733 and 1734. The second and third books were to treat of 'man in his intellectual Capacity at large' and 'Man in his Social, Political, and Religious Capacity'. Some of the material from the projected second book, a satire on wit and learning, was incorporated in the *Dunciad*, Book IV; the third book included a poem on the subject of Brutus, designed to illustrate Pope's theory of the 'ruling passion'. What we now know as the *Moral Epistles* were to form part of the fourth book: according to the 'Advertisement', this final book treats of 'Ethics, or practical Morality; and would have consisted of many members of which the four following Epistles were detached Portions: the two first, on the *Characters of Men and Women* being the introductory part of this concluding Book' (T. E. III. ii., pp. xviii-xx).26

It is hard to know how seriously to take the 'Advertisement' to the 1744 edition of *Epistles to Several Persons*, since Pope seems, partly jokingly, to outline a similar grand scheme in a letter to Swift of 1736:

If ever I write more Epistles in Verse, one of them shall be address'd to you. I have long concerted it, and begun it, but I would make what bears your name as finished as my last work ought to be, that is to say, more finished than any of the rest. The subject is large, and will divide into four Epistles, which naturally follow the Essay;

---

25 See Stack on Pope's investigation of the view of Horace as moral teacher.

26 F. W. Bateson points out that it is not clear how much Pope was responsible for the 'Advertisement': it is possible that Warburton had a hand in its authorship as he reprinted part of it in his 1751 edition. Miriam Leranbaum is more cautious about its attribution, *Alexander Pope's 'OPUS MAGNUM' 1729-1744* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), p. 181.
on Man, viz. 1. Of the Extent and Limits of Human Reason, and Science, 2. A view of the useful and therefore attainable, and of the un-useful and therefore un-attainable, Arts. 3. Of the nature, ends, application, and the use of different Capacities. 4. Of the use of Learning, of the Science of the World, and of Wit. It will conclude with a Satire against the misapplication of all these, exemplify’d by pictures, characters, and examples.

But alas! the task is great, and non sum qualis eram! (Corr., IV, 5)

The jocularity that creeps into Pope’s tone suggests that we cannot take at face-value the news that that he has not entirely given up on his Opus Magnum. His outline, ‘A view of the useful and therefore attainable, and of the un-useful and therefore un-attainable, Arts’, sounds like Scriblerus, with its pseudo-rationalism and awkward syntax. Although we might detect in his audacious description a note of regret, the once-grand scheme emerges mainly as a way of teasing Swift with the promise of an epistle; in other words, telling him not to hold his breath.27

Pope’s correspondence with Warburton and his conversations with Spence point to his abandonment of the grand scheme as a result of his greater interest in the Epistles Of the Use of Riches, his first two published Moral Epistles. In my introduction, I showed how his mockery of Bolingbroke’s philosophical ideals led to his humorous treatment of the whole enterprise of An Essay on Man. In contrast, he seems to have rated the Moral Epistles as amongst his finest work: in a letter to Warburton of 24 March 1743, moving on from news of the imminent publication of the new Dunciad, he expresses impatience for the publication of Warburton’s edition of the Moral Epistles: ‘I am more desirous of carrying on the best, that is your Edition of the Epistles & Essay on Crit. &c. I know it is there I shall be seen most to advantage’ (Corr., IV, 448). Spence’s notes of his conversations with Pope between 1 and 7 May 1730 seem to indicate that To Burlington and To Bathurst were the most important of the Moral Epistles. The transcript of these conversations consists of three paragraphs, the first of which concerns the notion of the ‘prevailing passion’ which was to form the subject of To Cobham; the second and third paragraphs deal mainly with construction of the two Epistles Of the Use of Riches according to the idea of ‘ye Balance of

27 For Swift’s wish for an epistle addressed to him, see Corr., IV, 12, 71-72, 337-38.
things', which also underpins *An Essay on Man* (see Book II of *An Essay on Man*, ll. 205-6, T. E. III. i., 79-80). As to the ordering of the epistles, *To Bathurst* is revealed as, originally, the first and therefore most important of the epistles, 'to ye Whole work, wt a Scale is to a book of Maps: in this lies ye greatest difficulty: not only in settling all ye parts, but in making them agreeable enough to be read with pleasure.' The subsequent fragmentary quotations from *To Bathurst* all concern the use of wealth, ending with the prototype of Pope's answer to his enquiry as to what riches give us: 'Meat, Drink, & Fire' (T. E. III. ii., p. xxii).

Pope's *Moral Epistles* are concerned with the connections between money and morality. His great service to Burlington might be seen as his defence and justification of Burlington's expense. In his Epistle *To Burlington*, he writes about the mistaken belief that Good Sense, upon which Taste is predicated, can be bought:

> Oft have you whispered to your brother Peer,  
> A certain truth, which many buy too dear:  
> Something there is more needful than Expence,  
> And something previous ev'n to Taste – 'tis Sense:  
> Good Sense, which only is the gift of Heav'n,  
> And tho' no science, fairly worth the sev'n:  
> A Light, which in yourself you must perceive;  
> Jones and Le Nôtre have it not to give. (ll. 39-46)

Pope's tone here is teasing and provocative: at first it appears that he is saying that Burlington often has to give his 'brother Peers' the kind of tips that true nobility shouldn't need; on closer inspection, we see Burlington simply telling them not to bother.

Though so close to being one himself, Pope scorned professional men of Taste, such as Ripley, adviser to Walpole:

> For what has Virro painted, built, and planted?  
> Only to show, how many Tastes he wanted.  
> What brought Sir Visto's ill got wealth to waste?  
> Some Daemon whisper'd, 'Visto! have a Taste.'  
> Heav'n visits with a Taste the wealthy fool,  
> And needs no Rod but Ripley with a Rule.  
> See! sportive fate, to punish awkward pride,  
> Bids Bubo build, and sends him such a Guide:  
> A standing sermon, at each year's expense,  
> That never Coxcomb reach'd Magnificence! (ll. 13-22, T. E. III. ii., 137-39)

---

28 'Meat, Drink, & Fire' became, in the published poem, 'Meat, Cloaths, and Fire' (*To Bathurst*, l. 82, T. E., III. ii., 94).
Pope promoted the view that, in Burlington, Taste was something quite other than the ‘Curse’ that afflicts Sir Visto, that is, a compulsive fashionable way of displaying wealth. Thanks to Burlington’s good sense, his expense was, in some way, made virtuous.

The first edition of the Epistle To Burlington bore the title An Epistle To The Right Honourable Richard Earl of Burlington, Occasion’d by his Publishing Palladio’s Designs of the Baths, Arches, Theatres, &c. of Ancient Rome, the half-title being ‘Of Taste’. The second edition, published 4-6 January 1732, changed this half-title to ‘Of False Taste’ (T. E., III. ii., p. xxv). This change is important when considering the panegyrics of the poem’s ending. Since the text of the poem itself was identical with the first edition, the change of title indicates a certain equivocation of purpose. One of the reasons for this may have been that as soon as matters of Taste were discussed, the risk of arrogance and pretension was as much a danger in the early eighteenth century as now. Anticipating hostile criticism, Burlington and Pope set themselves apart from the pretenders from the start and placed their emphasis on the need to distinguish true Taste from false, the latter being associated with hypocrisy.

Pope’s emphasis on Use in the epistle makes us consider further the common title of To Bathurst and To Burlington: Of the Use of Riches. In his Epistle To Burlington, he employs the language of ancient Use in his most direct praise of these two patrons:

Who then shall grace, or who improve the Soil?
Who plants like BATHURST, or who builds like BOYLE.
’Tis Use alone that sanctifies Expence,
And Splendor borrows all her rays from Sense.
(ll. 177-80, T. E., III. ii., 154)

The line ‘‘Tis Use alone that sanctifies Expence’ is a late revision, dating from the editions of 1735 and after. The earlier drafts and editions – the Chatsworth transcript and the first three printed editions – originally include the couplet: ‘In you, my Lord, Taste sanctifies Expence,/And Splendor borrows all her Rays from Sense.’ It would seem that the criticism

29 The Chatsworth transcript is a contemporary transcript said to have been copied by John Ferrett, Burlington’s estate agent, from the manuscript that Pope sent Burlington on 4 April 1731, eight months before its publication. The Last and Greatest Art: Some Unpublished Poetical Manuscripts of Alexander Pope, ed. by Mack (Newark: University of Delaware Press; London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1984), p. 157.
of Pope and Burlington for their claims to Taste led to Pope’s replacing the modern ‘Taste’ with the term ‘Use’, with its connotations of Virtue rather than politeness.30

As we have seen, in his letter to Burlington of 1731, Pope originally envisaged the epistle as a ‘Testimony of my Esteem for your Lordship’, yet, in 1730, he seems to have described the subject of his original plan for the Epistles Of the Use of Riches as ‘the misery of affluence’ (Spence, No. 293, I, 129).31 The shift from encomium to satire is seen in a further episode in the poem’s textual history. Both in the early drafts of the poem and in the 1731 printed editions, Pope referred, astonishingly, as we might think, to Burlington’s ‘hard heart’, calling into question the morality of his lavish spending on architecture. Erskine-Hill has discussed this matter in some detail. In “‘Avowed Friend and Patron”: The Third Earl of Burlington and Alexander Pope’, he points out that, in an early draft of the poem, known as the ‘Chatsworth Draft’ (1731), ‘thy hard heart’ refers to Burlington, whereas, in the 1735 versions of the poem, ‘his hard Heart’ clearly refers back to Timon, since the phrase follows the description of a visit paid to Timon’s villa:

Yet hence the Poor are cloth’d, the Hungry fed;
The Lab’rer bears: What his hard Heart denies,
His charitable Vanity supplies.
(II. 169-72, T. E. III. ii., 153)

We are invited to compare this version with the 1731 Chatsworth Draft where the phrase refers to Burlington and follows the passage treating of Sabinus and his foolish son:

Yet hence the Poor are Cloath’d, the Hungry fed;
Health to himself, and to his Infants bread
The Lab’rer bears: What thy hard heart Denies,
Thy Charitable Vanity Supplies.
(II. 67-70)

Erskine-Hill interprets the original application of ‘hard heart’ to Burlington as ‘a moral judgement’ tempered by raillery which demonstrates the understanding that existed between

---

30 See also Ferraro, 141-159 (esp. pp. 153-56).
31 In conversation with ‘Colonel’ Hay, Pope refers specifically to what would become To Bathurst: ‘Mr Pope is now employed in a large design for a moral poem. There will be several behaviours of men flung into fables: one in particular on the misery of affluence (planned just like that of Job, only with the contrary point in view), which Mr Pope says he foresees already will take up at least a thousand verses.’ We can, nevertheless, suppose that Pope’s notion of ‘the misery of affluence’ also shaped To Bathurst’s companion Epistle Of the Use of Riches, the Epistle To Burlington.
Pope and Burlington. The implication, however, that the survival of ‘thy hard heart’ from the manuscript to the first printed editions proves that Burlington did not initially take offence, leaves unanswered the question as to why Pope changed the passage in 1735 so that it referred to Timon’s ‘hard heart’.

In his satirical ‘key’ to his Epistle To Burlington, Pope mocked his enemies’ criticisms of his claims to Taste and what they took as his suggestion in early drafts of the Epistle that Burlington was lacking in charity:

To begin with his Title, It was first, of Taste, Now ‘tis of false Taste, to the Earl of Burlington. Is this alteration made to impute False Taste to that Earl? or out of unwillingness to allow that there is any True Taste in the Kingdom?

Nothing is more certain, than that the Person first & principally abus’d is the said Earl of Burlington. He cou’d not well abuse him for Want of Taste, since the allowing it to him was the only Channel to convey his Malignity to others: But he abuses him for a worst want, the want of Charity (one from which his Lordship is as free as any man alive)

(Prose Works, II, 412)

Although he made fun of these claims, Pope nevertheless revised the Epistle and simplified its title, as I have shown, so that his enemies’ criticisms could no longer hold. We might speculate about his reasons for these revisions: it was common sense to eliminate anything that might help his enemies’ case of ingratitude towards patrons; beyond this, he might have wished to fan the flames of controversy by making his praise of Burlington and his mockery of Timon more pointed. Pope’s motive for this particular revision might have been connected to his discovery of the instigator of the attacks, Walpole himself, who, as I show in Chapter 4, identified himself as Timon. This latter possibility seems at odds with his earlier reputation as a poet above politics; clear evidence of the way in which matters of Taste were intrinsically political.

iii) Hostile responses: Taste

The success of Pope and Burlington in becoming arbiters of Taste can be traced, in part, to their drawing-up of a new set of aesthetic rules; evidence that this drawing-up of rules mattered is shown in the resentment this caused amongst their enemies. Their enemies presented these rules as arbitrary and evidence of vanity, and, indeed, the advice given in the Epistle To Burlington – to take, as an example, Pope’s famous advice in gardening, ‘Consult the Genius of the Place’ (l. 57, T. E. III. ii., 142) – can seem difficult to put into practice. With his shaping of his poem to suit Burlington, the impression begins to form that Pope was effectively working with Burlington, if not for him. Theirs was an arrangement based on mutual self-interest, with Pope gaining prestige from his association with Burlington, and Burlington gaining a useful apologist. Yet Pope’s value in the circles of artistic patronage depended on projecting the contradictory guise of a leisurely, gentlemanly poet, while at the same time maintaining control of the publication his own works.

In his engravings, William Hogarth seizes on the mercenary aspect of Pope’s relationship with Burlington.
Figure 1. Hogarth, *Taste, or Burlington Gate*, Dec-Jan 1731/2 (later prints prefix *The Man of Taste* before *The Gate of Burlington House*). Hogarth's note to 'C' points to the significance of the crescent in one of the corners of the coach ('not a Dukes Coach') yet two of the corners have crowns: by pointing out that the coach cannot belong to the Duke of Chandos, Hogarth seems to makes it clear that it does indeed belong to him.
In *Taste No. 1 The Gate of Burlington House, 1731* (later prints prefix *The Man of Taste* before *The Gate of Burlington House*), Pope is presented whitewashing the gate of Burlington House (see figure 1).\(^{33}\) A statue of Kent stands at the top of the gate above the reclining figures of Raphael and Michelangelo. Hogarth has a strong point in his ridiculing the taste of the Burlington circle for over-rating Kent. Hogarth’s motive for attack was Burlington’s exclusive promotion of Italian art. By the power of his influence, Burlington had made this a vogue, at the expense of British artists: the results of his endeavours were the opposite of those intended by Campbell, with his promotion of Jones as pre-eminent British architect.

The pamphlet entitled *Mr Taste’s Tour* pretends to be written by Pope in answer to a pamphlet entitled *Ingratitude: To Mr Pope*, which I discuss in Chapter 4. Guerinot takes a lofty view, calling the poem a ‘rambling satire on the abuse of riches, lacking both plan and wit, and probably a bad imitation of Pope’s Epistle *To Bathurst*’.\(^{34}\) In his criticism, he points out how the poem has no connection with the introduction, and ridicules the hacks who sought to pass it off as Pope’s. In my view, Guerinot’s reading of this pamphlet does it a disfavour and underestimates the hacks. Pope was not, as he presented himself to be, a beacon in the darkness, alone in an age of dunces. The lack of connection between the title, introduction and poem might possibly have been designed with entertainment in mind: perhaps the hacks had a poem which was dull but had some mileage if they could amuse their readers by trying to pass it off as Pope’s.\(^{35}\)

The phrasing of the full title, *Mr Taste’s Tour from the Island of Politeness, to that of Dulness and Scandal*, mocks Pope’s pretensions to Taste and his self-image as a gentleman. He is imagined as having embarked on a tour, almost as if he were an aristocrat, but his title,

---

33 *Taste No. 1: The Gate of Burlington House, 1731, Catalogue of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum, Political and Personal Satires*, II.
34 Guerinot, p. 238.
35 See Chapter 4 for Pope’s account of how pamphleteers were directly in Walpole’s pay; in a note to the *Dunciad* he quotes figures from a secret enquiry showing that between 1731 and 1741 authors and printers received over £50,000 from the Government, T. E. V, 311-12.
‘Mr Taste’, cuts him down to size, so that he appears rather as the tutor on a Grand Tour, an undignified ‘bear-leader’. While I agree with Guerinot that the poem is not witty, a closer look at the treatment of its subject matter, the abuse of riches, shows that it might well have hit the mark. The ending would have been particularly close to the bone for Pope and, no doubt, made him keener than ever to prove himself to be disinterested as regards money:

   MONEY first tempted Judas to betray,
   ‘Tis the false Guide that leads Mankind astray;
   It makes Men warmly labour to deceive
   Others with what themselves do not believe.
   Where they Dependence, or an Int'rest have,
   With honest Characters they cloak the Knave;
   And without Cause, to serve their Purpose, stain
   The Reputation of deserving Men:
   One Man they flatter, t’other they abuse,
   The Guiltless blame, the Guilty they excuse:
   They from all Truth and Honesty dissent,
   To make their own Advantage crown th’Event;
   Hide their own Knowledge, to deceive the Blind,
   When mercenary Gain corrupts the Mind.

The implication is that Pope is a hack too, and, as such, no gentleman.

The poem’s introduction is a criticism of Pope’s evasiveness: the author’s parody of his style in all its shiftiness is both clever and, especially towards the end, amusing. In view of the fact that this parody demonstrates with some subtlety Pope’s manoeuvrings in his attacks on public figures, making it relevant to my investigation into his dealings with patrons, I will quote it in full:

   Such is the Petulancy and Malice of the real GRUBS of this Age, whose muddy Brains are fertile in nothing but Scandal and Reproach, Infamy and Falsehood, that they imagine that they are licensed to attack any Gentleman of Credit and Reputation who has the happy Talent of pleasing the World with Wit and Good Sense: they are like the Toad in the Fable, who, envying the Ox on account of his large Growth, swell’d his own Body with the Venom it contain’d, till, exceeding the Bounds of Nature, it burs’d, and thereby hastened its own Death; and let those malicious Insects take Care that they do not share the same Fate.

   To mention every particular Pamphlet, wherein I am misrepresented, and vilely traduced, would take up more Time than I can spare; and to refute ‘em would be the Labour of an Age. I shall therefore, at present, only vindicate myself, in relation to what is charged upon me in a Pamphlet call’d INGRATITUDE; to which is prefix’d an impudent Picture.

   THE heavy Allegation against me is, that I am guilty of Ingratitude; a Crime, I must confess, in its Nature vile and detestable. To maintain this, two Instances are produced; the first is concerning a Disgust that I took at the late Mr Addison; I own it; but then give me leave to put the Question, were we not reconciled after this? This is allow’d, but then I am charged again, with publishing a Satire on the aforesaid Gentleman, after his Death though our

---

Reconciliation had continued to the End of his Life. This, truly, I cannot deny but in Alleviation thereof, I must say, That I did inadvertently deliver one Satire to be printed instead of another.

THE Second is, concerning a noble Peer, to whom I went to beg a Subscription, who was very liberal to me; this I freely own: But who can say, I am guilty of Ingratitude? Can they prove that I have mention’d his Name, or that the Character of Lord Timon was design’d for him? If People will draw wrong Conclusions from false Premisses, who can help it? The Fault is theirs, and not mine.

WHAT is mention’d in the 8th and 9th Pages of Ingratitude, concerning Mr Congreve’s Assertion, as it affects me, gives me no Inquietude; I will neither own it, nor deny it; the Person is defunct, and if they can subpoena him from the Shades below, let ’em do it; I will then answer for myself; and this Introduction may satisfy every one, that I shall not trouble myself for the future, in vindicating my Character, whatever Aspersions shall be cast upon me.

The author wittily mimics Pope’s habitual self-justification, pointing out the devious ways by which he published his works: ‘but in Alleviation thereof, I must say, That I did inadvertently deliver one Satire to be printed instead of another’. Since this introduction suggests Pope’s habitual disingenousness in his protestations of innocence, we might compare it with Pope’s letter to Burlington, dated 21 December 1731, defending himself against the charge of ingratitude towards Chandos: ‘The Argument is short. Either the Duke these folks would abuse, did all those things, or he did not. If he did, he would deserve to be laughd at with a Vengeance; and if he did not, then it’s plain it cannot be the Duke: and the latter is really the case’ (Corr. III, 259). The depiction of Pope’s securing of subscribers for the Iliad is designed firmly to put him in his place: Chandos is ‘a noble Peer, to whom I went to beg a Subscription’. The author’s reference to ‘the Toad in the Fable’ might have, in part, led Pope to change his name for a patron from ‘Bubo’, Latin for owl, in his Epistle To Burlington to ‘Bufo’, Latin for toad, in his Epistle To Dr Arbuthnot: if so, this is an example of Pope using the best of his enemies’ attacks on him as very useful material for his own work.

A final example of an attack on Pope for his Epistle To Burlington that focuses on his self-appointed role of arbiter of Taste is a play that appeared in April 1732 entitled Mr Taste, the Poetical Fop: Or, the Modes of the Court. A Comedy. The plot concerns his infatuation

---

37 Mr Taste’s Tour (London, 1733), pp. 16-17 and pp. 3-4; the reference to Congreve concerns another instance of Pope’s supposed ingratitude.

38 Mr Taste, the Poetical Fop: Or, the Modes of the Court. A Comedy. By the Author of the Opera of Vanelia; or the Amours of the Great (London, 1732).
with Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, who appears as ‘Lady Airy’. Pope appears as ‘Mr Alexander Taste, A Poet who, in spite of deformity, imagines every Woman he sees in love with him, and imprudently makes Addresses to Lady Airy’. In this way, he is shown to merit his characterization in the preface as ‘Sawney Taste, who in one Fool is All’. Guerinot dismisses the play as ‘a confused and silly affair’ but this is to downplay its effectiveness as a smear and to disregard its design of humiliation. Pope is described in the play as a poet of humble origin who, once he had gained a reputation ‘treated those Gentlemen who had rais’d him from nothing with the utmost Contempt, taking all the vile methods he could think of to do them Injuries; nay, he was so much lost to Shame, that he wrote a Work on purpose to abuse them.’ Linked with this accusation of ingratitude is a description of Taste’s deformity: he ‘verifies the common Saying, as crooked in Mind as in Body’. Resentment of Sawney Taste’s vanity focuses on his drawing-up of rules; for example, in what is clearly a reference to An Essay on Criticism, he is shown boasting to Lady Airy:

Both Waller and Prior wrote tolerably well, Madam; but there are more Faults in their Works: than can be explain’d in one Conversation, I’ll give you in writing the necessary Rules to judge by.

As the play develops, Taste and Pope become synonymous as, via Sawney, he is accused of insufferable vanity and ingratitude.

Pope’s enemies made the link between Taste and money damagingly clear: they presented his dealings in Taste, as in writing, as mercenary and, with the intention of putting him in his place, also pointed out that he used the money he gained from his exploitation of Taste to rise in the world. In the next chapter, I will look at Pope’s use of friendship in his relations with patrons, as a basis on which to assess the charge of ingratitude made against him.

39 Guerinot, p. 218.
40 Mr Taste, The Poetical Fop, p. 61, p. 64, p. 46. This play was a source for a late pamphlet attack on Pope which shows how interconnect were the attacks on Pope for ingratitude, want of taste and mercenary. This was an anonymous poem entitled Sawney and Colley, A Poetical Dialogue: Occasioned by A Late Letter from the Laureat of St James’s, To the Homer of Twickenham (1742), referring to Colley Cibber’s A Letter from Mr Cibber to Mr Pope. Inquiring into the Motives that might induce him in his Satirical Works, to be so frequently fond of Mr Cibber’s Name (1742). The poem presents Sawney as suffering from a kind of pathological ingratitude, citing as evidence his ingratitude to Chandos in the Epistle To Burlington, and casts doubts on Pope’s declaration in Satire II. i. that he is ‘To VIRTUE ONLY and HER FRIENDS, A FRIEND’ (f. 121), T. E. IV, 17.
3. 'The Freedomes of Friendship': Pope's Relationship with Burlington

i) Burlington's early patronage of Pope and Gay

This chapter concerns Pope's attempt to strike a balance between dependence and friendship in his relationships with his patrons. Taking his relationship with Burlington as a test case, I will show that while it was to Pope's advantage, in terms of gaining a market for his work, to call his patrons his friends, in reality, it would be more accurate to call him their client, rather than their friend. The manner in which the relationship between Pope and Burlington developed is helpful in determining the basis of their loyalty to each other.

Not much is known about their initial acquaintance. Mack suggests that their friendship began possibly in early 1714. Burlington first appears in Pope's writings in his *A Farewell to London. In the Year 1715*, written as he was about to retire to Binfield, Windsor Forest, to work on his translation of the *Iliad*. Sherburn describes the poem as 'one of Pope's more spirited and light-hearted *jeux d'esprit* (The Early Career, p. 157) and Mack classes it as a 'tavern-poem' (*Alexander Pope*, p. 286). At this stage, Burlington appears as just one of the many society figures who make up London for Pope. Burlington had just returned from his 1714-1715 Grand Tour, which marked his coming of age.¹ Eight years Burlington's senior, Pope had by this time made his name as a poet and a wit: accordingly, in *A Farewell to London*, he presents himself as one who has experienced the best of London life. Burlington is remembered for his hospitality:

> Laborious Lobster-nights, farewell!
> For sober, studious Days;
> And Burlington's delicious Meal,
> For Sallads, Tarts, and Pease!
> (ll. 45-48)

Pope's attitude to the luxury of Burlington's hospitality is ambivalent. Virtue seems to lie in the country but the attractions of fine living are keenly felt. Burlington's use of riches for

¹ Harris describes the itinerary and taste of Burlington's Grand Tour as conventional, except for his love of music and the possibility that his longer stays might have had some connection with Jacobitism, pp. 38-40. See Clark's discussion of Burlington's possible Jacobite assignations in the Austrian Netherlands, Holland, the Black Forest and Rome, pp. 251-310 (pp. 253-57).
splendid hospitality is not held up for scrutiny, but, even in this early cameo role, his association with conspicuous consumption sets the tone for how he is to figure as Pope’s patron. In *A Farewell to London*, Pope’s portrait of Burlington is flattering but there is nevertheless something of a rebuke in the subsequent stanza:

Adieu to all but *Gay* alone,
Whose Soul, sincere and free,
Loves all Mankind, but flatters none,
And so may starve with me.
(ll. 49-52, T. E. VI, 130)

Pope overstates the case in anticipating starvation but this last stanza clearly makes an appeal for patronage for both himself and Gay.

It is worth contrasting Gay’s early relationship with Burlington with Pope’s. Where Pope, as we will see, extracted considerable benefits from Burlington thanks to the self-protecting distance he kept, Gay’s relationship with Burlington was conducted in the traditional language of patronage, a language which, I will suggest, was becoming outdated. From 1715, Gay was closely associated with Burlington House. He was probably, like Pope, introduced to Burlington by Jervas, the society portrait painter, who had accompanied Burlington on his Grand Tour of 1714-15. Gay’s *An Epistle to the Right Honourable the Earl of Burlington*, 1715, is a poem of ingratiation at once unsettling in what first strikes the reader as blatant flattery and charming in its description of Burlington’s Chiswick idyll. The poem opens:

While you, my Lord, bid stately Piles ascend,
Or in your *Chiswick* Bow’rs enjoy your Friend;
Where *Pope* unloads the Bough within his reach,
Of purple Grape, blue Plumb, or blushing Peach;
I journey far. — You knew fat Bards might tire,
And, mounted, sent me forth your trusty Squire.
(ll. 1-6)

In the last two lines above, Gay’s flattery appears to be undercut by the hint that he is to Burlington what Sancho Panza is to Don Quixote. Pope’s place in Chiswick is delicately

---

2 *John Gay*, p. 201.
described: the position of 'your friend' just before 'Where Pope unloads the bough', both suggests the intimacy between Burlington and his poet, while, at the same time, seeming to reserve 'friend' for the nobility: Gay does not quite call Pope Burlington's friend. As a celebrated poet, Pope's place in Burlington's garden is an additional flattery of Gay's: Pope is here as a status symbol. There is a clear echo of Ben Jonson's description of the orchard fruit in To Penshurst: 'The blushing apricot and woolly peach/ Hang on thy walls, that every child may reach' (ll. 43-44), making both for a mischievous joke about Pope's diminutive stature and a flattering allusion to the seventeenth-century tradition in English poetry which celebrated the English country house as the centre of a civilized community. To Penshurst is also much concerned with Jonson's relationship to his patron, a relationship which is likewise idealised.4

Gay's thanks to Burlington for lending him a horse is interesting in view of the fact that this is also the motive for Pope's most elaborate letter to Burlington, written in 1716, which I discuss later (Corr., I, 371-75). A patron who lent his artist a horse lifted him to the level of a gentleman. In thanking Burlington, both poets humorously style themselves vassals, using irony that emphasizes still more strongly the distance between patron and poet. Gay's Trivia, published in 1716, is a poem about London written from the point of view of walkers; as a poet without the means to travel other than by foot, Gay, like Pope, asserts the ethical superiority of poverty to luxury, while at the same time showing a taste for elegance.

In Book II of Trivia, Gay pays tribute to Burlington's generosity as a patron, while also setting the ruins of great English houses against the thriving Burlington House:

Yet Burlington's fair Palace still remains;
Beauty within, without Proportion reigns.
Beneath his Eye declining Art revives,
The Wall with animated Picture lives;
There Hendel strikes the Strings, the melting Strain
Transports the Soul, and thrills through ev'ry Vein;
There oft' I enter (but with cleaner Shoes)
For Burlington's belov'd by ev'ry Muse.
(II. 493-500)5

Gay’s rhyming his parenthetical ‘but with cleaner Shoes’ with ‘Burlington’s belov’d by ev’ry Muse’ refers to the alternative title of the poem: the full title runs *Trivia; or, the Art of Walking the Streets in London*. The poem’s appearance as a helpful guide to how to be streetwise in early eighteenth-century London through the metaphor of keeping your shoes as clean as possible despite the filth, ‘How to walk clean by Day, and safe by Night’ (l. 2), is belied by the alternative title’s punning reference to streetwalking.6 ‘With cleaner Shoes’ is a humorous reference to the distance between poet and patron: Gay might be implying either that Burlington has paid for his transport thither or else that, where Burlington might take a coach, chariot or a chair, the poet walks. Gay’s raillery is gentle; against Pope’s testimony that Gay ‘flatters none’, there is clear flattery here, although it is tempered with a certain jocularity. Burlington’s rarified world is sharply set against London’s dirty streets, which appear as the poet’s usual habitat.

The polished world of Gay’s patron, Burlington, is presented in the poem as the apotheosis of civilization. At the other end of the scale are the inevitable results of economic prosperity: pollution, as represented by ‘the slabby mire’ (the filthy streets) and poverty, as represented by hard-up poets such as Gay. As we might expect from a poet whose Muse is *Trivia*, London is made to seem trifling. In this light, Gay’s vision of urban dynamism is satirical. Yet since this is the only world there is, the trivial is shown to matter, as with Pope’s *The Rape of the Lock*.7 Gay was to become increasingly dependent on Burlington, spending long periods of time at Burlington House. There is an anecdote in James Lees-Milne’s *Earls of Creation* about Burlington’s neglect of Gay, once he was installed there:

Gay’s friends were critical of the Burlingtons for not giving him enough to eat; and Dr Arbuthnot declared that he found him one day in bed with a swollen face, eating his poultice for hunger.8

---

6 Ibid., 1, 135.
7 See also Brooks-Davies, p. 37.
8 Lees-Milne, pp. 140-41.
This story seems a world away from Gay's 'Burlington's belov'd by ev'ry Muse', which Foss describes as a picture of Burlington as a 'universal provider'. Burlington's neglect of Gay, along with more closely documented evidence about Burlington's treatment of other artists, might help explain Pope's reference to Burlington's 'hard heart' in the early drafts of his Epistle To Burlington.

Gay's intermittent dependency on Burlington continued for over a decade. In 1721 a letter of his to Francis Colman, diplomat and literary and musical dilettante, shows that he was Burlington's guest at Chiswick for much of spring and early summer:

I live almost altogether with Lord Burlington and pass my time very agreeably. I left Cheswick about three weeks ago, and have been ever since at the Bath with the Cholical humour in my stomach that you have heard me often complain off; Here is very little Company that I know; I expect a summons very suddenly to go with Lord Burlington into Yorkshire. you must think that I cannot be now and then without some thoughts that give me uneasiness, who have not the least prospect of ever being independent; my Friends do a great deal for me, but I think I could do more for them.

Some of this letter gives support to the traditional picture of Gay as a weak-willed dependent, uneasy in his conscience about his way of life; nevertheless, the mention of Burlington's expected summons hints ironically at his patron's imperious airs and also comes as something of a relief to the news about his ill health and the lack of company at Bath. The final spirited 'my Friends do a great deal for me, but I think I could do more for them' is crucial to understanding the intention of the letter as a whole, and to his relationship with Burlington. Despite his lack of funds, Gay maintained a resilient confidence in his gifts. He does not say that he himself feels uneasy about his dependency; rather, he anticipates a remonstrance from his friend, Colman. The traditional nature of Gay's relationship with Burlington highlights the novelty of Pope's attempt to combine dependency with friendship in his relationship with Burlington.

---

9 Foss, p. 134.
ii) Burlington's protection of Pope at Chiswick

In *A Farewell to London*, Burlington does not yet feature for Pope as a future patron of arts, despite the fact that Burlington’s mother, Juliana, had established Burlington House as a centre for the arts and had persuaded him to act as sole patron to Handel three years earlier. As I have indicated in my previous chapter, Handel was to be one of the many artists who stayed at Burlington House while under its owner’s patronage: it would seem that Burlington kept alive the Restoration practice whereby a patron literally sheltered the artist. ‘The Love of Arts lies cold and dead/ In Halifax’s Urn’ (ll. 25-26, T. E. VI, 129), Pope tells us earlier in the poem. Although Halifax was one of the patrons of whom Pope was especially critical, Pope is nevertheless not suggesting that there is anyone to take his place. Burlington’s capacity for magnificence had yet to be translated from hospitality to patronage of the arts and architecture. The connection made in *A Farewell to London* between hospitality and patronage is important as both Burlington’s patronage of artists and his own architectural career had their roots in the aristocratic modes of hospitality that he so scrupulously followed.

From *A Farewell to London* with its first mention of Burlington as a society figure noted for his hospitality, it is surprising to find in the same year, the Popes moving from Binfield to Chiswick in the wake of the Jacobite rebellion to place themselves, as Catholics, under Burlington’s protection (*Alexander Pope*, p. 286). Though a Protestant Whig, Burlington was known for his tolerance. On 20 April 1716, Pope wrote to Caryll about the move:

[. . .] my father and mother having disposed of their little estate at Binfield, I was concerned to find out some asylum for their old age; and these cares, of settling, and furnishing a house, have employed me till yesterday, when we fixed at Chiswick under the wing of my Lord Burlington. (*Corr.*, I, 339)

For a poet as sensitive about obligations as Pope, it is extraordinary that he began his relationship with Burlington with so heavy a debt.

---

11 See also "Avowed Friend and Patron", pp. 217-29 (p. 218-19).
Burlington emerges as the patron to whom Pope owed the most in the course of his life. At the time of the move to Chiswick, Pope had just published the second volume of the *Iliad*, and, although much of the groundwork for subscription was completed, the work of translation still weighed heavily on him. The subscription for the *Iliad* was a major commercial venture and, at this point in his career, Pope's readership was by no means defined. Burlington offered him 'Protection' at a highly vulnerable time and continued in his support: as a result, Pope was to stay 'under his wing' all his life.

Pope's retirement to the country to begin his translation of Homer coincided with Burlington's discovery of Palladio and, through him, Vitruvius and the architecture of Ancient Rome. Virtue for Pope and Burlington was located in the Ancient World. While both Pope's and Burlington's projects borrowed some glamour from the idea of a new renaissance in the arts, in the reigns of George I and George II, with the failure of 'the Augustan age' to materialize, they began to take on the cast of monuments to the past. Barrell has shown how the writings of the Classical Age became "'literary monuments" which function is 'not to provoke emulation, but to mark the distance between the societies that produced them, and the modern age." Pope's predilection for writing about erecting 'monuments' and leaving 'testimonies' as evidence of his friendships, not, it would seem, to stand as directives for his contemporaries or for future generations, but, rather, perhaps, to add to an imaginary museum of Virtue, would seem to support Barrell's description.

The move to Chiswick to escape religious persecution is the first of the three main episodes in Pope's life where he was shielded by Burlington. Here he showed himself to be of quite a different disposition from Gay who fell out spectacularly with Burlington through his success with *The Beggar's Opera*. Gay's triumph was Burlington's ruin: the huge popularity of *The Beggar's Opera* resulted in the commercial destruction of Burlington's

---

13 See Harris, p. 115.
14 Barrell, p. 61.
15 See my examples discussed later in this examination of the relationship between Pope and Burlington: Pope's description of his Epistle to Burlington as a 'Testimony' of his esteem for Burlington, Corr., III, 187; Pope to Swift on the 'Monument' of their friendship that was his publication of their correspondence, ibid., IV, 337-38. See also Pope's dedication of the *Iliad* to Congreve, which I discussed in my introduction, as a 'Memorial' of their friendship, T. E. VIII, 578.
rival opera company, the Academy of Music. The second episode is his persuasion of Burlington, Bathurst and Oxford to act as publishers of the *Dunciad* of 1729. The third time he needed Burlington’s defence was during the Chandos affair. In each of these three episodes, the old courtly idea of a patron’s ‘protection’ was made literal. Without this kind of patronage, the danger of impeachment would have made it impossible to have found a publisher for the *Dunciad Variorum*.

Pope expressed his thanks to Burlington for his help with the publication of the *Dunciad Variorum* by means of a note on line 324, Book III, ‘And Jones’ and Boyle’s united labours fall’, part of a prophecy on the end of culture, where he says that Burlington ‘by his publication of the designs of that great Master [Jones] and Palladio, as well as by many noble buildings of his own, revived the true Taste of Architecture in this Kingdom’ (T. E. V, 189). In the previous chapter, I have shown how little Burlington did to disseminate Palladio’s ideas by means of publication. Pope’s description of Burlington’s ‘many noble buildings’ seems an exaggeration: by 1729, Burlington had himself either made or supervised designs for Burlington House, General Wade’s house in Old Burlington Street, Tottenham House in Wiltshire, the Westminster dormitory and Chiswick villa. The extent to which Pope’s exaggerations helped create Burlington’s reputation, as well as his own, is worth bearing in mind: Pope was accomplished in the art of advertisement.

Burlington’s motive for protecting Pope was, I would argue, not disinterested friendship. His sympathy with the concerns of the *Dunciad* is exemplified in a letter of 1735 to his wife, responding to her news about criticism of his work. Describing the attacks upon him as

---

17 It is interesting that the most fulsome praise of Burlington dates from after Pope’s note of tribute in the *Dunciad* and his Epistle To Burlington and tends to use his terms of praise: Scipio Maffei described Burlington as ‘il Palladio e il Jones de nostri tempi’, inscribed by Maffei in his presentation copy of the A. Pompei edition of M. Sanmichele’s *Li Cinque Ordini dell’Architettura Civile*, Verona, 1735 (copy at Chatsworth); Francis Drake, the historian of York, dedicated his history of the city, *Eboracum*, to Burlington in 1735, asserting that Burlington’s ‘particular genius almost speaks him of Roman extraction’. For Drake, the new assembly rooms were a place ‘where the liberal arts should flourish and where new splendour should emulate the ancient glory of Eboracum’, quoted in Harris, p. 28; Daniel Defoe wrote about Tottenham Park as ‘built by our Modern Vitruvius, the Earl of Burlington, who gave to English Architecture the elegance and politeness of Italian Taste’, *A Tour Thro’ the Whole Island of Great Britain*, 1742; Horace Walpole’s summing-up of Burlington is one of superlatives: ‘Never was protection and great wealth more generously and judiciously diffused than by this great person, who had every quality of a genius and artist, except envy’, quoted in Connor, pp. 52-59 (p. 52). Before Pope’s praise, Burlington’s dedicators had tended to omit the link with Vitruvius and Ancient Rome, concentrating rather on Palladio, as Leoni’s dedication of his translation of Palladio’s *I Quattro Libri* shows, where he refers to Burlington as one who had ‘revived and set into its true light, the glory of that illustrious architect, the follower of our Andrea Palladio who [. . .] has shown himself a compleat Master of Magnificence and fine Taste’, quoted in Connor, pp. 52-59 (p. 52).
'insipid' and yet 'really entertaining to those, at whom they are level'd', he dismissed his enemies with a reference to the poem:

They wou'd have made their satyr keener, had they known the gracious message in your letter. did they but know how case harden'd I am, against all the forces of ye Dunciad they wou'd not throw away their time upon me. I have now thrown away too much both of yours and mine, upon them.18

Pope was, as Hogarth's cartoon on the gate of Burlington House suggests, highly useful to Burlington in 'whitewashing' his idea of Taste. He kept in Burlington's favour by continuing to promote this idea, with which he probably, in any case, agreed. In return for his loyalty, Burlington carried out many favours for him, the most striking financial examples of which are his offering him a site at the back of Burlington House and, later, when Pope had rejected this offer on the grounds of the cost of building in London, his insisting on paying for all the materials of his house at Twickenham (see Corr., II, 1-2 and III, 341-42). In turn, Pope's work on his own house and gardens can be seen as variations on Burlington's theme, both flattering to him and also useful in promoting his fame.

18 Chatsworth MS 127.5. In all subsequent references to Burlington's correspondence held at Chatsworth, his addressee is the Countess of Burlington.
iii) Pope’s and Burlington’s correspondence: Pope’s attitude towards their relationship

One of the overwhelming impressions gained from a reading of Pope’s letters to Burlington is that in nearly every letter he is asking for favours. He seems to enjoy paying court to him in the old style, artfully manipulating the traditional language of patronage to flatter his patron by showing that they two are above the empty forms of flattery and the corruption that it engenders. In so doing, he uses the phrases of patronage with irony. His ‘waiting’ on Burlington becomes a joke about patronage as well as an indicator of affection; his attitude seems to be the opposite of Swift’s bitterness at his days of attendance on ministers and lords. At times, in addressing Burlington, Pope plays with financial language, as in the excerpt below, taken from a letter expressing his gratitude for the offer of a site in town, though he has decided not to accept it:

I beg leave also to assure you, My Lord, that I think the Obligation as fully & strongly layd upon me, as if I had embraced the Favor you designed me. I take it further, as a Title to a future one; so that instead of obligeing me at Once, you will do it Twice, in the very same Affair. This is putting your Benefit out to use, & doubling it. Tho’ you never design’d to be the greatest Usurer in the world, yet you really will be so, if all the Hearts of those you have to deal with, have as good a Fund as mine. I am, with the sincerest Esteem & Gratefulness, My Lord, Your most faithful, obligd, & most humble Servant, A. Pope
(2 February 1718/19, Corr., II, 2)

I have argued that Burlington’s impatience with pretenders in manners forms the main subject of To Burlington: Pope wrote what he knew would not only strike a chord with Burlington but would also flatter him. A reading of Burlington’s letters and writings is needed to establish what characteristic attitudes of Burlington Pope was adopting in his poem. Burlington’s surviving letters to Pope are short and business-like in comparison with Pope’s to Burlington which are often elaborate essays designed to entertain his patron. There is none of the news and sharing of opinions that are found in Burlington’s correspondence with his wife. A typical Burlington response is a letter probably written in 1718, thanking Pope for a letter:

My dear Pope,— I was agreably surprised last post with your letter, I need not tell you that it is always the greatest pleasure in the world to me to hear from one that I love so well and whose
Epistles are something more entertaining than those, that one receives from the rest of mankind. you can expect no return, to your news paper from this remote quarter, but however to let you see that we are not quite void of curiosity I send you a weekly paper from Yorke I am my dear Pope your most affectionate humble servant / Burlington Londesbrough aug 26
Pray my sincere respects to Gay (Corr., I, 491)

The tone of Burlington’s letter is friendly, respectful and admiring of Pope’s wit but, as in the rest of his correspondence with him, he hardly gives any news of himself.

Pope wrote one of the finest letters in his entire collection to Burlington in 1716. The subject is the bookselling trade. The letter is a comic tour de force running to several pages about a journey to Oxford with Bernard Lintot, who had published his translation of the Iliad the previous year. In this letter, Pope flatters his patron in several ways, not least by the work that he has put into writing the letter and revising it: by writing so witty and, as Sherburn describes it, so ‘finished’ a letter, Pope pays tribute to Burlington’s sophistication (Corr., I, 371n.). Apart from this, of course, he has his own reputation to keep up. He also acknowledges his debt to Burlington, in that Burlington’s patronage helps to put him in a strong position in his dealings with publishers.

Pope’s letter about his journey to Oxford is an elaborate letter of thanks to Burlington for having lent him a horse. On the way to Oxford, he tells how he is overtaken by Lintot in Windsor Forest and Lintot suggests they rest for a while. When they dismount, Pope relates Lintot’s absurd literary opportunism, as he suggests that Pope might knock off a few translations of Horace while they rest: Lintot’s attitude is clearly ‘waste no time’. He addresses Pope as follows:

... ‘See here, what a mighty pretty Horace I have in my pocket? what if you amus’d your self in turning an Ode, till we mount again? Lord! if you pleas’d, what a clever Miscellany might you make at leisure hours.’ Perhaps I may, said I, if we ride on; the motion is an aid to my fancy; a round trott very much awakens my spirits. Then jog on apace, and I’ll think as hard as I can.

Silence ensu’d for a full hour; after which Mr Lintott lug’d the reins; stopt short, and broke out, ‘Well, Sir, how far have you gone?’ I answer’d seven miles. ’Z-ds, Sir, said Lintott, I thought you had done seven stanza’s. Oldsworth in a ramble round Wimbleton-hill, would translate a whole Ode in half this time. I’ll say that for Oldsworth, (tho’ I lost his Timothy’s) he translates an Ode of Horace the quickest of any man in England. I remember Dr King would write verses in a tavern three hours after he couldn’t speak: and there’s Sir Richard in that rambling old Chariot of his, between Fleet-ditch and St Giles’s pound shall make you half a Job.’ (Corr., I, 373)
Lintot’s admiration for speed in producing translations, regardless of quality of work or ability of the translator, has its opposite in Pope’s nonchalant anticipation of the years—six, as it turned out—that it would take him to translate the *Iliad* in the final sentence of his Preface to Volume I:

Whatever the Success may prove, I shall never repent of an Undertaking in which I have experience’d the Candour and Friendship of so many Persons of Merit; and in which I hope to pass some of those Years of Youth that are generally lost in a Circle of Follies, after a manner neither wholly unuseful to others, nor disagreeable to my self. (T. E. VII, 25)\(^{19}\)

Pope builds up to a crowning example of ludicrous literal-mindedness which satirizes both Lintot and the critics of the time. After having asked Lintot how he manages translators, he asks with mock politeness: ‘Pray tell me next how you deal with the Critics?’:

Sir (said he) nothing more easy. I can silence the most formidable of them; the rich one’s for a sheet apiece of the blotted manuscript, which costs me nothing. They’ll go about with it to their acquaintance, and pretend they had it from the author, who submitted to their correction: this has given some of them such an air, that in time they come to be consulted with, and dedicated to, as the top critics of the town. As for the poor Critics, I’ll give you one instance of my management, by which you may guess at the rest. A lean man that look’d like a very good scholar came to me t’other day; he turn’d over Homer, shook his head, shrug’d up his shoulders, and pish’d at every line of it; One would wonder (says he) at the strange presumption of men; Homer is no such easy task, that every Stripling, every Versifier—he was going on when my Wife call’d to dinner: Sir, said I, will you please to eat a piece of beef with me? Mr Lintott, said he, I am sorry you should be at the expence of this great Book, I am really concern’d on your account—Sir I am oblig’d to you: if you can dine upon a piece of beef, together with a slice of pudding—Mr Lintott, I do not say but Mr Pope, if he would condescend to advise with men of learning—Sir, the pudding is upon the table, if you please to go in—My critic complies, he comes to a taste of your poetry, and tells me in the same breath, that the Book is commendable, and the Pudding excellent.’ (Corr., I, 374)

Behind this literary-world mockery is Pope’s involvement with Lintot, as his publisher: apart from his lucrative contract for the *Iliad*, he would also later sign a contract with him for his translation of the *Odyssey*.\(^{20}\) Pope’s scrupulous refusal of money from his patrons has its opposite in his ruthless pursuit of profit in his relationships with his booksellers. His last imagined (or perhaps embellished) conversation with Lintot underlines his consciousness of his obligations to his patrons:

Now Sir (concluded Mr Lintott) in return to the frankness I have shewn, pray tell me, ‘Is it the opinion of your friends at Court that my Lord L— will be brought to the Bar or not?’ I told

---

\(^{19}\) Pope’s philosophical attitude as expressed in his Preface is contradicted by his letters to friends on the arduous task of translation: see, for example, his letter of June 1717 to Robert Digby, *Corr.*, I, 408-09.

\(^{20}\) Foxon points out that Lintot owned the copyright for most of Pope’s poems. See also Foxon’s description of Pope’s later relationship with Lintot, p. 47, p. 151, p. 237.
him I heard not, and I hop'd it, my Lord being one I had particular obligations to. 'That may be (reply'd Mr Lintott) but by G-d if he is not, I shall lose the printing of a very good Trial.'

These my Lord are a few traits by which you may discern the genius of my friend Mr Lintott, which I have chosen for the subject of a letter. I dropt him as soon as I got to Oxford, and paid a visit to my Lord Carlton at Middleton.

The conversations I enjoy here are not to be prejudic'd by my pen, and the pleasures from them only to be equal'd when I meet your Lordship. I hope in a few days to cast my self from your horse at your feet. I am, &c. (Corr., I, 374-75)

Pope’s signing off is a string of witty twists on the conventional language of compliment.

Lord Carlton, mentioned here at the end of the letter, was Burlington’s uncle. Pope’s compliment that he would not ‘prejudice’ the conversations at Lord Carlton’s by writing of them deferentially points not only to the social distance between Grub Street and the aristocracy (he has just been ‘prejudicing’, as it were, his conversation with Lintot) but also to the distance between Burlington and himself. The next link in the chain of compliments is to compare the conversational pleasures at Lord Carlton’s with those to be had with Burlington. The clinching of the letter is a witty literalizing of metaphor: Pope again acknowledges his debt to Burlington both for the lending of his horse and the lending of his protection as patron by looking forward to casting himself from Burlington’s horse at his feet.

Burlington’s correspondence with his wife shows a wry detachment from the deference and compliments he was always to receive. By looking at a few examples of his attitude to compliments, we can see how exactly Pope’s wit on this subject might have pleased him. In a letter of June 10, 1735, Burlington writes in a detached manner about social formalities:

I was yesterday at York, and passed thro the usual forms, coming back I called at Kilwick to see my Lady A. the whole family tho late, new dressed to receive us, which was not to much purpose for we did not stay ten minutes tho much pressed.21

There is a similar sense of Burlington’s expecting deference while being bored by it in a letter of 21 October 1739 where he tells his wife: ‘I have many compliments to you from Allerton, from whence I got away with much difficulty.’22

---

21 Chatsworth MS 127.4.
22 Chatsworth MS 127.21.
In paying Burlington compliments, Pope’s attitude is that of the jester. His readiness to take on this role should not be taken lightly. While, as Erskine-Hill suggests, his adoption of the role of the poet as Court entertainer points to a level of intimacy and understanding between aristocrat and poet, it is also worth bearing in mind the possibility of the indignity that a poet placed in such a position might suffer. Swift felt considerable bitterness towards the 1st Earl of Oxford, when, disappointed in his hopes for preferment, he took the view that his noble friend had entertained him simply for his own amusement. In his *Imitation of Horace, Epistle VII, Book 1* (1713), mockingly dedicated to Oxford, he tells how he is reduced to servant-like status by taking the bait of hospitality:

The Doctor now obeys the summons,  
Likes both the company and commons;  
Displays his talent, sits till ten;  
Next day invited, comes again:  
Soon grows domestic, seldom fails  
Either at morning, or at meals;  
Comes early, and departeth late:  
In short the gudgeon took the bait.  
My Lord would carry on the jest,  
And down to Windsor takes his guest.  
(II. 73-84)

In contrast to Swift, Pope seems to have known from the start that he had to sing for his supper. Being particularly good at the part of jester and using it to his own advantage, it seems that he was quite willing to do it.

By taking on the role of jester, Pope plays on Burlington’s identity as aristocratic landlord. This emphasis in Burlington’s life on his duties of hospitality rather than his work as either architect or patron of the arts seems to be confirmed by his correspondence, although, in his private letters, it might be expected that he would not write much of his architectural works. The reasons for this emphasis on hospitality turn out to be peculiarly modern. His letters demonstrate a recognition of ‘housekeeping’ in its Restoration sense of the hospitality owed by the landed aristocracy to the community, as a duty but, privately, this duty is often felt by him as a burden. He attributes this to a failure in manners on the part

---

24 Jonathan Swift, p. 155. See also Rogers’ account of the publication of the poem, ibid., p. 663.
of his guests: his country neighbours take advantage of his hospitality to the point where he hardly has the time to write to his wife.\textsuperscript{25}

There are two clear preoccupations in Burlington’s letters: he first tells stories of people behaving badly or inappropriately and, secondly, he writes of being constantly besieged by uninvited guests. He constantly writes to Lady Burlington of being besieged by visitors as an explanation as to why he cannot fix a date when he can come to meet her. The correspondence is a result of their respective demanding duties: Burlington’s obligations at Londesborough in Yorkshire had their counterpart in Lady Burlington’s obligations at Court as Lady-in-Waiting to Queen Caroline. Their letters are often concerned with their attempts to make arrangements to meet.

Burlington’s being beset by his Londesburgh neighbours reverses the traditional picture of the aristocratic patron, in a position of authority as to who was invited to his house and, especially so, we might have thought, on the matter of who came to dinner. The demands of housekeeping were so fierce that Burlington’s letters were mostly written in haste and, often, last thing at night, in the dark. A typical letter written in 1735 shows his plans to meet his wife being delayed by unexpected guests:

\begin{quote}
I find by yrs of this morning that you are to be received on Monday, and heartily wish that I cou’d have managed my affaires so as to have met you then at Chiswick but as Mr Burward and Sir Wm Abdy came so late they are still here but I hope they will be gone by to Morrow or next day and I propose to set out on tuesday and hope to be with you on thursday night if possible as the country is very pleasant I highly approve your intention of being here for some time which we may easily bring about after my having been ten days at Chiswick. I wonder you don’t chide me for the shortness of my letters, it is really occasioned by having never been alone since my being here, Mr Moyser has been here these 2 days, and I have not had time to be commonly civil to him. by this you may judge how my time is taken up.\textsuperscript{26}
\end{quote}

Many of Burlington’s letters give the impression that his only real desire was to escape from Londesborough to meet his wife. Often, as in the excerpt below from a letter of 1739, we see his spirits lift for a moment when he finds himself free from guests and goes out alone only to return again to a full house:


26 Chatsworth MS 127.9.
I have time (and that is all) to thank you for yr letter for this morning when I went to shoot, I left the house empty, at my return, I found Bradshaigh and a friend, Sr Wm Sr Quentin and his brother, Mr Musgrave, Ger, Drake, and afterwards Abdy and Burward. by this you may guess that we are full as to beds, the 2 first went home. I dined yesterday at Burton, where you was much enquired after. I have not had as yet, any discourse with Burward, when I have, by next post I shall be able to say something. they wait for me, so I must conclude.  

An earlier letter of 1735, two years after Burlington’s resignation from all his Court appointments, gives us a glimpse of his double-edged response to his uninvited guests:

I was in hopes of setting out on tuesday morning, but as the tide falls out, it will not be of any use to me for expedition, so that I intend to go on tuesday night to Mr Crowles, which is within two miles of the ferry. and then make what despatch I can, to which end, I shall send my horses forward, and go to Mr Hunganans to J K Hal. old Moyser has been here three days, and Crowle too. they both went away this morning, and left Libero Campo. but at coming from Church, I found Cl. Wade, Sr R Clifton Dan. D of Cl., Cl Moyser and 2 Fercklands, with others, in short a large table full. some people wou’d not like to know that this happens to me every day. if Polert was not figurd in honor, I shou’d make but a bad figure upon these occasions, but to give him his due, considering the help he has, we do very well twice a day.  

This last remark, ‘some people wou’d not like to know that this happens to me every day’, is ambiguous; it might mean that some people, presumably his enemies, might prefer him to be less popular; or else that his friends might wish, for his sake, he were not so put upon by uninvited guests. There is, I think, a suggestion in the tone that he is, in part, gratified that he is so besieged, as well as, at the same time, wearied by it. The end result of all this hospitality is, nevertheless, that he makes a ‘good figure’: as he says, they ‘do very well’. Over all, he does not seem unhappy with his situation at Londesborough.

In his letters to his wife, Burlington takes particular note of news about people behaving badly, especially when they ought to know better. His usual reaction is that he is ‘sorry but not surprised’. In response to a letter of Lady Burlington’s about bad behaviour at the Royal dinner party at Wimbledon, he writes:

you told me in yr former of the dinner at Wimbledon, nothing of this kind surprises me, for example, I found Sr. of Pensington here yesterday, when I came home to dinner common hospitality made me do what I thought right, barely, but nothing more.

---

27 Chatsworth MS 127.22.  
28 Chatsworth MS 127.10.  
29 21 October 1739, Chatsworth MS 127.21.  
30 30 October 1739, Chatsworth MS 127.25.
Burlington’s response to bad manners is to assume the most freezingly good manners he can. After telling Lady Burlington that he is among a great deal of company, he reports:

the other day, my Warter neighbour came in, with his son, and two cubs from London. I thought him infinitely too low, to show any resentment to him. as his very coming proved. I hope I behaved well, for the Vicar told me at night, that he had observed me to use great civility, with the greatest coldness towards him.31

From the emphasis in Burlington’s letters on domestic arrangements, focusing mainly on news about manners, it begins to emerge that his architectural projects made up, along with many other artistic and political projects, the public expression of his aristocratic way of living. In relaying stories of bad grace to Lady Burlington, he seems to be astonished at people’s bad behaviour but it does not occur to him to try to improve them. His approach seems to be that people should know how to behave: they should not have to be told. As in his life, so too in his architectural projects, his attention is drawn to the mistakes that people make, with no desire to set them right or show them how they ought to behave. Here Langford’s definition of politeness is helpful:

The essence of politeness was often said to be that je ne sais quoi which distinguished the innate gentleman’s understanding of what made for civilized conduct, but this did not inhibit others from seeking more artificial means of acquiring it.32

Commentators often tend to assume that Pope was in a stronger position in polite society than was actually the case. Howard Erskine-Hill describes the attitude of Pope’s patrons towards him as exemplary of ‘the Augustan Idea’:

They were affable and friendly, willing to honour talent with their friendship. This indeed is one of the positive aspects of what constituted the Augustan Idea in the earlier eighteenth century: a relation between ruler and artist in which patron and client became friends on a familiar footing. This Pope was to sum up when, late in his life and long after he had ensured his own financial independence, he wrote to the countess of Burlington of her husband’s being ‘his avowed Friend & Patron’ (c. 8 Sept. 1738).33

It is possible that Erskine-Hill’s version of ‘the Augustan Idea’ is, in this context, misleading. Ideas about patronage that commentators assume were common were, I would

---

argue, particular to Pope. The lengths to which Pope went in both his poetry and his life to keep Burlington’s favour testify not primarily to friendship but to his dependence on patronage in defining his readership. Lord John Hervey, who also had to work all his life to maintain his position, gives us an insight into how patronage worked in the early eighteenth century in his advice to his friend, Benjamin Hoadly, Bishop of Salisbury. Salisbury had been promised Winchester by the Queen and Walpole but as soon as the see became vacant, Hervey advised Hoadly to come to London to press his suit in person. Hervey told Hoadly that, in matters of patronage, he could not to take Mahomet’s attitude, warning him not to ‘sit still and fancy the mountain of preferment will walk to you to Salisbury’. Hervey’s advice to act suggests the approach adopted by Pope in his relationships with patrons: ‘Write therefore now, come, speak, dun, and behave, not as your laziness inclines you, but as your interest directs, as common prudence dictates, as your friends advise, and as what you owe to yourself and your family requires.’

From the start, it is clear that Pope had no illusions that ‘the mountain of preferment’ would come to him. As I have argued, while he might have put forward an ideal of friendship between poet and patron in his poetry and his letters, in reality his relationships with his patrons were by no means easy and assured. The letters between Pope and Burlington show mutual respect, affection and intimacy, but the social distance between them is always clear. The evidence would suggest that the benefits he gained for himself from Burlington and other patrons were hard-won. Burlington’s relationships with the many artists he encouraged give the impression that he was a patron who had no qualms about breaking off relations with his protégés when they disappointed or offended him. In a survey of the artists who benefited from Burlington’s patronage, only Handel and Pope emerge as continuing in his favour to the last.

An examination of the relationship between Pope and Burlington suggests that Rogers’ discovery of the labour and anxiety in Pope’s subscription work will also be found in his

dealings with his patrons. In the world of patronage, his exertions were extraordinary, in proportion to the difficulty of what he was setting out to achieve. In his works, he supplants the patron with the friend: at first glance this seems to be a real aim, but emerges rather as a criticism of traditional patterns of patronage, whereby the patron might abuse his superior position. His advice to Gay on how to behave with superiors supports the impression that he was mainly concerned with keeping from being a dependant so that relationships based on equality might at least become a possibility: ‘While you are no body’s Servant, you may be any one’s Friend’ (16 October 1727, Corr., II, 454). In his relationship with Burlington, he fell somewhere between the two extremes of servant and friend but, by insisting on the importance of friendship, he gained the most that he could from the relationship and, by this means, helped safeguard his reputation.

---

35 See ‘Pope and his Subscribers’, p. 192.
4. ‘A Most Extravagant Censure’: The Outcry against the Epistle To Burlington

i) The historical background

The culmination of Pope’s involvement with Lord Burlington and his circle is his Epistle To Burlington, published on 13 December 1731. As I outlined in Chapter 2, in the Epistle, Pope formally praises Burlington, ridicules his imitators and looks forward to his future public works; as events would have it, however, the Epistle marked the end of Burlington’s architectural career. The Epistle also marks a turning-point in Pope’s poetry. After the onslaught that it provoked, his poetry takes on a darker tone. It is as if from this point onwards, he is in some measure subscribing to Swift’s credo: ‘the chief end I propose to myself in all my labors is to vex the world rather then divert it’ (Swift to Pope, 29 September 1725, Corr., II, 325).

The original source of the rumour that Timon was Pope’s patron, the Duke of Chandos, was mysterious; nevertheless, the gossip against Pope was closely followed by scurrilous pamphlets by known writers. The swiftness of the strike against Pope is surprising. Aaron Hill first wrote to him with news of the gossip on 17 December and the first of the pamphlets, Leonard Welsted’s Of Dulness and Scandal, appeared on 3 January 1732. Welsted and Matthew Concanen, another of the pamphleteers, had appeared in the Dunciad Variorum. As we have seen, Pope’s method of publication of the Dunciad Variorum, using Burlington, Bathurst and Oxford as co-publishers, had effectively muzzled the hacks that he ridiculed: their fury was contained until his next publication, the Epistle To Burlington. The attacks on him for the Epistle To Burlington continued throughout 1732 and 1733. Charges arising from the Epistle became a dominant part of the catalogue of Pope’s offences and are to be found still in currency as late as 1743: evidently, much more was involved than purely the hacks’ revenge.

---

1 Concanen is described in Pope’s notes as ‘an anonymous slanderer, and publisher of other men’s slanders’, Book II, I, 130n. Welsted takes part in the patron-tickling competition, Book II, II. 197-98; both he and Concanen take part in the diving competition, Book II, II. 287-300, T. E. V, 124-25 and 137-39.
The campaign against Pope, accusing him of ingratitude towards Chandos, was seemingly out of all proportion to the design of the Epistle. That his enemies should attack him for a poem with no obvious political purpose shows how matters of Taste in architecture were far from innocuous. Bolingbroke feigns surprise on this score in his introduction to his Letters or Essays Addressed to Mr Pope:

By the authority that employed itself to encourage this clamor, and by the industry used to spread and support it, one would have thought that you had directed your satyr in that epistle to political subjects, and had inveighed against those who impoverish, dishonor, and sell their country, instead of making yourself inoffensively merry at the expense of men who ruin none but themselves, and render none but themselves ridiculous. ²

The implication behind what Bolingbroke says is that the 'clamor', as both Bolingbroke and Pope call it (see Corr., III, 265), is disingenuous and politically-motivated. On first impression, Pope seems to be the only target of the pamphleteers but, on further investigation and with greater knowledge of the background to the attacks, other targets appear. In feigning outrage on behalf of injured patrons at Pope’s supposed ingratitude, the pamphleteers not only defamed him but also, by association, smeared Chandos and Burlington. Chandos’ letter to Pope of 27 December 1731 clearing him of any blame makes it evident that the attack on Pope also constituted an attack on himself. Chandos also wrote that the attack on Pope confirmed his prior knowledge of the Town’s hostility towards himself:

Sir — I am much troubled by your favour of the 22d you are under any uneasiness, at the application the Town has made of Timon’s Character, in your Epistle to the Earl of Burlington. For my own part I have received so many instances of the will they bear me, that I am as little surprized as I am affected with this further proof of it; It would indeed be a real concern to me did I believe One of your Judgment had designedly given grounds for their imbibing an Opinion, so disadvantageous of me. But as your obliging Letter, is sufficient to free me from this apprehension, I can with great indifference bear the insults they bestow, and not find myself hurt by ‘em: nor have I Reason to be much disturb’d, when I consider how many better persons are the daily objects of their unjust censures [. . .]

I earnestly wish you may soon be restored to that quiet of mind you have hitherto possesst, and without which no happiness can be enjoy’d. I am/ Sir Your &c (Corr., III, 262-63)

It is worth noting here how good Pope was at writing ‘obliging Letters’.

² Bolingbroke, Henry St John, 1st Viscount, Letters or Essays Addressed to Mr Pope (first publ. London, 1753), Works, III, 314.
Chandos made his fortune between 1705 and 1713 in the wars against Spain and France when he was Paymaster of the Foreign Forces. His biographers highlight the spectacular nature of his rising in the world: ‘Mr Brydges entered the paymaster’s office a relatively poor man, just under thirty, and closed its doors behind him, eight years later, one of the richest men in England’ and, incidentally, an extravagant patron of the arts. At the time there was considerable public suspicion about the means by which he had come by his riches. This suspicion was well-founded: he had made use of public monies to fund private investments, had taken bribes and made use of his inside knowledge of foreign policymaking to help his and his friends’ speculations on stocks. Since his carefully orchestrated exit from office, he had been the subject of malicious rumour, both spoken and printed.

A distinction needs to be drawn, however, between the attack made on Pope and the attacks made on his noble patrons. Where Chandos and Burlington were only really under attack by association with Pope, Pope was the one with his head on the block. The nature of the attacks makes it clear that this was a real attempt to destroy his reputation. In response to this, his attitude towards his enemies changes. From his Epistle To Burlington onwards, he is no longer dealing with envious fellow-authors or hacks who write libellous material simply to earn a living, but (as he thought) an organized political campaign.

Pope’s sharp reaction to the attacks also indicates the importance of patronage in the first half of the eighteenth century and how closely patronage was woven in with the market. As I have argued in my introduction, Pope was not independent of his patrons: on the contrary, he was, in large measure, dependent on them, not merely for his continued success as a poet but also for his personal security. The pressure put on Chandos and Burlington, and, with them, the whole nobility, to remove their protection was deadly. If he could be established as ungrateful and unreliable, . There was as yet no public that he
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could rely on for the sale of his work, although he can be thought of as instrumental in
developing what would become the reading public. Without his noble lords’ support, he
might have found himself at the mercy of his enemies: his position as a member of a
persecuted minority made his situation particularly perilous.

In his first letter to Burlington on the subject, dated 21 December 1731, Pope’s tone is
fevered, registering shock and surprise at the outcry as well as real alarm as to how
Burlington will take the rumours:

My Lord, – Having been confined at home for ten days by my Mothers being in extreme
danger, I never heard till two days since of a most Extravagant Censure, which they say the
whole Town passes upon the Epistle I honourd myself in addressing to your Lordship, as if it
were intended to expose the D. of Chandos. Either the whole Town then, or I, have lost our
Senses; for nothing is so evident, to any one who can read the Language, either of English or
Poetry, as that Character of Timon is collected from twenty different absurditys &
Improprieties: & was never the Picture of any one Human Creature. The Argument is short.
Either the Duke these folks would abuse, did all those things, or he did not. If he did, he would
deserve to be laughd at with a Vengeance; and if he did not, then it’s plain it cannot be the
Duke: and the latter is really the case.

I beg to know what are your Lordships Sentiments, that I should do in this unaccountable
affair? I hope You are not abused too, because I meant just the Contrary; I can’t tell, but I
fancy your Lordship is not so easy to be persuaded contrary to your Senses, even tho the whole
Town & Court too should require it. I doubt not the Justice, the more than justice, you will do
me, on this or any other Injury: but I really want to know your Thoughts of it, being (as I
perceive) a Man out of the World, & delirious: but still my dear Lord with understanding
enough to Love and Adhere to you.

Yours ever faithfully, / A Pope (Corr., III, 259)

I quote the letter in full because the expression of vulnerability on Pope’s part cannot be
doubted here; it is also a rare instance of him dropping his guard. He is often accused, and
often guilty, of insincerity in his dealings with the world. In the above letter, his proposal,
‘Either the Duke these folks would abuse, did all those things, or he did not’, probably a
reference to the extravagance of Cannons, seems characteristically disingenuous. As a
Catholic, an independent satirist and a man crippled by tuberculosis, his vulnerability to
attack is indisputable, but in his letters to his patrons, in expressing that vulnerability, he
often appears calculating and insincere. His artfulness with letters was of enormous account
in his success as a writer. In this regard, he is commonly thought of as a kind of literary
politician, always on the make.
It is traditionally assumed that, as the first man of letters to make a considerable amount of money from his work, Pope was cunningly in control of his patrons, booksellers and market. In this picture, he has taken on Addison's mantle as king of the literary world. It is precisely because, unlike Addison, he did not hire his pen out to the administration in power that he had no real security. The traditional picture of Pope, gloriously independent of the Court, and secure in the favour of his patrons, is misleading. His initial letter to Burlington on the Chandos affair alone, with its demonstration of his isolation as 'a Man out of the World' and his fears that, despite their strong friendship, even Burlington might believe what he hears from the Town and the Court against him, shows how difficult, not to mention dangerous, it was for any artist to attempt to operate outside the Walpole administration and, indeed, outside of any party.

In the aftermath of the attacks on him for the Epistle, once he had gained Burlington's and Chandos' support, he could revert to his assured tone of protected poet in dealing with the affair. Pope's formal letter to Burlington of January 1732 expressed his gratitude for both patrons' backing while, at the same time, placing emphasis on the danger of dissent:

This way of Satire is dangerous, as long as Slander rais'd by Fools of the lowest Rank, can find any Countenance from those of a Higher. Even from the Conduct shewn on this occasion, I have learnt there are some who wou'd rather be wicked than ridiculous; and therefore it may be safer to attack Vices than Follies. I will leave my Betters in the quiet Possession of their Idols, their Groves, and their High-Places; and change my Subject from their Pride to their Meanness, from their Vanities to their Miseries: And as the only certain way to avoid Misconstruction, to lessen Offence, and not to multiply ill-natur'd Applications, I may probably in my next make use of Real Names and not of Fictitious Ones.

(January 1731/2, Corr., III, 266)

Pope's printing of this letter as a preface to the third edition of the Epistle both socially and rhetorically reconfirmed Burlington's protection.
ii) Hostile responses: ingratitude

Why did Pope's enemies choose to use this particular, unlikely epistle to attack him and why did they focus in their attacks on ingratitude? What do the answers tell us about his relationship with Burlington and the benefits that he gained from his patronage? An analysis of the attacks listed in Guerinot's survey reveals that, of all of the charges levelled against him throughout his career, ranging from the dangerous, where he is accused of treason, to the ridiculous, where the charge is that he never laughs, the strongest emphasis falls on ingratitude. The first hint of ingratitude is in a pamphlet that links greed for money with faithlessness towards his friends in 1727, where he is accused of slandering his friends in print for profit. Accusations of ingratitude begin in earnest in 1728 with the charge of ungratefulness towards Addison.

Ingratitude emerges as the most vehemently made charge against Pope, as frequent as charges of deformity and avarice. These three main charges are often inter-linked, as if interconnected symptoms of a single malaise. Of the three, the first, and longest-lived, is that of deformity: it dates from Dennis' first attack on *An Essay on Criticism* in 1711 to 1743 with an anonymous pamphlet in support of Cibber. The charge of avarice is first noticed by Guerinot in 1714 and continues up to 1743. Of the three main charges levelled at Pope, the charge of ingratitude is framed in the most scalding language. The attack often takes the form of a potted biography which describes how his initial flattery of patrons is followed by abuse. The turning-point in the story is his achievement of financial independence: thereafter he behaves like the worst type of ingrate.

In Guerinot's survey, a pamphlet published on 22 January 1732 is the first to name the three main patrons to whom Pope is alleged to have been ungrateful, Addison, Chandos and Burlington. The pamphlet is called *Of Good Nature. An Epistle Humbly Inscrih'd to His G[ra]ce the D[u]ke of C[hando]s*. After praising Chandos for his generosity, the author compares Pope to an adder lurking at the heart of his unsuspecting patron:
AND yet there lives (oh! Shame to human Race!)
A Wretch who boasts within Your Heart a Place:
Who like an Adder, swoln with cherishing,
Darts at his Patron his relentless Sting:
Well-tREATED, yet not pleas’d, caress’d, yet rude,
And proud of the base Crime – INGRATITUDE.⁴

The penultimate line in the above quotation perhaps echoes Sir John Denham’s well-known line describing the Thames in Cooper’s Hill: ‘Though deep, yet clear, though gentle, yet not dull’ (l. 191).⁵ If this is a deliberate allusion, the pamphleteer’s satirical re-use of the cadence disrupts the whole idea of balance (the concordia discors) in Denham’s description: that Cooper’s Hill belongs to the country house tradition of English poetry which Pope celebrated might have made such an allusion particularly wounding. After this follows a biographical sketch which offers, at the end, a logical extension of his destructive behaviour pattern. The particular vision of the future contained in the pamphlet is particularly damaging for Pope and, in the wider context, also daring in its bringing Burlington into the fray. In Guerinot’s survey, Of Good Nature is the only pamphlet that dares to implicate Burlington in the scandal:

AH! hapless they on whom unknown you [Pope] smile,
Whose yielding Hearts thy Flatteries beguile:
Soon shall they see themselves with wild Surprise
Adorn’d, as Victims, for the Sacrifice:
So ADDISON – Peace to his gentle Shade –
Was to thy seeming Merit once betray’d:
So C[HANDO]S, GEN’ROUS LORD, is taught to know
That to oblige, is to exasp’rate You:
So the same Change shall many others see,
And B[UR]L[INGTO]N Himself be stab’d by Thee.⁶

Welsted, who had launched the first major attack on Pope for his Epistle To Burlington with Of Dulness and Scandal on 3 January 1732, adopted the biographical angle in his follow-up pamphlet, Of False Fame, published on 3 February, 1732:

UNMARK’D at first! necessitous and scorn’d!
No Patron own’d him, and no Bays adorn’d:
One Critic’s Pupil, with one Bard he vy’d;
And knew not to be ‘sick with civil Pride’.
A hungry Scribbler, and without a Name;

Till Fraud procur'd him Wealth, and Falshood Fame!
That Wealth obtain'd, Faith, Friendship he disclaims;
Sneers, where he fawn'd, and where he prais'd, defames [...]7

The biographical line of attack on Pope peaks in May 1733, the year of the Excise Crisis, with the pamphlet entitled *Ingratitude: To Mr Pope. Occasion'd by a Manuscript handed about, under the Title of, Mr Taste's Tour from a Land of Politeness, to that of Dulness and Scandal, &c &c. Ingratitude's the Growth of ev'ry Clime.*

Figure 2. Frontispiece to *Ingratitude: To Mr Pope.*

7 Of False Fame. An Epistle to the Right Honourable the Earl of Pembroke (London, 1732), pp. 19-20. The 'Critic' in this excerpt is identified as Henry Cromwell and the 'Bard', Charles Gildon, whom, so Pope had been informed, had been paid by Addison to satirize him (Alexander Pope, p. 282). The phrase 'sick with civil Pride' comes from the Timon passage in Pope's Epistle To Burlington: 'Sick of his civil Pride from Morn to Eve' (I. 166). T. E. Ill. ii., 153. The reference 'Till Fraud procur'd him Wealth' might refer to Pope’s having sub-contracted the translation of the *Odyssey* and then taken the credit for it.
In the frontispiece, Pope is shown grasped around the waist by a nobleman, probably, according to Frederic Stephens, the Duke of Chandos; to the left is another nobleman, laughing, and the missing fragment to the right once showed a third nobleman urinating on Pope who has a speech bubble coming out of his mouth with the words: 'Damn me if I don’t put you all in the Dunciad.' The bad taste of this fragment seems an apt way of attacking a poet whose main claim was to Taste, whilst also putting him in his place as the social inferior of the noble Lord he was supposedly attacking. It is not clear, I think, that the men in the frontispiece are noblemen, although their quite handsome dress seems to signal that they are, at least, gentlemen. The probable allusion to the mock-heroic games of Book Two of the Dunciad, where the booksellers are put through a urination contest, perhaps makes the frontispiece part of the hacks’ revenge on Pope. Making for an incongruous juxtaposition, the text of the pamphlet is pompous, pretending to be concerned with matters of honour:

I am inform’d, that there is in the Press, and in a few Days will be publish’d, a satirical Poem, or rather a Libel, on several Noblemen, of which (as it is said) you are the Author: The great Personages whom you therein most falsely calumniate, if you are really the Author, have a Design, as I am inform’d, to truss you by turns under one of their Arms, and then, by lowering your Worship, to piss upon you as an Insect beneath their Resentment any other way: Nor can you deny that you deserve such Treatment.

In a strange kind of way, while enjoying the baseness of the act, the anonymous author pretends to be portraying Pope in an undignified manner for the sake of honour.

*Ingratitude: To Mr Pope* repeats the charge levelled in a pamphlet of 30 March, *An Epistle to the Little Satyr of Twickenham*, that Chandos gave him £500 and brings together again the trinity of deformity, venality and ingratitude:

A Certain *Animal* of diminutive [sic] Size, who had translated a Book into English-Metre, (or at least had it translated for him) addressed himself to a Nobleman of the first Rank, and in the Style of a *Gentleman-Beggar*, requested him to Subscribe a *Guinea* for one of his Books; the Nobleman entertain’d him at Dinner in a sumptuous Manner, (and continued to do so) as often as the insignificant Mortal came to his House. After Dinner this Generous Man of Quality, taking him apart, put a Bank Note for Five Hundred Pounds into his Hands, and desired he might have but one Book. But what was the Consequence of this? Why truly, the Wretch, who is a Composition of *Peevishness, Spleen, and Envy*, having no Regard to the Benefits he had receiv’d, in a few Years after, and without any manner of Provocation, or the least Foundation for Truth, publishes a Satire, as he terms it, but in Reality it is an Infamous and Scandalous Libel, calculated, with all the Malice and Virulence imaginable to Defame and render Odious the Character of his best Benefactor.9

---


*Ingratitude*, p. 3, pp. 7-8.
In the above passage, the story that Pope took £500 from Chandos is treated as fact: this is the advantage of the biographical approach. The earlier pamphlet on the same subject makes the allegation in the form of rumour:

A kind Compassion prompts me to conclude,
That Timon's Study you had never view'd;
Not LOCK, nor MILTON, nor a modern Book,
Has Truth your Tongue, or Sight your Eyes forsook?
An English'd Homer there you might have found,
Not b'Aldus printed, nor du Sueil bound,
Which cost, as I have heard, Five Hundred Pound."^10

This anonymous pamphleteer wrote in the knowledge that Pope reserved his fiercest contempt for mercenaries. A succinct summary of Pope's attitude is his vision of his country under Walpole: 'See Britain sunk in lucre's sordid charms' (To Bathurst, l. 145, T. E. III. ii., 105). For a poet whose poetry is full of references to money and whose financial acumen enabled him to outwit his booksellers in drawing up highly lucrative book contracts, it is interesting that he was most stung when he was accused of writing for money. From early on in his career, his enemies were well-aware of this sensitivity, as shown by the pre-Dunciad excerpt below:

Your Pen with MARLBOROUGH's Sword is much the same,
He fought, you write, for Profit, more than Fame:
His Eagles after Grants and Pensions flew,
And all your Laurels from Subscriptions grew:
His Friendship too, like yours, was false, and feign'd,
No longer lasting than his Ends were gain'd:
Thus then at once, we both your Deeds rehearse,
Gold was his God of War, your God of Verse."^11

Pope's ingenious use of subscription publication to make his fortune made him vulnerable to accusations of greed: like Marlborough, he was accused of exploiting his public. The connection between subscriptions and laurels shows how, according to his enemies, his status depended entirely on finance: to put it plainly, his status was dependent on his commercial use of patronage.

^11 To Mr POPE, on his second Subscription for HOMER. The Wharton Family, And Several other Persons of Distinction, Wharton: Or, Miscellanies, In Verse and Prose (London, 1726), p. 144. See my introduction for discussions of the stigma of print, poetry as a leisurely, gentlemanly activity and an account of eighteenth-century subscription publishing.
Pope’s pride in his independence runs throughout his correspondence and reached its clearest expression in the Testimonies of Authors that precede the Dunciad, in four books (1743):

[. . .] our Poet never had any Place, Pension, or Gratuity, in any shape, from the said glorious Queen, or any of her Ministers. All he owed, in the whole course of his life, to any court, was a subscription, for his Homer of 200 l. from King George I, and 100 l. from the prince and princess.

(T. E. V, 45)

Pope’s declaration is a defence of his own reputation and refers to Dennis’ criticism of Queen Anne’s administration, which Pope has just quoted. In the Dunciad of 1743 there is also a mention of the ‘Gazetteers’, the Grub Street press. In a lengthy note, Pope described how the hacks were rewarded for their work by means of the public purse, beginning with an explanation of the term, ‘Gazetteer’:

[. . .] the Daily Gazetteer was a title given very properly to certain papers, each of which lasted but a day. Into this, as a common sink, was received all the trash, which had been before dispersed in several Journals, and circulated at the public expense of the nation. The authors were the same obscure men; though sometimes relieved by occasional essays from Statesmen, Courtiers, Bishops, Deans, and Doctors. The meaner sort were rewarded with Money; others with Places or Benefices, from an hundred to a thousand a year. It appears from the Report of the Secret Committee for enquiring into the Conduct of R. Earl of O. <Robert Earl of Orford> ‘That no less than fifty-thousand, seventy-seven pounds, eighteen shillings, were paid to Authors and Printers of News-papers, such as Free-Britons, Daily-Courants, Corn-Cutter’s Journal, Gazetteers, and other political papers, between Feb. 10, 1731, and Feb. 10, 1741.’ Which shews the Benevolence of One Minister to have expended, for the current dulness of ten years in Britain, double the sum which gained Louis XIV. so much honour, in annual Pensions to Learned men all over Europe. In which, and in a much longer time, not a Pension at Court, nor Preferment in the Church or Universities, of any Consideration, was bestowed on any man distinguished for his Learning separately from Party-merit, or Pamphlet-writing.

(The Dunciad, in four books, II, 314n., T. E. V, 311-12)

The pamphleteers’ emphasis on ingratitude is, I think, the key to the Chandos affair. Walpole and his administration seem to have attempted to bring down Pope as a poet who refused to flatter them, using him as a proxy for Burlington and Chandos. Their line of thought might have been that because Pope would not flatter them, he was therefore ungrateful. That he was ready to pay compliments was evidently clear, as Ian Jack has pointed out: ‘The key to Pope’s career is that he was a Court poet born at a time when the Court was ceasing to be the cultural centre of England.’12 It must have been particularly irritating for an administration that wholeheartedly endorsed and propagated a system of
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client-patron relations founded on flattery that the country’s most celebrated poet, born, as it would seem, for writing complimentary verse, as shown by his early *Windsor-Forest*, should make a point of refusing to flatter them. Not only this, but he reserved his praise for others, and, finally, he dared to ridicule them in a poem written in praise of Burlington, an exceptionally well-placed aristocrat who nevertheless maintained a certain distance from Court and Government. Pamphlets such as *Of Good Nature* suggest that Walpole had created a culture in which flattery was a necessity and ingratitude was the cardinal sin. In the anti-Pope literature there is mockery of Pope for flattery and sneering at him for two of the most frequent charges, deformity and venality, but anger is reserved for the third other most frequent charge, his supposed ingratitude.

Why was ingratitude presented by Pope’s enemies as the worst crime that he could be accused of? Swift’s *Tritical Essay upon the Faculties of the Mind*, a parody of contemporary philosophical essays written in 1707-08, declares that ‘he that calls a Man ungrateful, sums up all the Evil that a Man can be guilty of. *Ingratum si dixeris, omnia dicis.*’ Chandos’ letter of exoneration to Pope makes it clear that he took the pamphlets’ attacks as attacks on himself as well as Pope. This was just as well for Pope: as I show later in this chapter, if he had indeed been the sole target of the attack on Epistle *To Burlington* he would have been in great danger. It was equally fortunate for him that the pamphleteers of the Chandos affair were also attacking Burlington. By identifying Chandos with the extravagant Timon, the pamphleteers revived rumours about the means by which he had acquired his wealth. Many of the pamphlets attacked Pope not for ingratitude but for his pretensions to Taste, which was Burlington’s domain. Such attacks probably referred back to Pope’s chief patron, Burlington (as in Hogarth’s *Taste No. 1 The Gate of Burlington House, 1731* and *Mr Taste, The Poetical Fop*).

The motives for the attack on Chandos and Burlington are to be found in the political events leading up to the 1733-34 Excise Crisis, which was caused by Walpole’s proposal to change the tax system so that tax would be levied on goods when they were sold instead of
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at the customs. Mack has described the political atmosphere of the early 1730s as one of turmoil and, for the Opposition, optimism. Both Burlington and Chandos kept a certain distance between themselves and the Government. Chandos was a plutocrat who had retired from public life after his resignation from the post of Paymaster for fear of public scrutiny into his accounts. Burlington was an aristocrat whose influence was underpinned by his wealth: he kept aloof from the political scene while, until 1733, maintaining diplomatic relations with the Court and Government. Both Burlington and Chandos had Jacobite associations, and must, on this account, have represented a threat to the Government.14

To return to the mood of the early 1730s, Mack writes of ‘the confidence of early 1733, when it seemed that Walpole’s removal might be imminent’.15 On the defeat of the Excise Bill, Langford writes of the ‘changing character of Walpole’s administration’ in the following terms:

The Parliament of 1727 to 1734 had seen him at the peak of his powers and his confidence. In these years he was a genuinely creative minister, refashioning his country’s foreign policy and reforming its financial system. After 1734 he was on the defensive.16

In The Patriot Opposition to Walpole, Gerrard describes how, after 1730, the number of Whig dissidents increased and gives the following reasons:

Contentious issues such as ministerial foreign policy, the abandonment of Dunkirk to the French, the retention of the Hessian troops, especially the Excise Crisis and its repercussions, precipitated others into opposition. In June 1733 Walpole purged the Lords of seven factious Whig peers (Stair, Cobham, Clinton, Bolton, Montrose, Marchmont, and Chesterfield) who pressed for an enquiry into the uses made of the forfeited estates of South Sea Company directors. They took with them into opposition a considerable group of supporters, notably the ‘Boy Patriots’ fostered by Cobham, and Marchmont’s young Scottish followers. Prince Frederick went into open opposition in 1737, taking with him most of the MPs attached to him through his Duchy of Cornwall and Leicester House patronage. In 1740 the Duke of Argyll and a large group of Scottish Whigs moved into opposition in the Commons, by the eve of Walpole’s fall in January 1742, 276 ministerial Whigs faced a combined opposition of 135 Tories and 124 opposition Whigs.17

14 For Burlington and Jacobitism, see Cruickshanks’ production of evidence pointing to his sympathy for the Jacobite cause, “The Political Career of the Third Earl of Burlington”, p. 215. See also Clark, pp. 251-310 (p. 251). Erskine-Hill points out that Burlington’s sympathy with Catholics is shown by his extension of protection to Pope and his family in the wake of the Jacobite rebellion and by his marrying his sister Elizabeth into the Catholic Bedingfield family in 1719, “Avowed Friend and Patron”*, pp. 217-29 (pp. 218-219). In his introduction to Lord Burlington – The Man and his Politics, Corp contends that, although Burlington’s political loyalties may remain mysterious, readers of his collection of essays will no longer believe in Burlington’s complete loyalty to the Hanoverians, p. 4. In this same volume, however, Carré casts doubt on Burlington’s alleged Jacobite affiliations, although his evidence is not conclusive, ‘Lord Burlington’s Book Subscriptions’, pp. 126-28. Chandos’ affiliation with the Jacobite cause is certain: both Clark and Corp point to the evidence for Chandos’ sending money to James III, Clark, pp. 251-310 (p. 273) and Corp, ‘The Stuart Court at Saint-Germain-En-Laye’, in Lord Burlington – The Man and his Politics, pp. 7-26 (p. 9).

15 The Garden and the City, p. 186.

16 Langford, p. 33.

17 Gerrard, p. 20.
A preliminary investigation into the Chandos affair shows that it would be unwise to underestimate Pope's enemies. Pope may have called them dunces, but an analysis of his reaction to the 'Noise which Malice' raised about his Epistle *To Burlington* shows that some of the dunces were highly dangerous (To the Earl of Oxford, 22 January, 1732, *Corr.*, III, 267). In the next part of this chapter, I will attempt to follow in Pope's footsteps, as he tried, after the initial delirium, to track down the instigators of the attack. A study of those authors responsible will show the close connection between his Epistle *To Burlington* and his Epistle *To Dr Arbuthnot*: in this later epistle published in January, 1735, he names names, targeting those guilty of malice in the Chandos affair.

Guerinot takes a dismissive view of the writings of Pope's enemies:

> As anyone who has ever tried to read them will surely agree, they are just what Pope said they were, thoroughly bad writers. Their real importance for the student of Pope and the Augustan Age is sociological.  

Contrary to the traditional picture, Pope's enemies were not simply his inferiors on every count: they were wily and knew how to hurt. The passages that Guerinot selects are often poor, supporting his claim, and while it is true that much of the material is sub-standard, amongst all this, as I have shown in Chapter 2, the reader will often come across sharp and witty pieces. I would like to attempt to locate Pope at the heart of the battlefield of letters: his poetry is generated by warfare.Swift's fellow churchman in Dublin, Dr Delaney, who was in London at the time of the outcry against the Epistle *To Burlington*, aptly commented on the more puzzling aspects of Pope's combative nature:

> There is a general outcry against that part of the poem which is thought an abuse on the D. Chandos - other parts are quarreld with as obscure & unharmonious . . . I am surprized Mr Pope is not weary of making enemies . . . . (*Corr.*, III, 259n.)

On the contrary, Pope was far from weary; in fact, his method was to provoke and goad his enemies.

---

18 Guerinot, p. xxxviii.
iii) Pope’s reply

Pope’s first printed defence of himself over the Chandos affair was an anonymous letter to The Daily Post-Boy, 16 December 1731. The letter is mainly taken up with his defence of himself against the charge of malice by showing how absurd is the accusation that he might attack Chandos. Only in a postscript to the letter does Pope turn his fire briefly on the perpetrators of the attack:

I really cannot help smiling at the Stupidity, while I lament the Slanderous Temper of the Town. I thought no Mortal singly could claim that Character of Timon, any more than any Man pretend to be Sir John Falstaff. (Corr., III, 257)

Who Timon really was has been a matter of considerable debate. In his essay, ‘Timon’s Villa and Chatsworth’, Rogers accepts the general view that Timon is a ‘composite portrait’ and that Chatsworth is just one of the sites that went into the making of Timon’s villa, but argues that this does not make the attempt to find out the factual basis of Pope’s satire any less worthwhile. For Pope’s contemporaries, the reader’s hunt for originals for satirical figures was an essential part of the satiric process:

[ . . . ] contemporaries evidently read poetic texts in a distinctly literal manner, and were constantly on the look-out for allusions to real life. Such a degree of referentiality was the normal reader-response of the time. Pope must have designed his works with such a mode of reading in his mind, even if (what is unlikely and certainly unproved) he wishes to discourage such an approach. His tortuous disavowals regarding the identification of Timon with the Duke of Chandos nowhere indicate that he thought such things could not be found in his poetry.

In his portraits of ‘Atticus’, ‘Lord Fanny’ and the ladies of his Epistle to a Lady, Pope clearly counted on his readers’ inclinations to identify characters. While detective-work on the identities of his characters would certainly have been vital to the pleasure of reading Pope for his wider readership, his friends must have enjoyed added pleasure from the hoaxes and counter-strategies that he set up in response to his victims’ attacks on him.

---

20 In his note to the letter, Sherburn seems to indicate that it would not have been clear to readers that it is from Pope, Corr., III, 254n.
Goldgar makes the point that only one pamphlet found Walpole attacked in the Epistle To Burlington, though, even there, not as Timon, but as Sir Shylock. No Opposition papers made use of the Epistle in their attacks on Walpole. Goldgar casts doubt on Mack’s interpretation of the poem as the moment when Pope’s poetry became political:

If Mack is correct in seeing the Epistle to Burlington as Pope’s declaration of war on Walpole, the opening shot of that war seems to have escaped the notice of the troops already engaged in battle [. . .] As far as the town at large was concerned, then, the cause célèbre created by the Epistle to Burlington was more literary than political.  

I would like to take issue with Goldgar’s last point: the Chandos affair was undoubtedly political because Pope’s enemies’ motive for attack was such. As Goldgar himself argues, from Pope’s unpublished pamphlet mocking the many interpretations of the Walpole pamphleteers, A Master Key to Popery, it was manifestly clear to him from what quarter the attacks were coming.

In his essay, “Timon’s Villa” and Cannons’, Sherburn demonstrates how a study of Pope’s Epistle To Dr Arbuthnot holds the key to who Pope discovered to be the principal disseminators of rumours that he was ungrateful to his patrons. Unsurprisingly, the printed attacks came mainly from the dunces whom he had ridiculed in the Dunciad. But the charges went further than mere revenge. To discover the origins of the charges connected with ingratitude, it is necessary to go back further than the pamphlets to discover the source of the Town talk that started the Chandos affair.

Pope’s publication of a poetic fragment in the London Evening Post, January 22-25, 1732 reveals that by this time he had identified Lord Hervey, the most powerful courtier of the day, as the initiator of the attack:

HORACE, Sat. 4. Lib. 1. paraphras’d.
Inscribed to the Hon. Mr – .

– I Absentem qui rodit Amicum:
2 Qui non defendit, alio culpante: 3 Solutos
Qui captat Risus hominum, Famamque dicacis:
4 Fingere qui non visa potest: 5 Commissa tacere
 Qui nequit: – Hic Niger est; Hunc, tu Romane, caveto.

23 See Matthew Concanen, A Miscellany on Taste By Mr Pope, &c (15 January 1732).
24 Goldgar, p. 126.
The lines appear cryptic at first until the identity of the ‘Hon. Mr –’ to whom the fragment is inscribed is discovered. Sherburn makes the case that this is Hervey by showing how the poetic fragment was incorporated, with few changes, in the Epistle To Dr Arbuthnot, where it introduces the Sporus passage. Hervey’s printed attacks were yet to come: it is likely that these attacks helped Pope crystallise his counter-attack on Hervey, and, through him, Walpole. The inscription to the ‘Hon. Mr –’ was purposely open. As Pope said in his formal letter to Burlington prefixed to the third edition of Epistle To Burlington, it was not just particular enemies that a satirist had to fear but the gullibility of the nobility as a whole: ‘This way of Satire is dangerous, as long as Slander rais’d by Fools of the lowest Rank, can find any Countenance from those of a Higher’ (Corr., III, 266).

Hervey’s letter on the Chandos affair is dated December 21, 1731, the day that the first printed attack by John Henley appeared. Hervey’s letter to his friend, Stephen Fox, later the Earl of Ilchester, is written from St James’s Palace:

. . . Everybody concurs in their opinion of Pope’s last performance, and condemns it as dull and impertinent. I cannot but imagine, by the 18 lines in the last page but one, that he designed ridiculing Lord Burlington as much as he does the Duke of Chandois. It is astonishing to me that he is not afraid this prophecy will be verified, which was told him a year or two ago, ‘In black and white whilst satire you pursue,
Take heed the answer is not black and blue.’

The casual menace of Hervey’s letter gives an indication of his power at Court. Hervey was ‘one of Walpole’s staunchest henchmen, Queen Caroline’s favourite confidant, and the

25 See ‘’Timon’s Villa’ and Cannons’, p. 135-36.
26 John Henley, Hyp-Doctor (December 21, 1731).
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Court’s vice-chamberlain’ (Alexander Pope, p. 608): his word was of considerable influence. While it might be observed that his slanders are in letter-form, and therefore perhaps of limited importance, his putting them in a private communication makes them significant because the early damaging rumours about Pope’s ingratitude took the form of gossip. Pope’s later attack upon Hervey in his Epistle To Dr Arbuthnot points to his instigation of the rumours. Hervey’s first printed attack on Pope for ingratitude was not until 1733.

In a note in his Epistle To Dr Arbuthnot concerning ‘Welsted’s Lye’, Pope identifies Welsted as the pamphleteer who spread the rumour that Chandos had given him £500:

> This man had the Impudence to tell in print, that Mr P. had occasion’d a Lady’s death, and to name a person he never heard of. He also publish’d that he had libell’d the Duke of Chandos; with whom (it was added) that he had liv’d in familiarity, and receiv’d from him a Present of five hundred pounds: The Falsehood of which is known to his Grace. Mr P. never receiv’d any Present farther than the Subscription for Homer, from him, or from Any Great Man whatsoever. (I. 375n., T. E. IV, 123)

A reply to this note came eight years later in the last of the pamphlets on the Chandos affair. Published in 1743, Mr P[O]PE’s Picture in Miniature, But As Like as it can stare; A Poem: With Notes dredges up again the old charges of ingratitude to Addison and Chandos. The reply to Pope’s footnote of 1735 is, in turn, couched in a footnote:

> If, C[hando]s, when thy Aid no more he needs,¹
>  His Satire thanks thee for thy past good Deeds.

¹ . . . The Satirist, asham’d of what he had done, (a very special Instance of his Modesty) has been pleased flatly to deny that he intended the noble Peer as the Object of his Raillery. It is worth remarking, however, that he could not do this, without at the same time indulging his Spirit of Ingratitude, by endeavouring to persuade his Readers, that the utmost Obligation he was under to that noble Lord was a bare Subscription to his Translation of Homer [see Epistle to Arbuthnot, l. 375, n.]. He thinks, I suppose, that nothing can be an Obligation, but what is paid down in Specie.²⁸

The throwaway last sentence of the above footnote points to what really rankled for Pope’s enemies: that, by being entirely mercenary, as they pictured it, he had escaped entirely the obligations of patronage. The implication is that he is no gentleman but the tone of affected contempt seems to betray a measure of envy.

Pope's acute consciousness of obligations that were not financial is clear in all his correspondence to Burlington and is powerfully expressed in his unpublished letter to Hervey, *Letter to a Noble Lord*. This letter is dated twenty days after the publication of Hervey's *An Epistle From A Nobleman To A Doctor Of Divinity: In Answer to a Latin Letter in Verse. Written from H-n C-t*, 28 August, 1733. Hervey's epistle attempts to belittle Pope by accusing him of over-ambition in his vain efforts to write satire when his talent only equipped him for defamation and derivative work:

But had he not, to his eternal Shame,
By trying to deserve a Sat'rist's Name,
Prov'd he can ne'er invent but to defame:
Had not his Taste and Riches lately shown,
When he would talk of Genius to the Town,
How ill he chuses, if he trusts his own.
Had he, in modern Language, only wrote
Those Rules which Horace, and which Vida taught;
On Garth or Boileau's Model built his Fame,
Or sold Broome's Labours printed with P-pe's Name:
Had he ne'er aim'd at any Work beside,
In Glory then he might have liv'd and dy'd
And ever been, tho' not with Genius fir'd,
By School-boys quoted, and by Girls admir'd.
So much for P-pe ...

The above lines seem on the surface a magisterial put-down. On closer examination, the message to Pope is: be subject to the Court and administration and gain 'Fame' and 'Glory', or else face the consequences. That Walpole's administration did not ever attempt to impeach Pope must be explained, I think, by his patrons' protection. Walpole kept the door open for him, in case he might one day be either frightened or bribed into his service. His friendships with supporters of Walpole, and, indeed, his not unfriendly attitude to him in his verse, when he is actually named, would suggest that he knew it was in his interest not to seem wholly antagonistic to the Government.

Although Pope's *Letter to a Noble Lord, on occasion of some Libels written and propagated at Court, in the Year 1732-3*, dated 30 November, 1733, is in direct response to

---

29 *An Epistle From A Nobleman To A Doctor Of Divinity: In Answer to a Latin Letter in Verse. Written from H-n C-t*, 28 August, 1733.
30 Erskine-Hill's description of Pope's position as regards the Atterbury Plot helps us to place Pope in the political landscape of the day: 'Pope was not a big political fish, but celebrated poets were important in the state, and from Walpole's point of view this one had kept very bad company', 'Alexander Pope: The Political Poet in his Time', p. 134.
31 See the survey of patrons in my introduction for Pope's relations with Walpole.
Hervey’s Epistle, he chooses here to focus on a far more damaging earlier pamphlet that Hervey co-wrote with Lady Mary Wortley Montagu:

I beseech your Lordship to consider, the Injury a Man of your high Rank and Credit may do to a private Person, under Penal Laws and many other disadvantages, not for want of honesty or conscience, but merely perhaps for having too weak a head, or too tender a heart. It is by these alone I have hitherto liv’d excluded from all posts of Profit or Trust: As I can interfere with the Views of no man, do not deny me, my Lord, all that is left, a little Praise, or the common Encouragement due, if not to my Genius, at least to my Industry.

Above all, your Lordship will be careful not to wrong my Moral Character, with THOSE under whose Protection I live, and thro’ whose Lenity alone I can live with Comfort. Your Lordship, I am confident, upon consideration will think, you inadvertently went a little too far when you recommended to THEIR perusal, and strengthened by the weight of your Approbation, a Libel, mean in its reflections upon my poor figure, and scandalous in those on my Honour and Integrity: wherein I was represented as ‘an Enemy to Human Race, a Murderer of Reputations, and a Monster mark’d by God like Cain, deserving to wander accurs’d thro’ the World.’ (Prose Works, II, 454-55)

The last quotation of Pope’s in the above passage is a paraphrase of the closing lines in Hervey’s collaboration with Lady Mary, Verses Address’d to the IMITATOR OF THE FIRST SATIRE OF THE Second Book of Horace, a pamphlet published on March 9, 1733 and republished in the Grub-Street Journal about three weeks later. Guerinot describes this pamphlet as the ‘most famous of attacks on Pope and perhaps the only one where Pope has found a worthy adversary’. I would argue that this gives a false picture of Pope’s relations with his enemies. ‘Worthiness’ is beside the point: his adversaries are worth paying attention to either because they made astute criticisms of him and his circle or else because their attacks provided Pope with material for his own writings.

In Verses Address’d to the IMITATOR, there is a development of the ‘ungrateful to Chandos’ idea since Pope’s alleged ingratitude is said to be outstripped by his injustice:

But even Benefits can’t rein thy Hand:
To this or that alike in vain we trust,
Nor find Thee less Ungrateful than Unjust.
(II. 41-43)

Emphasis is laid on Pope’s supposedly humble origins in a couplet that links low birth with the claim that his poetry is unpopular:

Whilst none thy crabbed Numbers can endure;

32 The above passage is that quoted by Mack, p. 609; alone, it seems to vindicate Pope. To play the devil’s advocate, it is worth taking note of the incendiary challenge that follows, which shows Pope’s method of baiting his ‘betters’ while appearing to defer to them, Prose Works, II, 455.
33 Guerinot, p. 225.
Hard as thy Heart, and as thy Birth obscure.
(ll. 19-20)\(^{34}\)

Pope’s *Satire* II. i., published in 1733, had referred to Lady Mary as Sappho in terms that used disease imagery to illustrate her nature:

Slander or Purson, dread from Delia’s Rage,
Hard Words or Hanging, if your Judge be Page.
From furious Sappho scarce a milder Fate,
P-x’d by her Love, or libell’d by her Hate [ . . . ]
(ll. 81-84, T. E. IV, 13)

In his last line above, Pope shows cruel wit in his reference not only to her role in smallpox inoculation but to venereal disease: Sappho’s love will give her partner the pox with the effect that her love, paradoxically, is worse than her hate.\(^{35}\) Lady Mary’s attack is also highly personal, taking its cue from Pope by using physical attributes to reveal character. By focusing on his deformity as evidence of a warped nature, she shows that she knows how to wound:

But how should’st thou by Beauty’s Force be mov’d,
No more for loving made, than to be lov’d?
It was the Equity of righteous Heav’n,
That such a Soul to such a Form was giv’n;
And shews the Uniformity of Fate,
That one so odious, shou’d be born to hate.
(ll. 48-53)

In her closing lines, Pope’s punishment is to be cast out from society:

Like the first bold Assassin’s be thy Lot,
Ne’er be thy Guilt forgiven, or forgot;
But as thou hate’st, be hated by Mankind,
And with the Emblem of thy crooked Mind,
Mark’d on thy Back, like *Cain*, by God’s own Hand,
Wander like him, accursed through the Land.
(ll. 107-112)\(^{36}\)

Pope’s reference in *Letter to a Noble Lord*, quoted above, to ‘THOSE under whose Protection I live, and thro’ whose Lenity alone I can live in Comfort’, signifying the King, Queen and Walpole, demonstrates his sharp understanding of how patronage determined the

\(^{34}\) Halsband and Grundy, p. 267; p. 266.
\(^{35}\) For an account of Lady Mary’s involvement in the inoculation for smallpox, see Grundy, pp. 209-22.
\(^{36}\) *Verses Address’d to the IMITATOR*, Halsband and Grundy, p. 268; p. 270.
conditions of his life and accounts for the vehemence of his rebuke to Lord Hervey. He was, in effect, fighting for his life.

As I have shown, Hervey's Epistle makes light of Pope; Pope's taking it entirely seriously shows his insight into the ways in which patronage worked. Personal injuries could be borne but libels designed to discredit him in networks of patronage might prove fatal. Accordingly, in his Epistle *To Dr Arbuthnot*, published in 1735, Pope's satire of Hervey as Sporus pictures him 'at the Ear of Eve' (l. 319) and as 'Eve's Tempter' (l. 330, T. E. IV, 118, 119), where Eve represents Queen Caroline: it is not what Hervey says or writes, which Pope characterizes as thoughtless, but his position that makes him dangerous.  

Of all the benefits that Pope received from Burlington, I suggest that the greatest was his protection during the Chandos affair. Burlington's approval of Pope's preface to the third edition of the Epistle *To Burlington* (Pope's letter to Burlington of January 1732) acted as a shield against Pope's enemies. On 3 May 1733, as I have outlined earlier, from having been one of the best-placed noblemen in the country, Burlington resigned all his Court appointments and went into Opposition. After his support of Pope in the Chandos affair, Burlington seems to have made himself Pope's firm ally. Both Burlington and Lady Burlington appear to have supported Pope in his writing of the *Master Key to Popery*: indeed Lady Burlington transcribed it (see *Corr.*, III, 272-73). In the aftermath of the Chandos affair, Pope's letters support my claim that, of all his patrons, Burlington is the one to whom he is most obliged. A letter of 1732/3 on the matter of Burlington's paying for all of the stone that went into building of his villa at Twickenham shows by his compliments the closeness of their association at this time:

> The Inclosed is the Last Bill I shall draw upon your Lordship for stone, according to the Commands you layd upon me, that there should be nothing Durable in my building which I was not to owe to Chiswick. I am sure there will be nothing in it Beautiful besides, nor (I believe) in this nation, but what is owed to the Lord of Chiswick. (*Corr.*, III, 341-42)

37 In 1736 Pope published an epigram addressed 'To the Earl of Burlington, asking who writ the Libels against him', naming Hervey as the source of these libels, T. E. VI, 355.
The effect of the hostility towards his Epistle To Burlington resulted in the delayed publication of the second Epistle Of the Use of Riches, the Epistle To Bathurst, on 15 January 1733. To Bathurst had been near completion at about the time of To Burlington's appearance. In a letter to Swift a month after To Bathurst was published, Pope wrote: 'I never took more care in my life of any poem' (Corr., III, 348). In the documented pamphlet attacks on Pope there is hardly a mention of To Bathurst: it would appear that his enemies either found no ammunition for attack in the epistle or chose not to use it for their attacks. From 1733 onwards, they continued to grind out the old charge of ingratitude towards Chandos. In my view, this points not to the paucity of their imaginations but to the significance of the Chandos affair in political terms: Pope had become a proxy through whom the Opposition could be attacked. This was a battle not only between a poet and his enemies in government but between a government and its emerging Opposition, whom the Government accused of ingratitude. There is no documentation, to my knowledge, to show whether Walpole intended to damage Burlington and Chandos from the start, by allowing the attacks on the Epistle To Burlington to go ahead, or whether, as seems more likely, the attacks on Pope became increasingly political as the pamphlet war continued. It is, I think, highly likely that the furore surrounding the Epistle became, inadvertently, one of the triggers that led to Burlington's going into the Opposition.

In February 1733, with the publication timed so that the two coincided, Pope brought out both the first Imitation of Horace, Satire II. i., and the first epistle of An Essay on Man, the latter anonymously. From 1733, Pope's poetry has a new barbed quality. In the first Horatian Imitation, he says that he writes because, given the age he lives in, he cannot help it; in response to his friend's advice that he should stop writing he says:

Not write? but then I think,
And for my Soul I cannot sleep a wink.
I nod in Company, I wake at Night,
Fools rush into my Head, and so I write.
(Sat. II. i., ll. 12-14, T. E. IV, 5)

---

I explore this in my subsequent chapter on Bathurst.
His poetic manifesto, in the same poem, has a new political edge. Pope now appears fearless in the face of his enemies' threats:

What? arm'd for Virtue when I point the Pen,
Brand the bold Front of shameless, guilty Men,
Dash the proud Gamester in his gilded Car,
Bare the mean Heart that lurks beneath a Star;
Can there be wanting to defend Her Cause,
Lights of the Church, or Guardians of the Laws?
Could pension'd Boileau lash in honest Strain
Flatt'rrers and Bigots ev'n in Louis' Reign?
Could Laureate Dryden Pimp and Fry'r engage,
Yet neither Charles nor James be in a Rage?
And I not strip the Gilding off a Knave,
Un-plac'd, un-pension'd, no Man's Heir, or Slave?
I will, or perish in the gen'rous Cause.
Hear this, and tremble! you, who -'scape the Laws.
Yes, while I live, no rich or noble knave
Shall walk the World, in credit, to his grave.
(II. 105-20, T. E. IV, 15-17)

Pope's deliberate and provocative pun on credit encapsulates the financial and moral corruption of Walpole's administration, as seen by the Opposition. It would seem that Burlington and the nascent Opposition Lords had banded together behind him in the Chandos affair and were now determinedly backing him. One might speculate to what extent their support during the central crisis of his career emboldened him afterwards to write politically daring satire and also to what extent their support placed an obligation upon him to write verse for their cause. It seems hardly accidental that, in the aftermath of the Chandos affair, he should address two of his Moral Epistles to Bathurst and Cobham, published in 1733 and 1734, respectively, so that at the time of the Excise Crisis, three out of four of his Moral Epistles were addressed to Lords who had newly deserted to the Opposition. From 1733, he is clearly on the attack.

Similarly, one might speculate about the extent to which Burlington's association with Pope curtailed his career in architecture. Certainly, his resignation of his Court appointments so depleted the funds available for his architectural projects that his career ended of necessity. By contrast, Pope's poetry benefited by the Chandos crisis and by his ever closer association with Burlington: he emerged with new strength and incisiveness.
5. 'Yet Unspoil'd by Wealth': Pope’s Friendship with Bathurst

i) The background to the Epistle To Bathurst

We see in Pope’s Epistle To Bathurst the consequences of the Epistle To Burlington: the hostile reception given the earlier poem shaped its successor. In his preface to the third edition of To Burlington, Pope officially repositioned himself as a poet who criticized rather than ridiculed the powerful:

Even from the Conduct shewn on this occasion, I have learnt there are some who wou’d rather be wicked than ridiculous; and therefore it may be safer to attack Vices than Follies. I will leave my Betters in the quiet Possession of their Idols, their Groves, and their High-Places; and change my Subject from their Pride to their Meanness, from their Vanities to their Miseries [. . .] (Corr., III, 266)

His unpublished A Master Key to Popery (1732), however, showed that he was now doubly armed, ready both to ridicule folly and to attack vice. From A Master Key to Popery onwards, we see a new scepticism about the nature of his relationships with his patrons.

As I mentioned in my previous chapter, To Bathurst had been near completion at about the time of To Burlington’s appearance but the hostility towards To Burlington resulted in its delayed publication in considerably revised form on 15 January 1733. In a letter to Caryll of 8 March 1732/3, Pope described the poem as ‘the work of two years by intervals’ (Corr., III, 353). Clearly, in this Epistle, he had to take considerably more care with the wording of his attacks. There is no doubt that much hung upon the Epistle and its reception. It was imperative that he shape his patrons’ perception of him to his own advantage. Beyond his legitimate fear of renewed attack, should his enemies be able to read any evidence of ingratitude into his next published work, we need still to ask why he took so much care in the drafting of To Bathurst. The Huntington library has preserved three manuscript versions of the poem that show his extensive and painstaking revision. Earl R. Wasserman has dated these manuscripts successively but points out that his supporting evidence is not conclusive.¹

¹ Earl R. Wasserman suggests possible dates, based on circumstantial evidence, for each surviving manuscript: the first manuscript, described by Wasserman as a revision of an unknown earlier manuscript, is assigned to between 1 May 1730 (the date of Spence’s earliest notes on the Epistle) and 30 May 1731 (the date of the Duke of Wharton’s death, since line 50 of this manuscript indicates that Wharton was still alive at the time of this manuscript’s composition). The second manuscript was probably, Wasserman thinks, composed before 30
Broadly, the manuscripts offer a more optimistic view of Bathurst’s capacity to use his wealth well than the Twickenham Edition of the Epistle. Pope’s elaborate revisions demonstrate how veiled is his final criticism of Bathurst. Later in this chapter I will examine Pope’s revisions of the passage containing his direct address of Bathurst.

Guerinot’s survey lists no attacks on Pope for the Epistle To Bathurst. Given the poem’s dangerously controversial subject, the mass bribery and corruption of Britain under Walpole, this seems quite astonishing. Pope alludes to the poem’s good reception in a letter to Caryll where he jokingly calls it a sermon: ‘I find the last I made had some good effect, and yet the preacher less railed at than usually those are who will be declaiming against popular or national vices’ (31 January 1732/3, *Corr.*, III, 345). Pope’s humorous reference to the Epistle as a ‘sermon’ that attacks ‘vices’ is in keeping with his new self-appointed role as a scourge of society. It also, however, points to the abstract and allusive nature of his attacks: the poem, somewhat like a sermon, focuses on abstract evils. The Epistle is concerned with the insidious nature of the new finance rather than single individuals, although, in the course of his attack on the vices of society, Pope freely refers to well-known villains and victims of the financial revolution.

One way in which to place the Epistle in the body of Pope’s work is to see it as a pledge of allegiance. By means of To Bathurst, he demonstrated his loyalty to Bathurst and, with him, the Opposition. It is nevertheless strange to find that his praise of Bathurst is qualified and that the poem includes passages that criticize the nobility as a whole, if not Bathurst in particular. That Pope should appear uneasy about praising Bathurst is surprising. By 1732, Pope owed considerable debts of friendship to Bathurst: first, Bathurst had shown him considerable hospitality and, as his patron, had generously promoted his poetry, secondly, as his financier, Bathurst invested his money in his land and his farms, thirdly, an ambitious amateur gardener himself, Bathurst had helped Pope to build up a reputation in gardening to

---

May 1730 since it contains a similar line concerning Wharton (l. 279) and completed about 7 June 1732, the date of a letter of Pope’s to Tonson concerning a note he was planning to add to the poem to the effect that the Man of Ross had no monument (this note appears in the second manuscript, p. 349); Wasserman suggests that the third manuscript was ‘perhaps written about [7 June 1732], but there appears to be nothing in its contents to date it more precisely’, *Pope’s Epistle to Bathurst: A Critical Reading with an Edition of the Manuscripts* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1960), pp. 59-60.
Pope’s laudatory address of Bathurst is itself spoilt by the caveat, ‘yet unspoil’d by wealth’. The implication is that Bathurst is still subject to temptations such as those experienced by Sir Balaam, pitiful anti-hero of the light morality tale that ends the Epistle: ‘But Satan now is wiser than of yore,/ And tempts by making rich, not making poor’ (ll. 351-52, T. E., III. ii., 122). In addition to this, we cannot rule out the likelihood of ambiguity in Pope’s praise of Bathurst’s ‘Secret’, supposedly, his ability to observe the Mean: it is possible that Pope is not, as we might expect, praising him for moderation as much as mocking him for his ability to range, somewhat wildly, between extremes. The ambiguity in Pope’s praise lies so deeply buried in the text as to be near non-existent, and, in view of the fact that only a knowledge of his painstaking manuscript revisions attests to its importance, we might wonder whether it is really of relevance to a modern reader of the Epistle. I suggest that the possibility that he might, to his own mind, have been mocking Bathurst is relevant to our understanding of their relationship, even if it is hardly detectable in the Epistle as finally published. What we witness in the Epistle’s long composition is a private tussle in Pope’s own mind as he struggles to get right his relationship with his patron: part of this process clearly involved not painting too flattering a portrait of Bathurst.

Why might Pope not only have qualified his praise but even introduced a measure of ridicule into his depiction of Bathurst. By the time that he came to write the Epistle, had his experience given him reason to think that the extremes of ‘Mad Good-nature’ and ‘mean Self-love’, as well as much of the good that comes between them, might indeed apply to Bathurst? In common with the Epistle To Burlington, the Epistle To Bathurst is a poem of patronage, but, in like manner, demonstrates the difficulty of writing panegyrical poetry. To
Bathurst is a poem of patronage unlike any of Pope's earlier poems because it was written and revised at a time when he was under unusual pressure to write a political poem. In the year of the Epistle's publication, Bathurst led the first major Opposition attack on Walpole's administration. It is no accident that his grounds for attack are the same as those of Pope's Epistle: the corruption facilitated by the new finance. His attack on Walpole in the debate on the South Sea Company directors' estates hinges on the fact that the new credit economy makes bribery near-impossible to detect.

To Bathurst necessarily became a political poem because of the political controversy surrounding To Burlington. Pope's attitude to Bathurst and to the Opposition can be discerned from close scrutiny of those aspects of Bathurst's character he chooses to portray and, most particularly, what, exactly, he chooses to praise. Selection of detail is of paramount importance. In praising Bathurst, Pope's omissions are as significant as that which he chooses to include.

In the Epistle To Bathurst, Pope focuses on Bathurst's status as a statesman, an aristocrat, and a wealthy patron. He abstracts him from the real-life character who was his respected patron and concentrates on his use of wealth, which forms the title for this epistle and To Burlington. The opening of To Bathurst gives the impression that we are listening to the end of a late-night conversation between Pope and Bathurst: we might, perhaps, picture the two of them after dinner, finishing off their last bottle. Pope begins as if referring to a long discussion on the use of wealth which they have not been able to resolve:

Who shall decide, when Doctors disagree,  
And soundest Casuists doubt, like you and me?  
You hold the word, from Jove to Momus giv'n,  
That Man was made the standing jest of Heav'n;  
And Gold but sent to keep the fools in play,  
For some to heap, and some to throw away.  
But I, who think more highly of our kind,  
(And surely, Heav'n and I are of a mind)  
Opine, that Nature, as in duty bound,  
Deep hid the shining mischief under ground:  
But when by Man's audacious labour won,  
Flam'd forth this rival to, its Sire, the Sun,  
Then careful Heav'n supply'd two sorts of Men,  
To squander these, and those to hide agen.  
(ll. 1-14, T. E. III. ii., 83-84)
The easy, friendly tone of the opening places Pope as Bathurst’s lordly equal. He links himself with Bathurst in ‘And soundest Casuists doubt, like you and me’, suggesting a friendship rooted in a shared ability to laugh at the madnesses of the world. But where the rich man, Bathurst, rests with laughter, Pope’s epistle suggests that laughter is an inadequate response. Bathurst’s point of view, ‘And Gold but sent to keep the fools in play,/ For some to heap, and some to throw away’, has a beguiling effect but also sounds a little pat. He sees the use of riches as a comedy of human folly and affects a lordly insouciance. By way of answer, Pope checks this worldly habit of laughing things off with the acutely self-mocking: ‘But I, who think more highly of our kind,/ (And surely, Heav’n and I are of a mind)’. Interestingly, Pope and Bathurst end up in agreement. Pope’s ‘two sorts of Men’ are not really any different from Bathurst’s: ‘To squander these, and those to hide agen’ amounts to the same thing as ‘For some to heap, and some to throw away’.

From the very beginning of the Epistle, the tone set by Pope allows him to get away with less praise of Bathurst than contemporary readers might have expected to find. In the imagined conversation between poet and patron, direct praise such as might be appropriate in strict epistolary form, would appear obtrusive and unnatural, sycophantic even. Bathurst was, by his own admission, delighted with the Epistle, although the publishing history of the poem subsequent to Pope’s death points to one sore point that concerns the Epistle’s structure. The form of To Bathurst is a hybrid, linking the letter form of To Burlington with something approaching dialogue. But while Pope catches the accents of speech throughout the whole poem, the letter form predominates and creates the effect of lordly equality. Pope’s introduction of fragments of dialogue and allusions to dialogue was a delicate matter. In a poem of 402 lines, Bathurst’s dialogue counts for just about seven lines, yet Pope contrives an equivalence between poet and patron.

While he praised the Epistle as a whole, Bathurst appears to have felt that he did not cut a sufficiently impressive figure in the fragmentary dialogue. This information only came to light because of Warburton’s insensitive editing of the Epistle in his edition of 1751, when

---

Bathurst was 67. Warburton altered the Epistle to make it read like a dialogue, with the effect that the Epistle loses Pope's archly mocking concealment of the fact that his patron does not have much to say. F. W. Bateson describes how in Warburton's edition, the poem 'becomes an imaginary conversation between Pope and Lord Bathurst, a transformation effected without changing a word, simply by prefixing "P." (= Pope) to most of the poem, with "B." (= Bathurst) occasionally interjecting a few lines' (T. E. III. ii., p. xv). In his 1797 edition of Pope's Works, Joseph Warton tells an anecdote about how unhappy Bathurst was with Warburton for making these changes because he cut such a poor figure in the resulting dialogue:

That very lively and amiable old nobleman, the late Lord Bathurst, told me, 'that he was much surprised to see, what he had with repeated pleasure so often read as an epistle addressed to himself, in this edition converted into a dialogue, in which,' said he, 'I perceive I make but a shabby and indifferent figure, and contribute little to the spirit of the dialogue, if it must be a dialogue; and I hope I had generally more to say for myself in the many charming conversations I used to hold with Pope and Swift, and my old poetical friends.'

Warburton's botching of the poem and its addressee's indignant response shows what a fine balancing act Pope accomplished in the composition of To Bathurst.

Warton gives a further insight into Bathurst's dissatisfaction with certain aspects of the Epistle in the anecdote below:

I never saw this very amiable old nobleman, whose wit, vivacity, sense, and integrity are well known; but he repeatedly expressed his disgust, and his surprise, at finding, in later editions, this Epistle awkwardly converted into a Dialogue, in which he has but little to say. And I remember he once remarked, 'that this line, "P. But you are tir'd. I'll tell a tale. B. Agreed:- "was insupportably insipid and flat.'

What emerges from these stories is both Bathurst's pride in the conversations he had enjoyed with Pope and Swift and also, quite understandably, perhaps, his vanity. We might agree with Bathurst on the flatness of the line ending with ""Agreed"" while at the same time noticing Pope's failure to flatter his vanity in this final exchange. It is significant that one of the surviving manuscript versions of the poem shows Pope in a more deferential light and

---

4 Ibid., I, pp. xiii- xiv.
gives Bathurst a more punchy presence: 'That knotty Point, my Lord, shall I discuss,/ Or tell a Tale? - A Tale - It follows thus.' That, in the published poem, Pope ends his sketchy metaphysical dialogue with Bathurst with an agreement between them brought about by Bathurst’s tiredness points more to Bathurst’s limitations than his own. The impression given is that Pope loved Bathurst because he could also love his faults.

In the course of the poem, using Bathurst as a prime example of a powerful and worldly aristocrat, Pope points out the dangers of laughing too much. Insouciance, taken past a certain point, comes close to moral irresponsibility. Bathurst’s tendency to laugh at life is shown most clearly in a letter to Swift of 29 March 1733. There has been a falling-out between them and Bathurst implores him for a letter, ending with the revealing ‘However lett me see yu, If I can’t laugh with yu as I us’d to do, I will laugh at yu, for I am resolv’d to laugh as long as I live, so my Dear little Petty-fogger/ Adieu’. The provocativeness of ‘If I can’t laugh with yu [. . .] I will laugh at yu’ is made inoffensive by the obvious affection behind ‘my Dear little Petty-fogger’. Bathurst clearly just wants to see Swift, yet his longing for a letter appears oddly selfish, as if he were thinking more about his own hunger for entertainment than about repairing their friendship. I think that Bathurst’s self-portrait, showing himself as a man ‘resolv’d to laugh’, is essential to Pope’s image of him. Bathurst’s love of laughter is reflected in his courting of poets who were also wits: Pope, Swift, Gay and Prior.

Bathurst’s correspondence shows his sympathy with the concerns of both Epistles Of the Use of Riches. Pope’s relationship with him was sufficiently close for Pope publicly to bring him into the fray of the Chandos affair by using him as a shield in A Master Key Against Popery. Bathurst shows his sympathy with Pope’s Epistle To Burlington, if not his understanding of its satire, by his quoting from the poem to justify his own use of wealth. In September 1732, a few months before the publication of To Bathurst, a letter from Bathurst to Pope shows him assimilating in self-justification Pope’s lines ‘What his hard Heart
denies, His charitable Vanity supplies' (ll. 171-72, T. E. III. ii., 153). Bathurst is writing to Pope on the dullness of the country:

I think of nothing out of my own circle, and though it is a large one, it only furnishes two ideas, - wood without timber, and land without water. But as my lot is cast here I must make the best of it, and I find employment from one day to another. My charitable vanity or folly supplies bread to many industrious labourers, and therefore I would think no further. (Corr., III, 312)

This assimilation appears disconcertingly unquestioning. Pope's revision of *To Burlington* shows his doubts as to the wisdom of ascribing either a 'hard Heart' or 'charitable Vanity' to Burlington, as his chief patron at the time. Bathurst's careless application of Pope's phrase, 'charitable vanity', to himself looks like a tease, especially with the tag, 'or folly'. Where Pope's revisions of *To Burlington* show that his criticism of Burlington was serious, Bathurst, as was his custom, pre-empts Pope by laughing off any such criticism. Bathurst's joking tone mocks his mundane 'mustn't grumble' attitude and oddly takes the sting out of Pope's satire. We might speculate about Pope's possible reaction to this letter. It clearly irritated him elsewhere that Bathurst's whole attitude was not to 'think further', especially as regards the damage he was doing to the landscape.

*To Bathurst* explores more fully the doubts about the morality of Pope's patrons' use of wealth expressed in *To Burlington*. Its theme of avarice was originally designed to balance *To Burlington*'s theme of prodigality. Pope's decision to dedicate a poem about avarice and financial corruption to one of his most valuable patrons raises the question: did he mean that these subjects in any way reflected adversely on Bathurst? Furthermore, Pope chose to set his last serious treatment of Bathurst in *Epistle II. ii.*, a poem that again treats of avarice. In order to understand the importance of *To Bathurst* in Pope's relationship with Bathurst, we first need to know something of the Bathurst's financial dealings.
ii) Bathurst: a brief biography and his early patronage of Pope

Bathurst came from a distinguished family: he was the eldest son of Sir Benjamin Bathurst, from whom he seems to have derived some of his financial expertise. Sir Benjamin was an M.P. and a successful government servant. He had managed the privy purse of Anne as Princess and Queen and had for a short time been Governor of the East India Company. Bathurst’s mother was the daughter of a baronet, Sir Allen Apsley. In 1695 Sir Benjamin set Bathurst up by buying Cirencester House and its park for him. In 1704, with the death of Sir Benjamin, Bathurst inherited the family estate at Riskins, or Richings Park, near Iver, Buckinghamshire.

Politics and gardening were the passions of Bathurst’s life, although, in an aristocratic fashion, and probably as a measure of self-defence in dangerous times, he affected carelessness about his political career while he showed an interest bordering on obsession in matters of forestry and gardening. Bathurst was a vigorous man, much given to riding, hunting and walking. Lees-Milne writes that Bathurst rode two hours a day and drank a bottle of claret or madeira after dinner to within a month of his death at ninety-one. Bathurst also had a formidable reputation with women and had numerous children. The overall impression formed from his correspondence and from that of his friends is of a man of great, if, perhaps, restless, energy.

In 1716, Bathurst bought from the executors of Sir Robert Atkyns a large area to the west of his own property made up of Oakley Wood and the manor of Sapperton which he planned to join to his original Home Park. Bathurst earned his income from his land, from farming and from the rents paid by his tenants, and channelled much of this into his improvements at Cirencester Park. Although we do not have figures for exactly how much money the Park cost, an overview of Bathurst’s improvements suggests that this was spending on a grand scale. Bathurst’s designs were ambitious: as it turned out, overly ambitious. Three of his

---

7 Lees-Milne, p. 22.
8 Ibid., p. 28. For Bathurst’s reputation with women, see also The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, III, 406.
great schemes were not realized in his lifetime: the joining of the original Home Park with Oakley Wood; the creation of a single vista leading up through the park to the house; and, lastly, the most ambitious scheme of all, the joining of the Severn and the Thames.

Bathurst was Tory M. P. for Cirencester from 1705. In 1712, he was one of the twelve Tory peers created to give the Government a majority in the House of Lords on the Treaty of Utrecht. Bathurst’s being 1st Baron Bathurst rather than a hereditary peer seems relevant to his relationship with Pope: it might be one reason why they were especially close and might also, in part, account for Bathurst’s considerable public service. Archibald S. Foord describes him as one of the leading Tory courtiers who met shortly after Queen Anne’s death in 1714 to attempt to formulate an opposition platform, the others being Bolingbroke, Harcourt, Ormonde, Wyndham and Atterbury. Bathurst’s early success is demonstrated by his having been created first Baron at the age of twenty-eight. His having had to wait until he was sixty before he was created first Earl Bathurst brings home how he spent most of his life out of favour. Rogers comments that the length of the gap between his first and second enoblements ‘may be some kind of record’.

Bathurst was a Tory with strong Jacobite sympathies. Christopher Hussey describes the Bathursts’ politics as ‘a staunch Royalist Toryism grounded, however, too securely on realities to deviate into the fantasies of Jacobitism’. Foord in contrast claims that Bathurst was part of ‘a group of the Tory leaders who had been deeply involved in the Pretender’s schemes since the accession’ who, after Atterbury’s exile in 1723, ‘declared themselves “ready to enter into into any measures” with Walpole and Townsend’.

A study of Bathurst’s speeches reveals him as a powerful presence in the House of Lords. He appears to have been remarkably bold in matters of controversy, the first such being the trial for impeachment of Atterbury in 1723. Bathurst vigorously defended Atterbury, arguing

11 ‘Pope and the Social Scene’, p. 137.
that if the proceedings against him were allowed to continue, there would be nothing for any
honest landowner to do but retreat to the country and abandon public life. Cobbett’s

*Parliamentary History of England* reports:

[... ] if this way of proceeding be admitted, it will certainly prove a very dangerous engine: no
man’s life, liberty, or property will be safe; and if those, who were in the administration some
years ago, and who had as great a share in the affections of the people, as any that came after
them, had made use of such a political machine, some of those noble persons, who now appear
so zealous promoters of this bill, would not be in a capacity to serve his Majesty at this time.
His lordship added, that if such extraordinary proceedings went on, he saw nothing remaining
for him, and others to do, but retire to their country houses, and then, if possible, quietly enjoy
their estates, within their own families, since the least correspondence, the least intercepted
letter, might be made criminal.¹⁴

Thanks to the efforts of Atterbury’s friends, the proceedings against Atterbury for treason
were not admitted. When his enemies failed to convict him, he was sentenced to exile.

Bathurst’s fierce defence of Atterbury can only have impressed Pope, who was himself a
witness in the trial. Owing to his precarious position as a Catholic, Pope found the trial a
considerable ordeal. It is likely that he both admired Bathurst for his bravery in defending
Atterbury and wondered at his reckless daring; it is possible that such daring might be traced
to the ‘mad Good Nature’ described in *To Bathurst*.

In the majority of his speeches in the Lords, Bathurst emerges as the Tory expert on
matters of finance: his talent seems to have been in giving conventional Tory arguments
economic bite. He again demonstrated a remarkable fearlessness in attacking Walpole’s new
tax legislation and in attempting to expose him for corruption in the affairs of the South Sea
Company. In 1732, Bathurst made a long speech against Walpole’s proposed Salt Tax,
attacking its injustice. By means of careful calculations, he presented the Salt Tax as a
measure cynically introduced by Walpole to please wealthy landowners, since, by this
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¹⁴ *Parliamentary History of England*, May 1723, VIII, 333. Parliamentary reporting in the early eighteenth century varied in its
reliability. Since the taking of notes was a breach of privilege, the reporting of parliamentary speeches had to be surreptitious.
Debates in the House of Lords’, pp. 514–18. According to Turberville, the most reliable sources for debates were the
manuscript notes of members of the House; second to this were printed speeches, issued by the speakers themselves. Other
sources included: the *Journals* of the House of Lords, Abel Boyer’s *The Political State of Great Britain* (which gave monthly
summaries of debates), Tindal’s *Continuation of Rapin’s History*, Coke’s *Memories of Sir Robert Walpole*, Philip Yorke’s
*Parliamentary Journal*, Grafton’s *Autobiography*, Almon’s *Anecdotes of Chatham*, Burnet’s *History of his own Time*, Hervey’s
*Memoirs of George II*. The least reliable sources listed were the reports in the *Gentleman’s* and *London Magazines*. See also
the introductions to volumes IX and X of *Parliamentary History*.
method, the Land Tax could be reduced. His computations also showed how not only the poor but moderate landowners would suffer as a result. He expressed in passionate language his contempt for the cruelty of Walpole’s proposed tax, ending his speech with grim humour, showing how, by taxing salt, a vital preservative, Walpole would victimize the poor essentially, so it would seem, for being poor:

[. . .] this tax upon salt has something in it more cruel, and more unjust than any other; because the poor are thereby obliged to contribute more in proportion than the rich: We all know that there is but a small number of the poor of this nation that live in the families of the rich, most of them live upon daily wages, and in little cottages of their own; the chief part of their food is salt meat, and salt fish, and therefore we must conclude that the poorer a man is, the more he is obliged to contribute to the public expence, by the means of this duty upon salt, in so far at least as relates to his own personal consumption.  

Bathurst also gave the many speeches he made against standing armies a powerful financial slant. He made the conventional Tory argument that a mercenary army presented a serious threat to the people’s liberty and cleverly insinuated that Walpole was already, effectively, a corrupt financial dictator; he then brought home to the Lords how effortlessly, with the help of a private army, he might become a tyrant.

Rogers describes Bathurst as ‘in some ways [. . .] a kind of Tory version of Walpole’. While I agree with Rogers’ representation of Bathurst as a political heavyweight, his speeches in the Lords place him as one of the most senior Tory statesmen rather than as a politician with Walpole’s ambition. More significantly, for the purposes of this study, he appears as Walpole’s opposite in his attitude to writers. Walpole did not believe that literature mattered, whereas Bathurst evidently valued the company of writers. Although we cannot be sure as to how much worth Bathurst attached to literature itself, he nevertheless behaved much in the style of a patron of the previous century.

It is likely that Bathurst’s apparent lack of ambition in politics lay partly in the fact that the Tories under Walpole were not a party that had any real expectation of power. As Walpole’s
grip on the country tightened, however, Bathurst gradually transferred his energies from parliament to his country estate. With the emergence in the 1730s of the Whig Opposition, for the foreseeable future, the Tories became unelectable. From the 1730s onwards, Bathurst’s speeches shift in their emphasis so that they are predominantly in support of the Whig Patriot Opposition. The strongest evidence of his position as the leading Tory expert on finance is to be found in his initiation of the debate calling for an investigation of the accounts of the South Sea Company in 1733: his motion was to lead to Walpole’s first defeat in the House of Lords.

In reward for his service in public life and to the cause of the opposition, on Walpole’s fall Bathurst was made a Privy Councillor and Captain of the Band of Gentlemen Pensioners. In 1753 he was made Treasurer to the young Prince of Wales and with the succession of George III, he was granted a pension of £2,000 a year from the Irish revenues. He was created Earl Bathurst in 1772; his rewards at Court after Walpole’s fall demonstrate how active he had been in the service of the Opposition. Bathurst’s son, Henry Bathurst, Baron Apsley, afterwards 2nd Earl Bathurst, became Lord Chancellor, while his grandson, Henry Bathurst, 3rd Earl Bathurst, became Secretary for War and Colonies.

Pope’s acquaintance with Bathurst dates from about 1712, since Bathurst was at that time associated with the Scriblerus Club. Sherburn casts doubt on Warton’s suggestion that Bathurst was a member (The Early Career, p. 77); Mack writes that Pope had known Bathurst ‘since Scriblerus days’ (Alexander Pope, p. 380). Bathurst was one of Pope’s most hospitable patrons: we can count as his first real favour to Pope his having him to stay at Cirencester during the summer of 1718 when Pope was working on the Iliad. In June, when Volume IV of the Iliad was published, Pope was staying alternately at Cirencester and at Stanton Harcourt, Lord Harcourt’s seat near Oxford. He had worked on the translation at Stanton Harcourt the previous summer.

In June of 1718, Pope had taken his mother with him to Stanton Harcourt where he could frequently see her while he was visiting Bathurst. Pope wrote to Caryll from Stanton Harcourt about his needing to write away from home:
I was necessitated to come hither to continue my translation of Homer, for at my own house I have no peace from visitants, and appointments of continual parties of pleasure: things very unseasonable to a man who has such a cruel, unproportionable task on his hands. (11 August 1718, Corr., I, 484)

One attraction of Stanton Harcourt for Pope was its proximity to Cirencester. This is clear from a letter of 5 July 1718 where he tells Bathurst: ‘I have made a Coup de Maitre upon my mother, in persuading her to pass a month or two at Stanton Harcourt, in order to facilitate my Journies to her from Cicester’ (Corr., I, 478). At this time, he was evidently in the process of winning Bathurst’s friendship. He spent most of July in London, probably to settle accounts with Lintot and to consult about building in town; at this point, he was contemplating taking up an offer of a free site from Burlington at the back of Burlington House (Corr., I, 477n.).

On 14 August, Bathurst wrote to Pope to invite him and Gay to stay at Cirencester while he was away: they stayed until October. All this time, Lord Harcourt was looking after Pope’s mother at Stanton Harcourt. There is no documentary evidence to suggest whether Lord Harcourt did this willingly or whether it was felt as something of an imposition. His hospitality to Pope’s mother is certainly evidence of the freedom with which the poet treated some of his patrons. It would seem that by the end of October 1718, Pope had cemented his friendship with Bathurst. Gay testified to their joint devotion in *Mr Pope’s Welcome from Greece* (written 1720):

> Bathurst impetuous hastens to the coast,  
> Whom you & I strive who shall love ye most.  
> (11: ll. 87-88)\(^{18}\)

‘Striving’ suggests competition between the poets, which would have doubly flattered Bathurst. As in his *Epistle to Lord Burlington*, where Gay linked himself with Pope in showing his allegiance to Burlington here also, their attentions are combined. A clear distinction can be drawn between Gay’s presentation of the poets’ relationship with Burlington and their relationship with Bathurst. The joint relationship with Burlington was

one of deference, if tongue-in-cheek at times. The relationship with Bathurst appeared to be based on affection.

The style of Pope’s first letter to Bathurst gives some clue as to what might have drawn them together. From the start, Pope wrote to Bathurst in the style and spirit of the club; the antic disposition of the Scriblerians can be seen as a source for the playfulness and often boisterous foolery of his letters to him. Bathurst was most likely drawn to Pope for the same reasons that he had first been drawn to the Scriblerians: he loved their particular brand of humour. Pope, unlike Swift, was happy to carry on the performance after the break-up of the Club. The apparent equality in the relationship between Pope and Bathurst can be understood only, I think, in a Scriblerian light, since, in the Scriblerus Club, under cover of wit, writers easily rubbed shoulders with powerful politicians. With the more ‘correct’ Burlington, a different kind of jester’s behaviour was needed, a more elaborate and more courtly wit.

An example of Pope’s Scriblerus Club style is his first surviving letter to Bathurst, which opens with playful flattery and includes a piece of doggerel, teasing Bathurst on the shortcomings of his wood:

My Lord,—To say a word in praise either of your Wood or You, would be alike impertinent, each being, in its kind, the finest thing I know, & the most agreeable. I can only tell you very honestly, (without a word of the high Timber of the one, or the high Qualities of the other) that I thought it the best company I ever knew, & the best Place to enjoy it in. 

A Wood? quoth Lewis: and with that,
He laughd, and shook his Sides so fat:
His tongue (with Eye that mark’d his cunning)
Thus fell a reas’ning, not a running.
Woods are (not to be too prolix)
Collective Bodies of strait Sticks
It is, my Lord, a meer Conundrum
To call things woods, for what grows und’r ’em
For Shrubs, when nothing else at top is,
Can only constitute a Coppice.
But if you will not take my word,
See Anno quart. of Edward, third.
And that they’re Coppice calld, when dock’d,
If this a Wood you will maintain
Meerly because it is no Plain;
Holland (for all that I can see)
Might e’en as well be term’d the Sea;

Sherburn writes that Bathurst was mentioned as a member of the club ‘but the connexion, if actual, must have been slight’, *The Early Career*, p. 77.
And C—by be fair harangu’d
An honest man, because not hang’d.

Sherburn’s notes tell us that ‘C—by’ stands for Thomas Coningsby, a violent opponent in Parliament of Lord Oxford.20 Bathurst’s exaggeration, calling his park a ‘wood’, tells us that Cirencester Park was still in the early stages of development. Pope’s version of Lewis’ laughing at Bathurst’s stretching things to call his park After his jesting, Pope indulges Bathurst by defending him: ‘The rest of Mr Lewis’ Arguments I have forgotten, for as I am determined to live in the Wood, I am likewise resolvd to hear no reasons against it’ (5 July 1718, Corr., I, 476-78). Although Lewis and Pope mocked Bathurst for calling what he owns a ‘wood’, it is also possible to see Bathurst’s design as an example of his far­sightedness. It was Bathurst’s practice to plant young trees as part of shaping a future park of his imagination. Pope was nevertheless ready to play along with Bathurst’s vision of what the wood might one day become. In these early days he was probably indulgent with Bathurst’s characteristic impetuosity because it reminded him so much of his own (see Corr., II, 258).

Pope’s jaunty tone is part of an act that he put on to suit his friendship with Bathurst. We find him apparently practising this act in a letter to Teresa and Martha Blount, written during his first lengthy stay with Bathurst in 1718:

I am with my Lord Bathurst, at my Bower, in whose Groves we had yesterday a dry walk of three hours. It is the place that of all others I fancy, & I am not yet out of humour with it, tho I have had it some months: It does not cease to be agreeable to me so late in the Season; the very dying of the leaves adds a variety of colours that is not unpleasant. I look upon it as upon a Beauty I once loved, whom I should preserve a Respect for, in her Decay. And as we should look upon a Friend, with remembrance how he pleas’d us once, tho now declin’d from his former gay and flourishing condition.

I write an hour or two every morning, then ride out a hunting upon the Downes, eat heartily, talk tender sentiments with Lord B. or draw Plans for Houses and Gardens, open Avenues, cut Glades, plant Firs, contrive waterworks, all very fine and beautiful in our own imagination. At nights we play at Commerce, & play pretty high: I do more, I bett too; for I am really rich, and must throw away my money if no deserving Friend will use it. I like this course of life so well that I am resolvd to stay here, till I hear of some body’s being in towne that is worth my coming after. (Corr., I, 515)

20 Brian W. Hill describes Coningsby as a ‘powerful landowner’ who opposed the Harleys for the seats of Leominster and Herefordshire, Robert Harley: Speaker, Secretary of State and Premier Minister (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1988), pp. 22-23, p. 227. There was a long-standing family feud between the Harleys and the Coningsbys. Thomas
In his humorous description of Cirencester Park as his ‘Bower’, Pope lightheartedly plays the part of the poet, romanticising the wood. In his letter to Bathurst of 5 July 1718 Pope had described Gay’s vision of ‘the Bower’ as a place of enchantment: ‘He has already planted it with Myrtles, & peopled it with Nymphs’ (Corr., I, 477). That this pleased Bathurst is shown in a letter from Bathurst to Pope about his country neighbours which ends with Bathurst’s remedy for his smoke-ridden evening: ‘Therefore I will defer the rest which I have to say till I am purified by walking round Oakley wood, and conversing with the hamadryads which you have lodged there’ ([October 1724?], Corr., II, 262-63). There is considerable delicacy in Bathurst’s description of Pope’s hamadryads; Pope had contributed a ‘genius’ to the place at Cirencester (even though, later, as I show in Chapter 6, Bathurst would devastate it). This ‘Genius of the Place’ appears in Bathurst’s letter as a presence rather than anything artificial and has its opposite in Pope’s description of the statues at Timon’s villa (T. E. III. ii, 148-49). By ‘conversing’ with Pope’s hamadryads, Bathurst repopulates Oakley Wood with his imagination.

In this letter to the Blounts, Pope takes on a persona that is amiably self-mocking: it is hard to picture him doing all the things he claims. In particular, the image of him riding out ‘a hunting upon the Downes’ is comically far-fetched. The disparate elements in his list of activities create a picture of life at Cirencester Park as one of comic incongruities. The nonchalance of ‘I write an hour or two every morning’ seems at odds with the jauntiness and vigour of the morning’s hunting followed up by hearty eating calmed by tender talking and finished off with the description of drawing ‘Plans for Houses and Gardens’. This last description suggests a kind of amateurish ambition which clashes next with the vigorous and exhausting list of transitive verbs that deludingly suggest real action: ‘open Avenues, cut Glades, plant Firrs, contrive waterworks’. We are finally let down by the comic anti-climax:

Coningsby was one of the committee appointed to investigate the negotiations for the Treaty of Utrecht; as a result of the committee's investigations, Walpole moved to impeach Bolingbroke and Coningsby, Harley (DNB).

21 Bathurst’s understanding of ‘presence’ has much in common with Marvell’s sense that ‘skill’ counts against ‘presence’ in The Mower against Gardens, II. 31-40, Andrew Marvell, ed. by Frank Kermode and Keith Walker (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), pp. 40-41. See also Marvell’s forms and fairies in Damon the Mower, II. 61-64, and The Garden, II. 25-32, Andrew Marvell, p. 43 and p. 48. For further examples of the importance of ‘presence’ in English landscape poetry, see Denham’s nymphs in Cooper’s Hill, II. 229-34, The Poetical Works of Sir John Denham, p. 79. Pope alludes to Cooper’s Hill in The Rape of the Lock, Canto V, l. 124, T. E. II, 210. Mack very interestingly compares To Burlington with
all very fine and beautiful in our own imagination'. Nevertheless, the attractions of Bathurst and his way of life are strongly felt, while, at the same time, Pope humorously depicts his inability really to join in with them, owing to his ill health.

Pope’s claim that he is ‘resolvd to stay here, till I hear of some body’s being in towne that is worth my coming after’ sounds as if it has been lifted word for word from Bathurst himself. Pope’s expression of resolution sounds comically careless. Pope is clearly having fun imitating Bathurst by taking insouciance to its limits but it is Bathurst, however, and not Pope, who is the one ‘resolvd to stay’ in the country. Earlier in the letter, Pope imagined that, in time, he would become immune to the charms of Cirencester Park: ‘I look upon it as upon a Beauty I once loved, whom I should preserve a Respect for, in her Decay’. If we take the Park as a symbol of its owner, his words are strangely prophetic. To his death, he maintained a respect for Bathurst even when the charm and easy affection of their early friendship had been lost. Even in the exhilaration of his first friendship with Bathurst, he was anticipating its decline. Although there is no surviving evidence, it is possible that this relationship was of sufficient importance to Pope to make him want to doctor this early letter to Bathurst. In this intimate letter to the Blount sisters, he acts a part that humorously pictures for them his efforts to keep up with Bathurst, and the exertions it cost him to win his friendship. Nevertheless, in this early picture of his friendship with Bathurst, the overall impression given by Pope’s letter is that staying at Cirencester Park is a pleasure.

Milton’s *Nativity Ode*, pointing out that Pope upholds the tradition of presence in the landscape, *The Garden and the City*, pp. 23-24.
iii) Bathurst’s financial dealings and the Epistle *To Bathurst*

Bathurst’s ‘Groves’ are central to his relationship with Pope. His failure to mention Bathurst’s gardening at all might possibly be construed as saying that his gardening abilities amounted to so little that they were not worth mentioning. To take playing the part of the devil’s advocate still further, we might infer from *To Bathurst* that Bathurst’s gardening activities struck him as simply an aristocrat’s hobby and perhaps just another example of his swaying in his use of wealth between the extremes of ‘mad good nature’, shown in the extravagance of his schemes, and ‘mean self-love’, shown in the pride he displayed thinking these schemes worth the money.

Pope’s ambivalence lay in the essentially frivolous way, as he saw it, that Bathurst spent his money at Cirencester Park; it would seem, however, that he had no doubts about Bathurst’s ability to make money by means of wise investments. Pope’s investment in Bathurst’s land and farms was in the form of an annuity. After his death, among his bonds was one for £2,000 lent to Bathurst on 25 March 1738, on which £1,500 had been repaid. In his correspondence with Bathurst, he lightens mentions of his investment with humour, acknowledging the awkwardness of discussing money matters with a friend. In a letter to Bathurst of 7 November 1728, he writes about an annuity that he has purchased from the Duchess of Buckinghamshire, which it would seem that Bathurst helped bring about:

> You will rejoice I know with me, that what You so warmly sollicited and contributed to, for my future Ease, is accomplished. If I live these hundred years, I shall never fancy, even in my jealous Old age, that I live too long upon You & Her. And if I live but one year, it would better please me to think an Obelisque might be added to your Garden, or a Pond to hers, with my money, than such a Hospital as Guy’s to the City, or such a Monument as Priors to Westminster. *(Corr., II, 525)*

There is a difficult humour here in Pope’s reference to his own death. At first, we might think that he is saying that he would rather give his money to private individuals such as Bathurst and the Duchess of Buckinghamshire than to the poor. The humour, though, directs the reader not to take Pope literally; he jokes about being a good investment, since he might
not live to see a return. Even so, his early death might only pay for an obelisque for Bathurst or a pond for the Duchess, making a humorous contrast with the scale of Guy’s hospital. Along with Pope’s self-mockery, there is also some mockery of Bathurst and the Duchess for the frivolous use to which they might well put any profit made by his early death. Later there were misunderstandings between Pope and those patrons who helped him in his financial affairs, amongst them, Bathurst, the Duchess of Buckinghamshire and Caryll. Indeed, with his growing estrangement from Caryll from about 1717, Pope looked to Bathurst for financial advice. Pope’s investment in Bathurst’s financial expertise puts the joint title of his epistles, *To Bathurst* and *To Burlington*, *Of the Use of Riches*, in a new light: the title no longer appears purely speculative and gains an aptness derived from its vivid relevance to Pope’s life.

Pope was not alone in gaining valuable financial advice from Bathurst: Bathurst also acted as financier for Swift and Gay. There is little documentary evidence of Bathurst’s handling of accounts in Pope’s correspondence but letters between Bathurst, Swift and Gay in Swift’s correspondence show that Bathurst acted as a kind of bank for his money and Gay was his business agent. This arrangement is highly surprising, given Gay’s dire reputation as regards money and Swift’s fastidiousness in money matters. In Swift’s letters, once the arrangement had been established, there was a running joke about Bathurst’s entrusting Gay with Swift’s money.

On 12 February, 1730, Bathurst wrote to inform Swift about his investment: ‘[...] I must lett you know that as to your money affairs tho’ I have pay’d off John Gay I still keep yr 200il for wch I have giv’n him a Note, I have pay’d him interest to this time for it wch he must acct to you for.’ On 3 March, 1730, Gay wrote to Swift in a manner that suggests considerable confidence in financial matters:

[...] I would not have you think me capable of neglecting [your affairs] whatever you think of me as to my own. I have receivd 21f – 13 – 4 interest from Lord Bathurst, for your 200f from October 1727 to Xmas 1729 two years and two months at 5f p Cent. Lord Bathurst gave me a

---

22 See my introduction for a brief account of Pope’s prickly relationship with the Duchess about money. Pope writes to Bathurst about the annuity she has sold him, mediated by Bathurst, on 7 November [1728], *Corr.*, II, 525.

23 See my introduction for the cooling of Pope’s relationship with Caryll; see Erskine-Hill’s chapter on Caryll in *The Social Milieu*, pp. 72–102.

24 See Gay to Swift, 9 November 1729, *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift*, III, 357.
note for your 200/ again, & to allow interest for the same dated January 15 1729/30. If you
would have me dispose of your money any other way, I shall obey your orders; Let me know
what I shall do with this interest money I have receiv’d.

Swift replied to this letter, agreeing to let Gay handle his money for him. Although he teases
Gay about his reputation as a spendthrift, Swift’s directions as to the money are detailed
enough to suggest that, in fact, he had confidence in his abilities:

I will leave my money in Lord Bathurst’s Hands, and the Management of it (for want of better)
in Yours. But I hope you have paid yourself the five Guineas; and pray keep the Interest
Money in a bag, wrap’t up and sealed by itself, for fear of your own fingers under your
Carelessness and necessities. I pay an Annuity of 15l per Ann: in Surrey, and shall soon send
you a direction for part of it, And besides My Lord Lieutenant hath forced me against my will
to pay nine Guineas for the New Edition of Thuanus which I know to be a jobb for Buckley,
and I shall put the Payment on you or Mr Lewis [Erasmus Lewis], who likewise hath some
money of mine in his Hand. And now I have learnt a way of making my Friends write, it is but
letting them keep my money, for till then I never had a line from Mr Lewis, nor hardly from
you.

The following year, Bathurst expresses mock incredulity at Swift for letting Gay act as his
financial intermediary:

Cou’d any man but you think of trusting John Gay with his money; none of his friends
wou’d ever trust him with his own whenever they cou’d avoid it. he has call’d in the 20011 I
had of yrs, I pay’d him both principal & interest; I suppose by this time he has lost it, I give yu
notice yu must look upon it as annihilated.

Swift’s letter of reply, dated 17 July 1731, in turn expresses mock bewilderment as to how
Bathurst could possibly have imagined that he had given Gay permission to look after his
money:

As to my 20011 I know not by what Authority your Ldship payd it to Mr Gay. I have been at
law these ten years and still continue so, and have learnt enough to know that I expect my
Money from you, & the constant interest too. Besides cost and damage at valorn cent libr
sterl. The Aggravation is that you know Mr Gay very well, for his first offer to me, after he
received the money, was to throw off the interest at hazard with the Government, till I
entreated him he would employ it in paying a debt.25

Bathurst’s initial decision to entrust Gay with Swift’s money seems to demonstrate that he
was a more far-sighted judge of character than Swift. Indeed, Bathurst’s belief in Gay’s
reliability goes some way towards dispelling the myth that Gay was hopeless with money.
Nokes’ biography of Gay suggests that he was adept in financial matters and that the myth

of his indigence was one fabricated by his friends partially in order to help him in his life as something of a professional sponger. Swift’s allowing Gay to act as his financial agent in England shows his confidence in him, but more importantly, in Bathurst, their financier: he trusted Gay because so did Bathurst. So also, Pope’s and Gay’s entrusting Bathurst with their money is a considerable tribute to his talents as financier.

Bathurst’s expertise in matters of finance gave him the casting vote in one of the most important decisions in Pope’s life: the decision about where to build his house. On Bathurst’s advice, Pope rejected Burlington’s generous offer of a free site in London and, instead, opted for Twickenham. Burlington’s remarkable offer was made at a time when he was developing the land behind Burlington House as part of his Palladian campaign, installing friends and allies there in houses designed by Campbell. Apart from the promotion of Palladianism, the development of the land was for Burlington a way of raising money for architectural projects.

It is possible that Pope was uneasy about the prospect of becoming part of Burlington’s Palladian colonization of Picadilly. Burlington’s offer to Pope was probably a reward for loyalty but was most likely also motivated by a desire to display him as his poet. Had Pope accepted Burlington’s offer, it would certainly then have been difficult to have maintained an independent stance with regard to him and his circle. Apart from the prohibitive expense of building in town, Pope might well have felt the need to withdraw a little from Burlington and transfer some of his attention to the less exacting Bathurst.

Pope’s letter rejecting Burlington’s offer is one of his greatest exercises in diplomacy. He turns Burlington down, yet still further binds himself to him. On 3 February 1718/19, he wrote to Burlington:

I am told your Lordship is going into the Country upon some journey to morrow, & lest the affair you sent to me about should be That of my building or not, I take this method of repeating what I said when last I had the honour of seeing you; That I readily resign the piece of ground intended for me, as not being yet prepared to build, & absolutely unwilling to retard the progress of the rest who are. I beg leave to assure you, My Lord, that I think the Obligation as fully & strongly layd upon me, a Title to a future one; so that instead of obliging me Once, you will do it Twice, in the very same Affair. This is putting your Benefit out to use, &

---

doubling it. Tho' you never design'd to be the greatest Usurer in the world, yet you really will be so, if all the Hearts of those you have to deal with, have as good a Fund as mine.

The importance of maintaining Burlington's favour is shown in Pope's follow-up letter written a day later. In this letter, he flatteringly asks Burlington for permission to let some friends see his gardens and then assures him that, though he is now set on building at Twickenham, he will still be under his dominion:

... as to your Gardens, I beg your Lordships leave I may keep my promise, & send to ask it. If you stay all night I'll come personally to thank you; if not, I'll follow your Wheels to London, or stop you on the Road, or do any thing to see you; tho' at present 'tis a great proof of my virtue, & ability to bear Satyr, since you have Twick'nam for your Subject. I'm sure you shall always have me for your Neighbour, where-ever I live; & always for / My Lord / Your most gratefull, most affectionate, most obedient Servant, / A. Pope. (Corr., II, 2)

Pope's shrewdness in his dealings with his patrons is at its most visible in the help Burlington later gave him in building his villa at Twickenham. As I showed in my discussion of Burlington, despite Pope's rejection of the site in town, he subsequently offered to pay for all his building materials. Nevertheless, the later correspondence between Pope and Burlington does seem to show a certain coolness on Burlington's part as to the design of Pope's villa. On 8 October 1732 Burlington comments on the front of Pope's villa with its newly designed portico: 'I have considered your front, and am of the opinion that my friend Kent has done all that can be, considering the place [...]' (Corr., III, 322-23). This grudging remark is tempered with apologies about his lacking the time to write more fully, but it must have come as something of a disappointment for Pope.

On the issue of where to build, it is likely that Pope's decision arose directly from his long stay with Bathurst in the summer of 1718. Bathurst's influence appears here to have been greater than Burlington's. In effect, the advice he gave was simply financial commonsense: it would have been too expensive for Pope to have built in London. Bathurst moves quickly from writing about the expense of the building that he is himself currently undertaking to Pope's own plans for building:

---

27 I have found no evidence to support this indication that William Kent designed Pope's portico: John Dixon Hunt gives no mention of his involvement in *William Kent: Landscape Garden Designer: An Assessment and Catalogue of his Designs* (London: Zwemmer, 1987).
I have only been disturbed with the noise of saws and hammers, which has no other ill effect whatsoever attending it but only that it is apt to melt money sometimes. It may be proper for you to consider of the phenomenon against you begin to employ those engines about your palazzotto at London. Neither Aristotle nor Descartes can find a method to hinder the noise from having that effect, and though the one should tell you that there was an occult quality in those machines which operated in that manner upon gold and silver, and the other should say that there were certain atoms which flow from them adapted to the pores of those metals, it would be of no manner of use to you towards preserving the coin; but we that lay out our money in the country have the sanction of Horace upon our prudence who says,

Vos sapere et solos aio bene vivere, quorum
Conspicitur nitidis fundata pecunia villis.

I have consulted Dr Bentley and I find that he is of the opinion that *fundata pecunia* means money which was in the funds. (Corr., I, 488-89)

The quotation from Horace is taken from Epistle I. XV, where Horace is writing to his friend Numonius Vala, who had a country house in southern Italy and came from a distinguished family. We need the lines immediately preceding those Bathurst quotes to determine their meaning and Bathurst’s use of them:

[... nam tuta et parvola laudo,  
cum res deficiunt, satis inter vilia fortis:  
verum ubi quid melius contingit et unctius, idem  
vos sapere et solos aio bene vivere, quorum  
conspicitur nitidis fundata pecunia villis.  
(II. 42-46)]

[... when matters are a little deficient, I commend the snug and homely fare, of sufficient resolution amidst mean provisions; but, if anything be offered better and more delicate, I, the same individual, cry out, that ye are wise and alone live well, whose wealth and estate are conspicuous from the elegance of your villas.]

Horace admits here that he is both like the well-known Maenius, who would proclaim the blessings of a simple life but, given the chance, would indulge his appetite to the full and also like his friend, Vala, who, no doubt, owned one of the villas that he covets. The contrast in Bathurst’s letter to Pope between the sententious tone of ‘we that lay out our money in the country have the sanction of Horace upon our prudence’ and Horace’s jocular, teasing ‘vos sapere et solos aio bene vivere, quorum/ conspicitur nitidis fundata pecunia villis’ shows that Bathurst is being ironic throughout the whole passage.

---


Through Horace, Bathurst teases Pope in suggesting that he should display his wealth by building an elegant villa. In addition, such a villa in Horace’s day might really have been a country retreat, but, by Pope’s time, the ‘villa’ was entirely suburban: Bathurst’s implication is that Pope cannot claim a virtuous use of wealth because he will not really be building in the country. Bathurst was also joking, as Sherburn tells us, when he quoted Bentley as no such note on ‘fundata pecunia’ exists. Like Pope, he enjoyed mocking the pedantry of modern scholars and, in any case, the phrase is a pun on ‘funds’. Perhaps the deciding factor for Pope was that Campbell had quoted him a price for the house in town that he thought exorbitant (see Corr., I, 516). Even with the offer of a free site and, possibly, at this stage, an offer of building materials, it seems that Pope would still have had to pay for the work.

In the early months of 1719 Pope and his mother moved to Twickenham. They had spent three years ‘under the wing’ of Burlington at Chiswick. While I have argued that Burlington was the patron who shaped Pope’s career as a poet, after the move to Twickenham, Pope became closer to Bathurst. Pope’s decision to build at Twickenham rather than in town marked a turning-point in his life: from this point onwards, he embraced the ideal of virtuous retirement both in his poetry and in his life. Bathurst became increasingly important for him as a landed Tory, symbolic of the values of the country as opposed to those of the City.

Since the fall of the Tories with the death of Queen Anne in 1714, Bathurst had accustomed himself to a life lived outside Court circles. It was not until May 1733 that Burlington resigned from all of his government and court appointments and went into Opposition over the Excise Bill. By accident, Chiswick House, which he had been rebuilding since 1726 in the style of a villa suburba, a temporary summer retreat, became his primary residence.30 By 1733 the cult of the retirement ethic was firmly established among the Opposition. Bathurst was one of the earliest and most significant exponents of this ethic and it is in this that his attraction lay for Pope. Life in town meant a life led at Court for Bathurst and, since the Hanoverian succession, there was no real place for him there. Like

---

30 See Harris, pp. 169-72.
Bathurst, Pope made enforced retirement into virtuous living superior in ethics and value to life in town.

Given the background of Bathurst’s position as representative of Opposition retirement philosophy, Pope’s Epistle To Bathurst appears all the more surprising in its neglecting to praise him for upholding the values of the country. Pope’s portrait of Bathurst is not one of rural virtue but, rather, one of hard-bitten financial acumen, and it toughly questions the morality of Bathurst’s attitude to the financial revolution as an aristocrat whose wealth derives from land. With the greatest subtlety, Pope questions Bathurst and the Opposition lords’ qualifications to assume the moral high ground as regards the use of wealth.

After his urbane conversational opening, Pope launches into an initial exploration of corruption which centres on bribery, calling to mind, for a contemporary reader, the bribes Walpole was rumoured to have accepted from the directors of the South Sea Company for the return of their estates. Surprisingly, however, rather than simply preparing the ground for Bathurst’s coming campaign against Walpole, he breaks off from his account of bribery and questions Bathurst himself. It is at this point in the poem that he elicits from Bathurst his most powerful demonstration of insouciance. He has just described how the new credit economy facilitates corruption by making bribery invisible:

   Blést paper-credit! last and best supply!
   That lends Corruption lighter wings to fly!
   Gold imp’d by thee, can compass hardest things,
   Can pocket States, can fetch or carry Kings;
   A single leaf shall waft an Army o’er,
   Or ship off Senates to a distant Shore;
   A leaf, like Sibyl’s, scatter to and fro
   Our fates and fortunes, as the winds shall blow:
   Pregnant with thousands flits the Scrap unseen,
   And silent sells a King, or buys a Queen.
   Since then, my Lord, on such a World we fall,
   What say you? ‘Say? Why take it, Gold and all.’
(II. 69-80, T. E. III. ii., 93-94)

Pope’s exploration of the nefarious effects of credit is feverishly exercised by the effects of corruption. His breaking off here to ask for Bathurst’s response evidences his sudden awareness of his absorption in the subject. His manner of phrasing his question, ‘Since then, my Lord, on such a World we fall,/ What say you?’, is remarkably direct, even to the point
of being adversarial. But his manner of address is also a form of politeness, since he alters his tone and style of speech in an attempt to put Bathurst at his ease. ‘What say you?’ comes across as bluff, signalling Pope’s adaptation of his tone to his worldly friend. The sudden shift in tone shows the difference in temperament between Pope and Bathurst, as Pope perceives it: he becomes agitated about the question of the use of wealth where Bathurst appears unconcerned and pragmatic. The awkwardness in the transition signals this difference. Pope’s bluntness of address seems strangely unfit for a question which, although about the world, is essentially unworldly.

The above exchange between Pope and Bathurst on what is Bathurst’s subject, pari
cellexcellence, that is, the corruption engendered by the new finance, follows the satiric convention whereby the indignant poet has to be talked down by his more worldly friend. In this opening, the archness of his approach demonstrates his sensitivity to the particular dynamics of their friendship. Pope’s deferential ‘my Lord’ has something self-mocking about it, as if, for a while, absorbed as he was in his cogitations about paper credit, he points out how he had forgotten himself and, more importantly, in this poem of patronage, his place.

As a man ennobled for purely political reasons, to help to keep his party in power, and as the Tory expert on finance, Pope seems also to insinuate by ‘my Lord’ that Bathurst, if any, is the man to ask about financial and political corruption. With the confidence of friendship, he puts Bathurst on the spot as a worldly aristocrat being asked for his opinion of a fallen world. The self-consciousness and openness of the question itself might suggest that he is not really looking for answers from Bathurst but is, rather, interested in his point of view, as one steeped in the worlds of politics and finance. The directness of his question takes Bathurst aback, as it does the reader, but also, by virtue of this tone, prepares the ground for his answer, “‘Say? Why take it, Gold and all.”

Bathurst outdoes Pope in bathetic bluntness. In this one line, Pope captures what is perhaps Bathurst’s overriding characteristic, one which comes close to contradiction: a kind of robust insouciance. In his characterization of Bathurst, Pope makes it clear that his
insouciance has its source both in his worldliness and in his position as a wealthy landowner. We see that Pope is not primarily judging him but rather the world that he so easily inhabits. Not impressed by his answer, Pope patiently resumes his enquiry by means of dialogue, evidently still keen to learn what he can from his experience.

Before considering further Pope's attitude towards Bathurst in the Epistle, we need some knowledge of Bathurst's campaign to expose corruption in public life. Just two months after the publication of *To Bathurst*, Bathurst was employing its vocabulary of corruption, focusing on fraud, cheats and bribes, in his speeches in the House of Lords against Walpole's administration. When we consider Bathurst's speeches, Pope's portrait of his nonchalance in the Epistle towards the effects of corruption appears unfair. Where in the Epistle, in the privacy of conversation with Pope, Bathurst is depicted as having a carefree approach to these questions, in the House of Lords, it would seem that he argued his points with a ferocity that suggests sincerity. Yet we need to bear in mind, however, Bathurst's political motives in assessing his sincerity: he was clearly making powerful political capital out of the South Sea Company's accounts on behalf of the Opposition.

On March 6, 1733, in the debate on the Number of Land Forces, Bathurst made a lengthy speech stating the general Tory argument, 'A standing army must [. . .], my Lords, be of dangerous consequence to the liberties of every country', but, in the process, insinuating financial corruption:

I believe it never was said, that a standing army is the only method by which an arbitrary power may be established; there are, without doubt, other means by which it may be established, but I am sure that it can never be long supported without a standing army. By a political and cunning administration the people may be cheated out of their liberties; by some specious pretence or another they may be induced to give up all those barriers, which are the defence and the protection of their liberties and privileges; but the fraud will at last be discovered, and as soon as it is, the people will resume their ancient privileges, if there be no new sort of power established for protecting the arbitrary government against any such resumption, which power can never consist in any thing else but a standing army of some kind or other. 31

Bathurst's suggestion of financial corruption is quite subtle. 'Cheated' and 'fraud' refer to his general argument about the threat to liberty but also have marked financial overtones.

In the debate held on May 3 1733 on his ‘Motion for an Account of the Product of the South Sea Directors’ Forfeited Estates in the Year of 1720’, Bathurst was passionate about the deleterious effects of corruption on the national credit:

[. . .] we have, my lords, a right to enquire into the management and disposal of all public monies, and we are at present the more obliged to exercise this right, because of the many enormous frauds which have been lately discovered in the management of the affairs of such Companies [. . .] We cannot, my lords, discharge our duty to our country without making such an enquiry; and now that I have made the motion, I hope it will be agreed to; for if it should not I dread the consequences; the putting a negative upon such a question would certainly injure the public credit of the nation among foreigners; it might probably be the cause of their drawing all their money out of our funds at once, which would give such a shock both to the trade and credit of this nation that I tremble to think of it.

Bathurst’s emphasis on fraud, while it referred to the old South Sea Company, had a contemporary resonance, and was thereby an attack on Walpole. Bathurst showed surprising audacity in taking the financial scandal of the century, the South Sea Bubble, and insinuating that the present administration was responsible for greater fraud. By associating Walpole with the South Sea Bubble, Bathurst helped to make the South Sea Bubble a kind of shorthand for Walpolian corruption. We might imagine Bathurst in the Lords placing heavy emphasis on ‘many enormous frauds’ and enjoying making his enemies quake. He had already given figures to support his case, suggesting that a sum of between two and three million pounds, originally kept in trust for the proprietors of the South Sea Company, had gone missing. The substance of his argument concerns bribery, as evidenced by the difficulty of keeping track of South Sea Company’s accounts in the new credit economy.

Elsewhere in his speeches on this subject, he shows an accountant’s respect for figures, pointing out the muddle and confusion of the South Sea Company’s finances and demonstrating the importance of well-kept accounts. His exposure of government fraud and bribery helped shape Pope’s To Bathurst: in turn, it is likely that Pope’s Epistle shaped Bathurst’s speeches in the Lords. In the light of Bathurst’s speeches, we can see the Epistle To Bathurst as a kind of forerunner to Bathurst’s campaign.

32 Ibid., IX, 95-96.
33 See also the emphasis on fraud in the the fifth article in the Opposition lords’ letter of dissent in response to the defeat of their motion calling for a general enquiry into the accounts of the South Sea Company, ibid., IX, 152-53.
J. H. Plumb gives quite a detailed account of Bathurst’s calling for an inquiry into the accounts of the South Sea Company, describing how the debate gained strength from the government’s continued difficulties with Spain:

[... ] men talked of Houghton, of Chelsea, of Richmond, of the profusion and extravagance of Walpole’s life; *The Craftsman* and the informed whispers of the malignant courtiers had taught everyone to look for the explanation in corruption. For years the story had gone round that many of the downiest features of Sir Robert’s well-cushioned nest had come from the bribes paid by the directors to get back their estates.\(^34\)

Plumb describes how Bathurst’s securing of an enquiry into the management of the South Sea directors’ estates on 3 May 1733 was ‘the first defeat any ministry had suffered in the House of Lords within living memory’.\(^35\) Walpole’s administration was clearly in danger: a defeat in the House of Lords meant an inability to control the Court. The Excise Crisis earlier that year made this second crisis even more of a threat to the government. Hervey describes how, between 1 and 24 May, in an effort to drum up support for the government, ‘many Lords were *closeted, schooled* and *tampered with* by the ministers, some by the King and more by the Queen.’\(^36\) On 2 June, Bathurst tried to extend the crisis to the House of Commons by calling for a general enquiry into the affairs of the South Sea Company since 1720. His motion was narrowly defeated this time, with 70 Content and 75 Not Content. Plumb comments that the campaign had been an ‘attempt at a *coup d’état* at Court and in the Lords by the friends of the King when he had been Prince of Wales’ which had ‘almost succeeded, and for the first time since 1722 Walpole’s power had been in jeopardy’.\(^37\)

As with Pope’s choice of false imitators of Palladio as his satirical target in *To Burlington*, so, also, in *To Bathurst*, Pope chooses to attack his patron’s target. Pope’s writing on financial politics for Bathurst was entirely apt; it also demonstrates to what extent his writing of poetry had become political. His addressing a poem to Bathurst on the subject of corruption presents the Epistle as an extension of a conventional pattern of patronage: the

---

\(^{34}\) Plumb, p. 275. Neither Carswell nor Lewis Melville (*The South Sea Bubble*, London: Daniel O’Connor, 1921) mention Bathurst’s part in this affair.

\(^{35}\) Plumb, p. 276.


\(^{37}\) Plumb, p. 279.
purpose of the Epistle is to augment Bathurst’s reputation. As Bathurst’s poet, Pope was writing on subjects that absorbed his patron in his public life if not particularly, as the Epistle puckishly demonstrates, in his private life. In conversation with Bathurst, oddly, Pope shows Bathurst as no great thinker about corruption, as adept as he might have been in his detailed knowledge and documentation of Walpole’s financial crimes; Pope comes across as thinking more deeply than Bathurst about the nature of the new credit economy.

Given Pope’s life-long attacks on those poets who slavishly wrote propaganda for government or eulogies for their patrons, his apparent compliance with the demands of the Opposition is surprising. His late commitment to Opposition politics in his poetry has aroused considerable speculation. On the grounds that he published no political satire between the Atterbury plot in 1722 and the publication of the Dunciad in 1728, E. P. Thompson has suggested that Walpole might have had a hold over him during this time.\(^{38}\) Whatever the truth of this suggestion, from To Bathurst onwards, Pope is engaged in work for the Opposition. After the Chandos affair, it is likely that he recognized the importance of forming an alliance with the Opposition, in order to secure aristocratic protection. There might also have been pressure from Bathurst to write about financial corruption in the lead-up to the Opposition’s first major onslaught on Walpole for his corruption in the affairs of the South Sea Company.

To Bathurst does not simply manifest a desire to please. Pope not only wrote the Epistle in support of Bathurst, but also subjected Bathurst, and, to a lesser degree, himself, to scrutiny as to the use of wealth. While he attacked Walpole’s administration for corruption, he did not shy away from covertly mocking Bathurst for not knowing much about the use of riches. Indeed, his portrayal of Bathurst’s insouciance in private conversation suggests that, what is worse, Bathurst did not really care to know much about the subject. There are many clues in To Bathurst that Pope intended to shame his patrons as much as to attack his enemies,
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hinting that his patrons were not exempt from financial wrongdoing. There is a highly significant moment in *To Bathurst* where, in the same breath, Pope both attacks Walter and shames both Burlington and Bathurst for the wrong use of wealth. As I mentioned in my introduction, Walter was for Pope the representative of a new breed of moneyed man, the crooked professional money-lender. In my introduction I also described how Pope’s mock-panegyrics to Walter in *To Bathurst* reveal criminal financial activity to be so dangerously infectious that it overturns all values. The nature of this infectiousness is only fully revealed, however, when we compare the two *Epistles Of the Use of Riches*. Pope’s panegyrics to Burlington in his Epistle *To Burlington* which mark the climax of the poem, where he urges Burlington on to the design of imperial works, have a disturbing parallel with his mock-panegyrics to Walter in *To Bathurst*:

You too proceed! make falling Arts your care,  
Erect new wonders, and the old repair,  
Jones and Palladio to themselves restore,  
And be whate’er Vitruvius was before [...]  
(*To Burlington*, ll. 191-94, T. E. III. ii., 155)

Wise Peter sees the World’s respect for Gold,  
And therefore hopes this Nation may be sold:  
Glorious Ambition! Peter, swell thy store,  
And be what Rome’s great Didius was before.  
(*To Bathurst*, ll. 125-28, T. E. III. ii., 102)

In the above parallel, we see something of Pope’s idea of ‘ye Ballance of things’ (T. E. III. ii., p. xxi) in that Burlington’s and Bathurst’s prodigality balances out Walter’s avarice, yet his satirical re-use of the cadence from *To Burlington* has the effect of infiltrating the first heroic version. Bathurst is also involved since Pope sets the parallel in the Epistle addressed to him. Although Walter is nominally Burlington’s and Bathurst’s antithesis, Pope seems to suggest that all three characters might be examples of the ‘misery of affluence’ (Spence, No. 293, I, 129). If this is indeed Pope’s meaning, he thereby questions the notion of a providential balance of opposites and, implicitly, his patrons’ virtue. In the Epistle *To Burlington*, Burlington is pictured as the representative of some future nobler age; the mocking re-use of the panegyrics addressed to him might indicate that such a future seems
unlikely, both because the world looks set to be run by men like Walter and, also, perhaps, because great noblemen like Burlington and Bathurst fail to live up to Pope's ideal. The balance that Pope strikes between attacking the follies and vices of both his enemies and his patrons makes To Bathurst neither propaganda nor simply an exercise in patronage. It represents satirical comment on the institution of patronage and the politics of the time.

The three surviving manuscripts of To Bathurst demonstrate the care that Pope took with his ten-line passage of formal praise: indeed, it is the most heavily revised section of the poem. Between these three manuscripts there are six versions of this single passage: one version in Manuscript 1, four versions in Manuscript 2 and one version in Manuscript 3. In view of the fact that there is no conclusive evidence for the dating of the manuscripts, we cannot treat them as successive drafts. It is possible that Pope revised the manuscripts simultaneously. In my analysis of some of the ways in which the manuscripts relate to the Twickenham Edition of the Epistle, I will firstly deal with Manuscripts 1 and 3, each of which contains one version of the passage of formal praise, before proceeding to Manuscript 2, in which this passage is most revised. In my discussion of the manuscripts, I concentrate on Pope's treatment of the 'Secret' of the Golden Mean, the knowledge of which distinguishes Bathurst from the many aristocratic rogues of the poem. This 'Secret' was originally informed by a maxim of Swift's:

... I have made a maxim, that should be writ in letters of diamonds, That a wise man ought to have Mony in his head, but not in his heart.

The context for Swift's letter is his exhortation to Bolingbroke to take better care of his fortune, for, as Swift has told him immediately before giving the above maxim: 'My Lord, I have no other notion of Oeconomy than that it is the parent of Liberty and ease' (Swift to Bolingbroke and Pope, 5 April 1729, Corr., III, 28).

Swift's maxim is found in all six versions of the ten-line passage in the manuscripts. In Manuscript 2, however, the maxim appears only in fragment form in one version and is struck out in another version; the maxim is also struck out in Manuscript 3. Pope took considerable care in the revisions that determined the placing, and eventual striking out, of
Swift's maxim. Manuscript 1 shows how central Swift's maxim is to the evolution of the Epistle: here the maxim acts as a bridge between passages praising the Man of Ross and Bathurst. Pope has just given a description of the charity extended by the Man of Ross, a man of little means compared with Bathurst. Pope then dares boldly to address Bathurst in terms that suggest that, unlike the Man of Ross and his kind, men not even dignified with names, he is unworthy of praise:

Those, Bathurst! those alone, give Riches Grace
Whose measure full overflows on human race,
Force them to virtue, tempered & diffus'd;
As Poisons heal, in just-due proportion used.
What & how great, the Virtue & ye\^c Act,
To bear our Fortunes in our head, not heart,
Large Wealth to sanctify with just Expen'se
Join with Oeconomy Magnificence
Yet keep our Fame our Reason & our Health
Oh teach us, Bathurst! yet unspoil'd by Wealth.
That Secret, rarely with good fortune joind,
wer shall
wch Villers lost. & W-- cannot find.

(ll. 39-50)39

In the above lines, Pope seems to imply that Swift's maxim, the ability to 'bear our Fortunes in our head, not heart' (l. 44), is an essential part of the 'Secret' of the Golden Mean that should distinguish Bathurst from such spoilt men of wealth as George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham and, possibly, Philip, Duke of Wharton ('Villers' and 'W - -', l. 50). Pope yet seems undecided in the above manuscript version as to whether Bathurst is truly in possession of the 'Secret'.

39 Wasserman, p. 67. Rather than transcribing these drafts myself, I have scanned in the relevant passages from Wasserman's transcription. With the exceptions of my first quotation from MS 3 (which appears next to l. 185, p. 121) and my quotation from MS 2 (which appears in the margin next to ll. 226-37, p. 91), I have given his line numbers.
Manuscript 3 brings together in one version all the various stages of the ten lines of praise. After much revision, Pope struck out the lines containing Swift’s maxim:

In Manuscript 3, Pope’s passage of formal praise is unflatteringly positioned. It comes after the portrait of ‘Mad good nature’ embodied in Young Cotta, who ruins himself for love of his country; this order survived to the first printed edition of the poem (and the Twickenham Edition). A few lines later, Pope’s praise of Bathurst has almost taken its published form:

Next to Pope’s laudatory address, ‘Oh teach us, Bathurst, yet un-spoild by Wealth! [. . .] That Secret rare, between th’Extremes to move/ Of mad Good nature, & of mean Self Love’ (l. 192; ll. 197-98), there appears a marginal note marked by a cross: ‘if thou know’st thy self’ (l. 192). That Pope chose not to include Swift’s wise maxim in his lines praising Bathurst indicates that he made a late decision to temper his praise and to introduce a note of scepticism concerning the virtue of his patron. The marginal note questioning Bathurst’s self-knowledge suggests that Pope’s high hopes for Bathurst might well come to nothing should Bathurst be ignorant of his true nature. Without such vital self-knowledge, which
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includes recognition of his duties to society as an aristocrat and steward of the land, Bathurst’s use of wealth would lack the ‘Secret’ of the Golden Mean.

In a marginal addition in Manuscript 2, Swift’s maxim only appears as a fragment. Pope has heavily revised the passage:

We might compare the above fragmentary form of Swift’s maxim, ‘What & how great/ To bear our fortunes’ (MS 2), with the full version in Manuscript 1 quoted earlier: ‘What & how great, the Virtue & ye Art/ To bear our Fortunes in our head, not heart’ (ll. 43-44). Bearing in mind that the maxim had originally been addressed from Swift to Bolingbroke, it seems likely that Pope was having second thoughts as to whether or not it really fitted his relationship with Bathurst: in other words, perhaps Bathurst did not measure up to Bolingbroke. Pope’s doubts about whether or not to include Swift’s maxim in Manuscript 2 seem to have resulted in revisions that oscillate between uncertainty and confidence as to Bathurst’s virtue. In some ways, however, in the above version, Pope’s treatment of the ‘Secret’ can be read as more favourable to Bathurst than the Twickenham Edition of the

---

41 Ibid., p. 91.
poem: note the striking omission of the caveat ‘yet unspoil’d by Wealth’ which follows ‘Oh teach us, BATHURST!’ in every other version, published and unpublished. Pope’s omission of any qualification of his praise of his patron becomes more remarkable when we see the sharp contrast he draws here between Bathurst and the aristocrats named as exemplars of the wrong use of wealth, a contrast missing from the equivalent passage in the Twickenham Edition. Furthermore, the ‘Secret’ itself is made unambiguously praiseworthy by the use of the phrase ‘That safe mid-way’, which identifies it with the ‘Golden Mean’, given as the heroic standard in the main body of the manuscript text on this same page.

In the light of Pope’s revision of his praise of Bathurst, one possible reading of the Twickenham Edition of the poem is that Pope is pointing out that Bathurst has great potential to use his wealth well but, as yet, has not done so; we might infer from this either that he does indeed sway from one extreme to the other in his use of wealth, rather in the manner of the juxtaposed portraits of Old Cotta and Young Cotta, or that he is in danger of behaving in this way. We might note that Old Cotta is condemned for the negative vice of meanness: it is what he fails to do that provokes Pope’s satire. Pope’s unflattering comparison between Bathurst and the Man of Ross is designed to shame Bathurst into better use of wealth: ‘Blush, Grandeur, blush! proud Courts, withdraw your blaze!’ (l. 281, T. E. III. ii., 116). It is likely that Pope hoped to prompt Bathurst towards self-knowledge, but his tone suggests that he is not too confident that Bathurst will become worthy of praise:

The Sense to value Riches, with the Art
T’enjoy them, and the Virtue to impart,
Not meanly, nor ambitiously pursu’d,
Not sunk by sloth, nor rais’d by servitude;
To balance Fortune by a just expence,
Join with Oeconomy, Magnificence;
With Splendour, Charity, with Plenty, Health;
Oh teach us, BATHURST! yet unspoil’d by wealth!
That secret rare, between th’extremes to move
Of mad Good-nature, and of mean Self-love.
(ll. 219-28, T. E., III. ii., 111)

Wasserman suggests in his notes that the abbreviations stand for Philip, Duke of Wharton, the Marquis of Blandford, and Philip Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield: he thinks Courthope’s identification of ‘G - s’ as Granville is unlikely and leaves this abbreviation unidentified, ibid., p. 91.
The published eulogy is no longer the climax of the poem, but appears buried in the middle. Without the surrounding material in the manuscript versions introducing Swift's maxim and the Golden Mean, Pope's praise becomes colder. The impression is given that Bathurst is an exemplar of good stewardship such as the world approves but, as laudatory as this sounds, Pope's syntax suggests his reservations. 'Oh teach us, BATHURST!' is generally taken to be an exhortation yet it is possible that Pope's address of Bathurst is optative, expressing a wish and not an imperative; if so, rather than suggesting that Bathurst might be a standing example of the right use of wealth, Pope's representation appears tentative. The sense is then 'can't you act as a right example?' and the lines act as a prompt towards self-knowledge and a particular course of action. In this light, the connection between Pope's rolcall of virtues and Bathurst is tenuous. The first seven lines of the passage of praise are oddly suspended in front of 'Oh teach us, BATHURST!': it is not certain whether this phrase of direct address refers back to the preceding lines or only to what comes after it. While Pope does not, on the surface, at any rate, 'damn with faint praise', the caginess of his wording is revealing. It is possible that, in this passage of formal praise, out of the ten lines, Pope only refers directly to Bathurst in the last three, and there only with ambivalence.

In the first seven lines of the passage, the stately balancing of public virtues, 'Oeconomy' with 'Magnificence' and 'Splendour' with 'Charity', suggests the setting of a public ceremony. The vanity that Pope suspects might be Bathurst's would seem here to be the pleasure of displaying wealth, recalling Timon's being 'smit with the mighty pleasure, to be seen' (To Burlington, l. 128, T. E. III. ii., 149). The third pair of virtues, 'Plenty' and 'Health', are not really virtues at all, although they are 'goods', perhaps suggesting that the public acclamation that has preceded them is also open to question. It is worth bearing in mind here that To Bathurst scorns the Puritan assumption that riches mark out the chosen, as well as the common belief that they are virtue's reward:

Both fairly owning, Riches in effect
No grace of Heav'n or token of th'Elect;
Giv'n to the Fool, the Mad, the Vain, the Evil,
To Ward, to Waters, Chartres, and the Devil.
(II. 17-20, T. E., III. ii., 84-85)
So, also, we might suppose that Pope casts doubt on the supposition that Bathurst's robust health and fortune in some way betoken virtue. Early in the poem, Pope has said that he and Bathurst agree on this point, so it is strange to find him praising Bathurst in these worldly terms, suggesting that riches are a sign of virtue.

Further clues as to how we should read Pope's mixed eulogy of Bathurst are to be found in the two paragraphs which form the link between it and the passage about the Man of Ross. The first paragraph, beginning 'To Want or Worth well-weigh'd, be Bounty giv'n,/ And ease, or emulate, the care of Heav'n,/ Whose measure full o'erflows on human race;/ Men Fortune's fault, and justify her grace' (ll. 229-32) returns to the idea of a kind of divine justice in the sharing out of fortune. These lines are, I think, sententious, and, in this, carefully mocking. Pope's ridicule becomes clear in the final imagery he uses in this paragraph to illustrate the balancing of fortune by heaven: 'Wealth in the gross is death, but life diffus'd,/ As Poison heals, in just proportion us'd:/ In heaps, like Ambergrise, a stink it lies,/ But well-dispers'd, is Incense to the Skies' (ll. 233-36, T. E., III. ii., 111). 'Ambergris' is 'a strong-smelling waxlike secretion of the intestine of the sperm whale, found floating in tropical seas and used in perfume manufacture' (OED). The archness of this image recalls his invented examples of bad poetry in The Art of Sinking in Poetry and suggest that he cannot take seriously conventional ideas about the use of wealth.

In the next paragraph, leading up to the Man of Ross, Pope considers his own situation as the poet of a patron whom he has such difficulty in praising honestly. Pope deflects attention from himself by attacking false poets, artists and other hangers-on before praising Bathurst again this time in conjunction with Oxford. This passage about hangers-on appears to be a late addition to the poem, since it is not present in the Huntington manuscripts. The paragraph might be read as the closest Pope comes to acknowledging his own situation as a sponger, while, on the surface, humorously exempting himself from the category:

Who starves by Nobles, or with Nobles eats?
The Wretch that trusts them, and the Rogue that cheats.
Is there a Lord, who knows a cheerful noon
Without a Fiddler, Flatt'rer, or Buffoon?
Whose table, Wit, or modest Merit share,
Un-elbow'd by a Gamester, Pimp, or Play'r?
Who copies Your's, or OXFORD's better part,
To ease th'oppress'd, and raise the sinking heart?
Where-e'er he shines, oh Fortune, gild the scene,
And Angels guard him in the golden Mean!
There, English Bounty yet a-while may stand,
And Honour linger ere it leaves the land.
(Il. 237-48, T. E. III. ii., 112-13)

In the above lines, Pope ostensibly praises Bathurst’s and Oxford’s ability to discriminate between, on the one hand, ‘Wit’ and ‘Merit’, and, on the other, ‘Gamesters’, ‘Pimps’ and ‘Players’. But this praise is preceded by a mocking indictment of aristocrats in general: only a ‘Wretch’ would trust a nobleman and so starve (here we might think of the story referred to in my discussion of Burlington about how Arbuthnot was shocked to find Gay starving at Burlington House), and only a cheat will be able to wheedle a free lunch out of them, an idea which, we might think, puts Pope in a compromising position as a poet who extracted so much hospitality from his patrons. His use of ‘Nobles’ to signify the aristocracy becomes ironic, since he attributes to them falseness and meanness.

After this swipe at the nobility, Pope shifts his tone so that he sounds sympathetic to those patrons who are beleaguered with hangers-on. In particular the phrase ‘who knows a cheerful noon’ recalls Burlington’s dismay when, having thought he was free from visitors for a while, he returns from hunting to find his house full of hungry neighbours. Yet by beginning the paragraph with the deceit and meanness of the so-called nobility, Pope weighs the faults of spongers against those of the aristocracy, with the effect that the spongers do not seem so bad, merely ‘wretches’ and ‘rogues’.

Pope’s praise of Bathurst and Oxford is a gesture of gratitude to them for their kindnesses to him. One of the Huntington manuscripts shows that this praise has also been tempered. This earlier version ran: ‘Oxford & Chandos, acting God’s own part,/ Relieve th’oppress, & glad the Orphans heart’ (MS 3, ll. 201-02). The Twickenham Edition’s ‘Ease th’oppress’d, and raise the sinking heart’ sounds like it might be no more than a kind word or the odd free dinner. As with his praise of Burlington in To Burlington, however, Pope’s praise of
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Bathurst and Oxford is ambivalent: they are seen as exceptions to the general aristocratic rule, and, yet, at the same time, they are not entirely cleared from what we are persuaded to recognise as, in some way, the taint of aristocracy. The final quatrain beginning ‘Where-e’er he shines, oh Fortune, gild the scene’ takes on a tone of specious patriotism, at once wistful and possessing the weakness of affectation, as is powerfully brought home in the vitality and strength of the introduction to Pope’s modest alternative for a model for the right use of wealth:

But all our praises why should Lords engross?
Rise, honest Muse! and sing the MAN of ROSS [...] (ll. 249-50, T. E. III. ii., 113)

While Pope ranks Bathurst below the Man of Ross on the moral scale, he seems to acknowledge his own worldliness in preferring the company of a Bathurst to a Man of Ross. Pope has himself eaten with nobles – in fact, it might be argued that he owed his career to his genius for living ‘among the Great’ (Sat. II. i., l. 133, T. E. IV, 19) – and, by the end of the poem, the jury is still out as to whether this makes him a ‘Rogue’. His duplicity in his dealings with his patrons, not least in his artful flattery, might mean that, by the poem’s moral standards, the charge of cheating might also be levelled at him. It is possible that one motive of his for wishing that Bathurst could be more like the Man of Ross is that it would make him feel easier in his own mind. What his ideal, his Man of Ross, accomplishes, by means of charity, on a small scale, his noble friend might do on a grand scale, and, in the process, Pope would be let off the hook for courting the nobility in his pursuit of greatness.

We might briefly contrast Pope’s heavily revised lines praising Bathurst with the morality tale ending of the poem, a passage that shows hardly any revision in the manuscripts. By the end of the poem the impression is that Pope has not succeeded in making Bathurst give any serious thought to what might constitute the right use of wealth, but there would seem to be an acknowledgement on Pope’s part that this is the way of the world. By ending the poem with his modern parable, the story of Balaam, he reverts to the role of entertainer. As with Burlington, so also with Bathurst, he knew the part he was expected to play and, here also, he was willing to play it.
The tone of the tale about Sir Balaam is light, deflecting attention from its serious import and acting as something of a sweetener to the Epistle as a whole. Spence’s notes of Pope’s conversation about his design for the *Moral Epistles* show that the Sir Balaam tale was part of his earliest plans for the Epistle. Spence’s first line of Pope’s plan for *To Bathurst* runs ‘Sr Balaam: The man of Ross: The Standing jest of Heaven’, suggesting that the antithesis between Sir Balaam and the Man of Ross was the Epistle’s foundation. As a Director of the infamous South Sea Company, Sir Balaam is, nominally, Bathurst’s opposite, yet we can connect their two characters. Bathurst showed a shrewdness in managing his affairs that is lacking in Sir Balaam; Bathurst appears never to have found himself in serious danger as a result of his political activity. Nevertheless, like Sir Balaam, Bathurst’s ambition lay at Court, not, primarily, in politics. Pope’s comment on Sir Balaam’s enoblement and the limits of his ambition, ‘And one more Pensioner St Stephen gains’ (I. 394, T. E. III. ii., 124), acts as a warning to Bathurst against the dangers of becoming a political placeman in an age in which the dividing line between Court and politics has become blurred. Sir Balaam demonstrates no virtue in his life, and Pope does not actually praise Bathurst for virtue. The tale’s abrupt ending, ‘The Devil and the King divide the prize,/ And sad Sir Balaam curses God and dies’ (II. 401-02, T. E. III. ii., 125), strangely bespeaks more pity than ridicule.

Despite his jollity, Bathurst resembles Sir Balaam in his disenchantment: both suffer the ‘misery of affluence’ (Spence, No. 293, I, 129) because, so Pope seems to imply, they lack the grace to be good. Finally, there is a tenderness in this tale that seems at odds both with Pope’s lambasting of corruption in the main body of the Epistle and with the austerity of his praise of Bathurst. The tale of ‘sad Sir Balaam’ paves the way for the regret at last voiced in Pope’s final treatment of Bathurst in his poetry, the *Imitation of Horace, Epistle* II. ii.
6. ‘Alas, my BATHURST!’: Pope’s Later Relationship with Bathurst

i) Pope, Bathurst and gardens

This chapter will focus on Pope’s attitude towards Bathurst’s use of wealth in his gardening projects. The importance of gardening to Pope can be demonstrated by his having temporarily given up writing original poetry, at what might be thought the height of his career, for gardening. Pope’s gardening career has been fully chronicled; he is often compared with Kent as one of the originators of the picturesque in gardening (see Spence, No. 603, I, 250).¹ My aim in this chapter, though, is not to attempt to place Pope in the history of modern gardening but rather to ask: why, in relation to his patrons, did he consider gardening to be so important? By way of answering this question, I will firstly look further at how gardening brought Pope and Bathurst together. Secondly, I will investigate why gardening became their main point of difference. Bathurst, the most passionate of his ‘Gardening Lords’ (Corr., IV, 459), was the patron closest to him, yet Pope grew to ridicule his gardening projects even while maintaining his respect for him.²

Pope’s decision to build in Twickenham rather in town was motivated, as I have shown in the previous chapter, mainly by expense. An additional factor was his growing interest in gardening and garden design. As, in Pope’s eyes, the quintessential landed nobleman, Bathurst was an ideal resource for him in the next phase of his life. In the in-between location of Twickenham, neither town nor country, Pope embraced Opposition retirement philosophy.³ Significantly, his one letter to Bathurst published in his lifetime is on the subject of gardening, written shortly after the move to Twickenham.⁴ This letter, written in 1719, shows the same care that went into his letter to Burlington on his journey to Oxford.

² This circle of landscaping lords included Burlington, Peterborow, Digby and Cobham.
³ See The Garden and the City for a discussion of the ‘semi-rural’ position of Twickenham, p. 8 and p.11.
⁴ Sherburn writes that this letter was first printed in the Roberts octavo of 1737: in this edition, Pope did not print Bathurst’s name in connection with the letter.
with Lintot of November 1716 (Corr., I, 371-75). Pope’s letter to Bathurst ridicules the gardening experts of the day as they argue about the design of the Prince of Wales’ gardens at Richmond. As I have shown in Chapter 3, Pope’s letter to Burlington of 1716 artfully placed him in Burlington’s circle of patronage, underlining his consciousness of his obligations to his patrons, yet also, behind his literary-world mockery, emphasized his involvement with Lintot, his publisher. In a similar way, in this letter to Bathurst, his exploration of his position vis-à-vis his patrons and the world of booksellers and professional men of letters brings out the effort that went into maintaining relationships with both worlds.

Pope first appears to flatter Bathurst for his natural inclination to draw up schemes of improvement without carrying them out. Pope teases him, but there is also a polite rebuke here for temperamental laziness in Pope’s description of Bathurst’s ‘Plans’:

... I am of opinion your Lordship has a loss of me: for generally after the debate of a whole day, we acquiesce’d at night in the best conclusion of which human reason seems capable in all great matters, to fall fast asleep! And so we ended, unless immediate Revelation (which ever must overcome human reason) suggested some new lights to us, by a Vision in Bed. But laying apart Theory, I am told you are going directly to Practice. Alas, what a Fall will that be? A new Building is like a new Church, when once it is set up, you must maintain it in all the forms, and with all the inconveniences; then cease the pleasant luminous days of inspiration and there’s an end of miracles at once!

The second part of Pope’s letter of 1719 to Bathurst echoes his essay on gardening published in the Guardian in 1713: the subject in both is the artifice fashionable in modern gardening.5

On the Prince of Wales’ garden at Richmond, Pope writes in this letter:

Several Criticks were of several opinions: One declar’d he would not have too much Art in it; for my notion (said he) of gardening is, that it is only sweeping Nature: Another told them that Gravel walks were not of a good taste, for all of the finest abroad were of loose sand: A third advis’d peremptorily there should not be one Lyme-tree in the whole plantation; a fourth made the same exclusive clause extend to Horse-chestnuts, which he affirm’d not to be Trees, but Weeds; Dutch Elms were condemn’d by a fifth; and thus about half the Trees were proscrib’d, contrary to the Paradise of God’s own planting, which is expressly said to be planted with all trees. There were some who cou’d not bear Ever-greens, and call’d then Never-greens; some, who were angry at them only when cut into shapes, and gave the modern Gard’ners the name of Ever-green Taylors; some who had no dislike to Cones and Cubes, but wou’d have ‘em cut in Forest-trees; and some who were in a passion against any thing in shape, even against clipt hedges, which they call’d green walls. Sure such a Taste is like such a stomach, not a good one, but a weak one. We have the same sort of Critics in poetry; one is fond of nothing but Heroicks, another cannot relish Tragedies, another hates Pastorals, all little Wits delight in Epigrams. Will you give me leave to add, there are the same in Divinity? where many leading
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Critics are for rooting up more than they plant, and would leave the Lord's Vineyard either very thinly furnish'd, or very oddly trimm'd. (13 September [1719], Corr., II, 14)

The letter of 1719 is a more subtle and more sophisticated parody of modern men of taste than the Guardian essay of 1713. What is surprising is the way in which Pope's witty comparison between gardening critics and poetry critics extends and pointedly comments on Addison's comparison between landscapes and literary genres in his Spectator essay No. 477 dated 6 September 1712: 'I think there are as many Kinds of Gardening, as of Poetry; Your Makers of Parterres and Flower-Gardens, are Epigrammatists and Sonneteers in this Art. Contrivers of Bowers and Grotto's, Treillages and Cascades, are Romance Writers. Wise and London are our Heroick Poets [. . .] As for my self, you will find, by the Account which I have already given you, that my Compositions in Gardening are altogether after the Pindarick Manner, and run into the beautiful Wildness of Nature, without affecting the nicer Elegancies of Art'. Pope ridicules Addison by re-casting his Spectator criticism so that it mocks modern critics (amongst whom, of course, Addison is pre-eminent), whose fondness for catalogues and analogues is presented as proof of their narrowness: 'These (my Lord) are our Men of Taste, who pretend to prove it by tasting little or nothing'. Although Pope's imitation of Addison in his writing on gardening itself betokens admiration, he clearly sets himself and his enlightened patron, Bathurst, above professional 'Men of Taste'.

Pope's mocking allusion to Addison's Spectator essay No. 477 in his letter to Bathurst of 1719 seems odd when we consider his plagiarism of Spectator Nos 414 and 477 in his Guardian essay of 1713. When this early essay was written, Pope was living at Binfield. The first part of the essay is probably based on a visit to see Rowe and the garden discussed is the work of Pope's father:

I lately took a particular friend of mine to my house in the country, not without some apprehension, that it could afford little entertainment to a man of his polite taste, particularly in architecture and gardening, who had so long been conversant with all that is beautiful and great in either. But it was a pleasant surprise to me to hear him so often declare he had found in my little retirement that beauty which he always thought wanting in the most celebrated seats (or,
if you will, villas) of the nation. This he described to me in those verses with which Martial begins one of his epigrams:

Baiana nostri villa, Basse, Faustini,
Non otiosis ordinata myrtetis,
Viduaque platano, tonsilique buxeto,
Ingrata lati spatia detinet campi;
Sed rure vero barbaroque laetatur.

There is certainly something in the amiable simplicity of unadorned Nature that spreads over the mind a more noble sort of tranquillity, and a loftier sensation of pleasure, than can be raised from the nicer scenes of art.8

Pope’s essay echoes Addison’s Spectator essay No. 414, June 25 1712, even to the point of imitating the phraseology: ‘There is something more bold and masterly in the rough careless Strokes of Nature, than in the nice Touches and Embellishments of Art’.9 Pope then attacks, as Sherburn writes, ‘the sculptured evergreens so dear to London and Wise, the royal gardeners of the day’ (The Early Career, p. 278):

I believe it is no wrong Observation that Persons of Genius, and those who are most capable of Art, are always most fond of Nature, as such are chiefly sensible, that all Art consists in the Imitation and Study of Nature. On the contrary, People of the common Level of Understanding are principally delighted with the little Niceties and Fantastical Operations of Art, and constantly think that finest which is least Natural. A Citizen is no sooner Proprietor of a couple of Yews, but he entertains Thoughts of erecting them into Giants, like those of Guild-hall. I know an eminent Cook, who beautified his Country Seat with a Coronation Diimmer in Greens, where you see the Champion flourishing on Horseback at one end of the Table, and the Queen in perpetual Youth at the other.10

Pope then describes an ‘eminent Town-Gardiner’ who prides himself on his skills as a sculptor of evergreens, listing from his catalogue, amongst others: ‘An old Maid of Honour in Wormwood’, ‘A topping Ben Jonson in Lawrel’, ‘Divers eminent Modern Poets in Bays, somewhat blighted, to be disposed of a Pennyworth’ and ending with the waggish ‘A Pair of Maidenheads in Firr, in great forwardness’ (Prose Works, I, 149-51).

In a climate where artifice was de rigeur, Pope’s ideas appear revolutionary yet they do little more than improve on Spectator No. 414:

Our British Gardeners, on the contrary, instead of humouring Nature, love to deviate from it as much as possible. Our Trees rise in Cones, Globes, and Pyramids. We see the Marks of the Scissors upon every Plant and Bush. I do not know whether I am singular in my Opinion, but,

---

8 James Michie gives the following translation of Pope’s excerpt from Martial’s Epigram III, 58: ‘Our friend Faustinus at his Baian place/ Doesn’t go in, Bassus, for wasted space – / No useless squads of myrtle, no unmated/ Planes, no clipped box; true, unsophisticated/ Country’s his joy’, The Epigrams of Martial (London: Hart-Davis, MacGibbon, 1973), p. 63.

9 The Spectator, No. 414, June 25, 1712, III, 549.

10 Henry Wise (1653-1738) was gardener to Queen Anne and worked in the formal French style.
for my own part, I would rather look upon a Tree in all its Luxuriancy and Diffusion of Boughs and Branches, than when it is thus cut and trimmed into a Mathematical Figure; and cannot but fancy that an Orchard in Flower looks infinitely more delightful, than all the little Labyrinths of the most finished Parterre.  

Pope also owed a debt to Addison's *Spectator*, No. 477, 6 September 1712, where there is a strong case made against 'filling an English Garden with Ever-Greens': 'I can by no Means think the Verdure of an Ever-Green comparable to that which shoots out Annually, and cloathes our Trees in the Summer Season.' In view of the fact that Pope's *Guardian* essay appeared just one month before the publication of the proposals for his *Iliad*, perhaps his imitation of Addison was a form of flattery. By including his translation of the gardens of Alcinous, he probably sought to impress him.

By the time of his composition of his letter to Bathurst of 1719, Pope had achieved remarkable success with his *Iliad*, of which all but the final two volumes had been published. 1719 also marks the year of Addison's death; he had died just three months before Pope wrote this letter. Although, as I have shown in my introduction, Pope was to acknowledge Addison, probably disingenuously, in his *Preface* to the *Iliad* of 1720 as having first encouraged him to embark on the translation, we can trace in his letter to Bathurst of 1719 the beginnings of his re-writing of the history of his friendship with Addison and, by that token, his poetic career. The final touch to that re-written history was the publication of his *Letters* (1735), which established that he had translated the *Iliad* at the request of his friends, implicitly a category from which Addison was excluded. While, on a personal level, these manoeuvrings seem to point to Pope's acute sense of betrayal by Addison, they also show the meticulous way in which he constructed his poetic identity, central to which was the importance of friendship.

Pope's mocking allusion to Addison in his letter to Bathurst of 1719 seems to make the point that he has won success in spite of rather than thanks to him; nevertheless, it also

---

12 Ibid., No. 477, IV, 191.
13 See Martin, p. 7.
14 See *The Early Career* for an account of Addison's 'betrayal' of Pope by his promotion of Thomas Tickell's rival translation of the *Iliad* in 1714, pp. 127-48.
speaks of his indebtedness. As in his letter to Burlington of 1716, Pope's sign-off makes for both flattery and a kind of elaborate good manners. His closing compliment joins him, and, by implication, Bathurst, with another patron of Pope’s, the Duke of Chandos: 'I have lately been with my Lord [Chandos] – who is a zealous yet charitable Planter, and has so bad a Taste, as to like all that is good. He has a disposition to wait on you in his way to Bath, and if he can go and return to London in eight or ten days, I am not without a hope of seeing your Lordship with the delight I always see you. Every where I think of you, and every where I wish for you. I am, &c.'(Corr., H, 14-15). In linking himself with nobles Bathurst and Chandos, Pope suggests that they three have in common a Taste that distinguishes them from the corrupt majority.

In the earlier part of his 1713 *Guardian* essay Pope gives as his ideal garden the description of the gardens of Alcinous from the *Odyssey*. Mack notes that Pope used this exact translation twelve years later in his *Odyssey*. Both Pope and Bathurst looked to the heroic world for inspiration: beyond gardening, this preoccupation with the ancient world bound them together. Their shared preoccupation was political, in that both contrasted the virtue of the ancient world and indeed of the recent age of Queen Anne with the moral bankruptcy of the present, and abstract, in that both men had a real love of the ancient world, regardless of politics. Pope’s translation of the description of the gardens of Alcinous supplies the heroic standard by which he measured modern gardens and, for this reason, I will quote it in full:

Close to the Gates a spacious Garden lies,  
From Storms defended, and inclement Skies:  
Four Acres was th’allotted Space of Ground,  
Fenc’d with a green Enclosure all around.  
Tall thriving Trees contest the fruitful Mold;  
The red’ning Apple ripens here to Gold,  
Here the blue Figg with luscious Juice o’erflows,  
With deeper Red the full Pomegranate glows,  
The Branch here bends beneath the weighty Pear,  
And verdant Olives flourish round the Year.  
The balmy Spirit of the Western Gale  
Eternal breathes on Fruits untaught to fail:  
Each dropping Pear a following Pear supplies,  
On Apples Apples, Figs on Figs arise:

15 *The Garden and the City*, p. 52.
16 See Martin for the ‘allusive’ quality of Pope’s gardening, p. xxi.
The same mild Season gives the Blooms to blow,
The Buds to harden, and the Fruits to grow.
Here order'd Vines in equal Ranks appear
With all th'United Labours of the Year,
Some to unload the fertile Branches run,
Some dry the black'ning Clusters in the Sun,
Others to tread the liquid Harvest join,
The groaning Presses foam with Floods of Wine.
Here are the Vines in early Flow'r descry'd,
Here Grapes discolour'd on the sunny Side,
And there in Autumn's richest Purple dy'd.

   Beds of all various Herbs, for ever green,
In beauteous Order terminate the Scene.

Two plenteous Fountains the whole Prospect crown'd;
This thro' the Gardens leads its Streams around,
Visits each Plant, and waters all the Ground:
While that in Pipes beneath the Palace flows,
And thence its Current on the Town bestows;
To various Use their various Streams they bring,
The People one, and one supplies the King.

In the gardens of Alcinous, nothing is forced and the designer of the garden is not directly credited for their perfection but is paid an indirect tribute. The gardens are praised first of all for their simplicity and modesty, as shown by what comes next in Pope's essay, his reference to Sir William Temple's comments on this description: 'Sir William Temple has remarked, that this Description contains all the justest Rules and Provisions which can go toward composing the best Gardens. Its Extent was four Acres, which, in those times of Simplicity, was look'd upon as a large one, even for a Prince. It was inclos'd all round for Defence; and for Conveniency join'd close to the Gates of the Palace' (Prose Works, I, 146-47). In his notes to this passage in his translation of the Odyssey, Pope again emphasizes simplicity and modesty, particularly in relation to scale: 'This famous Garden of Alcinous contains no more than four acres of ground, which in those times of simplicity was thought a large one even for a Prince' (Book VII, 142n., T. E. IX, 242). The emphasis on the virtues of a small scale is significant, given how, later, the vast scale of Walpole's Houghton would become shorthand for the vulgarity and corruption of his administration.

There is an impression of ease in the actions of Nature in the above passage. The garden designer is credited for what he does not do wrong, rather than for what he does right: he is given unspoken praise for not interfering with the processes of Nature: 'The balmy Spirit of
the Western Gale/ Eternal breathes on Fruits untaught to fail'. At other moments, the gardener is unobtrusive in his art, 'Here order'd Vines in equal Ranks appear', merging into the humble seasonal work of the garden labourers: 'Some to unload the fertile Branches run,/ Some dry the black'ning Clusters in the Sun,/ Others to tread the liquid Harvest join'. The isolated heroic couplet, 'Beds of all various Herbs, for ever green,/ In beauteous Order terminate the Scene', contains in itself Pope's gardening virtues of variety, order and use (the beds are full of herbs, at once beautiful and useful) and the satisfying sense of balance and closure that well-placed features of a garden could provide. Finally, the description of the actions of the fountains also emphasizes the virtues of variety and use, describing an ideal balance between king and people, created by the equal division in the water supply: 'To various Use their various Streams they bring,/ The People one, and one supplies the King'.

In the autumn of 1724 Pope collaborated with Bathurst, Peterborow and professional architect, Charles Bridgeman, on the designs for the gardens at Marble Hill.

Figure 3. Marble Hill from the river, 1749, by Heckell and Mason.
Between 1724 and 1728, Marble Hill was built by the Prince of Wales for Mrs Henrietta Howard (see figure 3). Marble Hill was a model of contemporary architecture and came to exemplify the elegant villas that lined the Thames. The proximity of Marble Hill to Twickenham facilitated Pope’s involvement in the design of the gardens. The importance of this commission for Pope should not be under-estimated. He threw himself into the work to such an extent that it took over from his work on the *Odyssey*, which had already suffered setbacks earlier in the year owing to his ill health. At the same time, Pope was working on his own gardens, as is shown by his letter to Fortescue: ‘Homer is advanced to the eighth book, I mean printed so far. My gardens improve more than my writings’ (17 September 1724, *Corr.*, II, 257). In a letter to Martha Blount describing the gardens at Sherborne, probably written in June 1724, he ends by asking her to reassure Mrs Howard that his mind is taken up there with research for the design of her gardens:

> I hope this long letter will be some Entertainment to you, I was pleased not a little in writing it; but don’t let any Lady from hence imagine that my head is so full of any Gardens as to forget hers. The greatest proof I could give her to the contrary is, that I have spent many hours here in studying for hers, & in drawing new plans for her. I shall soon come home, & have nothing to say when we meet, having here told you all that has pleas’d me: But Wilton is in my way, & I depend upon that for new matter. (*Corr.*, II, 240)

On 12 September 1724, he wrote to Broome about the demands of the work at Marble Hill:

> I am much recovered from the ill state of health I have lately laboured under, very busy in laying out of a garden, shall be busier next month in planting, but with all avocations, will proceed cheerfully through the version of the fourteenth book, which is heavy and laborious to me more than all the rest. (*Corr.*, II, 256)

The intensity of Pope’s attachment to Bathurst during the time that they were working on the gardens at Marble Hill is shown in a letter also written in September 1724 in which he presents himself and Bathurst in what comes humorously close to the imagery of lovers:

> Nothing flatters me so much or (to give it a much more agreeable word) nothing pleases me so much as a thought, that we exactly keep pace in thinking of each other. I remember a few weeks ago, when in Zeal of heart I was running over Hounslow-heath to see you, I met you just half-way, (as one would always wish to meet a Friend.) At the very moment, as near as I can guess, that I was writing to you the Impatencies of my heart, your Lordship was imploying your pen the same way to me: for the same post that carryd out my Impetuosities, brought hither yours. (*Corr.*, II, 257-58)

17 See *The Garden and the City*, pp. 11-21.

18 Pope’s and Bathurst’s meeting on Hounslow Heath might possibly have been connected with their meeting Archibald Campbell, Earl of Ilay (later third Duke of Argyll), who was Lady Howard’s agent for the acquisition of the land for Marble...
The letter makes quite a contrast with his business-like letter to Broome, written five days earlier, on the delays with the Odyssey translation. The closeness of Pope’s friendship with Bathurst is confirmed by a letter of Digby to Pope around this time where he describes the two of them as ‘inseparable’ (14 August 1723, Corr., II, 192).

In his account of Pope’s collaboration with Bridgeman, Bathurst and Peterborow in designing the gardens at Marble Hill, Brownell describes Pope as ‘the prime mover’. Pope’s correspondence supports this description, as does a note of Swift’s to A Pastoral Dialogue between Richmond Lodge and Marble Hill, written in 1727: ‘Mr Pope was the contriver of the gardens, Lord Herbert the architect, and the Dean of St Patrick’s chief butler, and keeper of the ice-house.’ Swift’s self-deprecating humour about his part in the hospitality points both to his grudge against the aristocracy for past disappointments and the conviviality of Marble Hill before the death of George I.

Brownell also draws attention to Peterborow’s involvement in the gardens and ranks him above Bathurst and Bridgeman as Pope’s collaborator. Peterborow’s correspondence with Pope shows his efforts to keep things moving at Marble Hill. In the five years that it seems to have taken between initial designs and completion, there were quite a few delays, probably because the Prince of Wales tended to be slow in his payments. In a letter of September 1723, Peterborow urged Pope to help him speed the progress at Marble Hill:

I was impatient to know the issue of the affaire, and what she intended for this autumn for no time is to be Lost either if she intends to build out houses or prepare for planting, I will send to morrow to know if you can give me any account, & will call upon you as soon as I am able that we may goe together to Mrs Howards. (Corr., II, 197)

At the time that the gardens of Marble Hill were being designed, Peterborow was carrying out a gallant courtship of Mrs Howard, most likely for the same political motives as

---

Hill Illy lived at Whitton Place, about a mile from Twickenham, on the edge of Hounslow Heath, Marie P. G. Draper, Marble Hill and its Owners (London: Greater London Council, 1970), pp. 10-11.

Brownell, p. 160.

Jonathan Swift, p. 767.

In connection with Swift’s sense of having been ill-treated by the English aristocracy, see his letter to Bathurst, October 1730, where he seems to blame Bathurst and his ‘Crew’ for his exile, The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, III, 412.

Brownell, p. 158. See also Corr., II, 177, 183.

See Draper’s account of the delays in building, pp. 36-38.
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Bathurst: as mistress of the Prince of Wales, it seemed likely that she would soon be in a position to secure preferments for them (see Corr., II, 178n.).

Peterborow features in one of Pope’s strongest expressions of the advantages of retirement, written and published in 1733:

Know, all the distant Din that World can keep
Rolls o’er my Grotto, and but soothes my Sleep.
There, my Retreat the best Companions grace,
Chiefs, out of War, and Statesmen, out of Place.
There St John mingles with my friendly Bowl,
The Feast of Reason and the Flow of Soul:
And He, whose Lightning pierc’d th’Iberian Lines,
Now, forms my Quincunx, and now ranks my Vines,
Or tames the Genius of the stubborn Plain,
Almost as quickly, as he conquer’d Spain.
(Sat. II. i., II. 127-32, T. E. IV, 17-19)

A ‘quincunx’ is a ‘disposition of five trees by which four are placed at the corners, the fifth at the centre, of a square’ (T. E. IV, 17n.). Pope’s mock-heroic zeugma, ‘And He, whose Lightning pierc’d th’Iberian Lines,/ Now, forms my Quincunx, and now ranks my Vines’, compares Peterborow’s forming of a quincunx with his brilliant service in the Spanish campaigns of 1705-06. Where Peterborow once served his Queen and country in battle, he now serves Pope, as a friend and fellow member of the Opposition; Pope also compares this with Bolingbroke’s ‘out of Place’ exercise of reason.

In the rhetorical space of Pope’s poetry, Peterborow’s gardening conquests are more difficult than those he performed in Spain: ‘Or tames the Genius of the stubborn Plain,/ Almost as quickly, as he conquer’d Spain’. The humour keeps the trivial – the image of a great soldier doing battle in Pope’s garden – to the fore, so that cracking the political symbolism is not entirely the point. There might also be some implicit criticism of Peterborow’s character in Pope’s description of his gardening technique: he ‘tames the Genius’ of the place rather than consulting it. Behind this is Peterborow’s frustration at being out of place in modern politics: his channelling his energies into his garden is enforced upon him since, by temperament, he is better suited to the battlefield. But Pope seems to

---

24 Bathurst’s courtship of Henrietta Howard appears to have foundered because of his reputation with women. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu spread a rumour that Bathurst and Mrs Howard were lovers with the result that the Prince of Wales banished Bathurst from his drawing-room, Lees-Milne, pp. 27-28.
suggest that now that the world has become a trivial place there are no more heroes: those, like Peterborow, who once were heroes are now shrunken by the comic indignity of the modern world.

In a letter that dates probably from shortly after they had finished working on the gardens at Marble Hill, Pope depicts his relationship with Bathurst as being of a patriarchal nature. Beneath the jest lies, I think, the reality of his dependence on Bathurst at this time:

There was a Man in the Land of Twitnam, called Pope. He was a Servant of the Lord Bathurst of those days, a Patriarch of great Eminence, for getting children, at home & abroad. But his Care for his Family, and his Love for strange women, caused the said Lord to forget all his Friends of the Male-Sex; insomuch that he knew not, nor once rememberd, there was such a man in the Land of Twitnam as aforesaid. ([1725?], Corr., II, 292)

Although Pope might jokingly describe his obligations to Bathurst as Biblical, the relationship was two-way. Just as Bathurst helped him to prestigious connections as regards his gardening career, with Pope’s help, I suggest, Bathurst became known as one of the great forest gardeners of his age. Mack describes Bathurst as ‘one of the century’s greatest arborealists’ (Alexander Pope, p. 382). In their approaches to gardening, Pope and Bathurst appear to be opposites in terms of the scale on which each worked. Where Bathurst worked with trees, joining woods, altering land levels to suit his designs and, later, creating an artificial lake, Pope took a miniaturist’s approach in his garden design. It is hard to determine how ambitious Bathurst was as a forest gardener. Morris Brownell writes that where Bathurst was conservative, Pope was a progressive influence. I would suggest that it was a case of Pope’s shaping for Bathurst a reputation as a great forest gardener rather than Bathurst’s setting out to forge such a reputation himself. Pope’s letter of 1718 joking with Bathurst about the park’s qualifications to count as a wood at all would seem to support my suggestion. Pope’s influence did not stop with Bathurst’s reputation, though: his influence is there in many of the features of the park itself.

---

25 See also Hussey’s high opinion of Bathurst: he praises Cirencester Park as ‘perhaps the most spectacular park in England’ and calls Bathurst and Pope ‘the reputed apostles of landscape design’. In Hussey’s view, Bathurst might have set out to rival Badminton, ‘Cirencester House – II: The Park’, pp. 1880-81.
26 Brownell, p. 195.
27 Bathurst’s letter to Pope of 14 August 1736 shows how much he relied on Pope’s advice concerning the design of Cirencester’s ornamental buildings, Corr., IV, 25.
Figure 4. The Home Park. Cirencester House lies at the lower extremity of the illustration.
Much of what we can see in figures 4 and 5 (from Samuel Rudder’s map of Gloucestershire, 1779) still remains today. Bathurst’s Home Park begins with a tree-lined vista leading from the house to a Doric column surmounted by a statue of Queen Anne,
which was built in 1741 (see figure 4). This main vista then meets Bathurst’s great Broad Avenue at a diagonal, leading up to the impressive Seven Rides, seven great avenues of trees converging at a central rond-point. On the periphery of Seven Rides is ‘Pope’s Seat’, a modest little building with a rustic finish, surmounted by a plain portico. There are niches in the front walls where Pope might once have sat and watched Bathurst and his friends riding up to the rond-point. Pope’s Seat is one of many ornamental buildings in the park. Rudder’s maps list a Hexagon, an Octagon, Doric temples called The Horse Temple and Hartley’s Temple, a Venetian Building (see figure 4), a Round Tower and King Alfred’s Hall (see figure 5).^28

In the previous chapter I outlined some of Bathurst’s ambitious plans for Cirencester Park: joining the original Home Park with Oakley Wood; creating a single vista that would lead through the park to the house; joining the rivers Severn and Thames. The joining of the two parks was not a simple matter. Rudder’s Gloucestershire of 1779 shows the parks as still separate and Bathurst failed to execute his design to create a single vista that led through both parks to the house. In 1730, Bolingbroke wrote to him about his design to link the original Broad Avenue, which starts in the far west in Oakley Wood (see figure 5), to his house at the eastern end of Home Park (see figure 4):

Are you planting? Are you levelling? What are you doing? Essex [the Earl of Essex, brother-in-law of the Duchess of Queensbury, who shaped Amesbury Park], thinks, with me, that the marriage of the line of the great park with the house is practicable, but that it requires the phlegm he is master of rather than your lordship’s impetuosity to contrive.^29

Bolingbroke’s quizzical tone, teasing Bathurst about his inability to see his projects through at Cirencester Park, supports the idea that Bathurst had a reputation as an amiable but fairly inconstant character who lived life according to his whims. As Bolingbroke and Essex predicted, the plan was not realized in Bathurst’s lifetime. Rudder’s maps of both parks in his Gloucestershire show the Broad Avenue stopping short by nearly a mile of its present eastern end. Today both parks are joined and, with the continuation of the Broad Avenue,

^29 Quoted in ibid., p. 1884.
there are now two avenues leading in the direction of the house, one vista leading from Queen Anne’s Column up to the house itself and the Broad Avenue exiting at the side of the house by an independent gate to the town. Bathurst’s project of joining the Thames and the Severn was undertaken by his son, Henry Bathurst, 2nd Earl Bathurst, fourteen years after his death.

Hussey writes that it is uncertain why the creation of a single vista presented such a difficulty. He speculates that it might have been the density of trees or defective surveys that made the scheme impossible. In figure 4, the vista leading from the house to Queen Anne’s Column (in the middle of the Home Park) meets up diagonally, at a NW angle, with another vista leading to the first rond-point at Seven Rides. From there, this second vista is set to join up, at a still more acute NW angle, with the Broad Avenue of Oakley Great Park (see figure 5). It is hard to rule out the sense of a blunder in Bathurst’s misalignment of the original Broad Avenue. Part of the difficulty might have been his having planned and begun work on the park from the middle.

In the above letter, Bolingbroke teases Bathurst about his planting and levelling. We might compare this letter with a letter from Bathurst to his friend, the Earl of Strafford, written in 1736, that concerns his levelling of the land around his house to create new vistas:

I go on with my works and have great satisfaction in hoping to see yr Lordship here next year and show you quite a new scene about ye House. I have cut throw one of ye Hills and lett in a View of one of ye Diagonals wch terminates upon a little building wch I have erected; next summer I shall build another to answer ye other Diagonal & cut thro’ that Hill, & by removing part of ye Hill before ye House in ye straight line I shall have a View of ye Park wch I propose to sett off a little with some proper Ornaments. all this levelling work will not amount to above 50 or 60 Il. and ye Situation of ye House will appear as good again as it does at present. I have brought a considerable quantity of Stone & lay’d it round that stand in ye great Centre of my wood, that when some unskillfull person sees it, he may be convinc’d that wooden machine was not erected with a design to remain but only for a trial to see wt height & size wou’d be proper for ye stone building; having done this I may lett my Stone lie there as long as Lord Bristol has left his for ye building of his House.

---

30 Hussey writes that the dates for these changes are not known, ibid., p. 1884.
31 See Lees-Milne, p. 44. Martin notes that 2.25-mile Sapperton Tunnel opened by George III in 1789: the Thames-Severn canal became operational on 22 April 1790 when four barges delivered coal to Cirencester, p. 259n.
33 BL, Add. MS 22221, f. 140.
The proposed buildings set on diagonals would seem to be the Hexagon and the Horse Temple (see figure 4). It is not certain exactly for which ornamental buildings Bathurst’s pile of stone was used. When Bathurst writes of putting the stone he has bought in the centre of his wood, he is probably referring to Home Park, not Oakley Park, since the building at the centre of that, King Alfred’s Hall, was, according to Gerrard, completed in 1731. Rudder’s map shows that the levelling of the land in front of the house created a view of the column to Queen Anne. The tone of this letter is strangely disengaged: Bathurst pictures himself ‘cutting through’ hills in the manner that a child might cut through paper. Here we might recall Pope’s lines in his Epistle To Burlington, where he chastises such improvements as pointless destruction of the landscape: ‘Or cut wide views thro’ Mountains to the Plain,/ You’ll wish your hill or shelter’d seat again’ (ll. 75-76, T. E. III. ii., 144).

The image we form of Bathurst from this letter to Strafford is a little disturbing, I think, owing to the purposeless and slightly melancholy humour of ‘having done this I may lett my Stone lie there as long as Lord Bristol has left his for ye building of his House’. Bathurst’s actions suggest not childlike innocence but, instead, a solitary dissatisfaction with works no longer born out of imagination but out of boredom. Perhaps this might help our understanding of exactly what Pope meant when he said that the subject of his original plan for the Epistles Of the Use of Riches was ‘the misery of affluence’ (Spence, No. 293, I, 129): the phrase can be interpreted as both tongue-in-cheek and grounded in the reality of his patrons’ experience.

While Bathurst’s projects tell us much about his character, they should also be considered in the context of Opposition politics. In my discussion of Burlington, I showed how, in the early eighteenth century, architecture was far from innocent. So also, gardening became charged with political significance. When Burlington’s Palladianism was hijacked by the Whigs, as Pope describes in his Epistle To Burlington (‘Yet shall (my Lord) your just, your noble rules/ Fill half the land with Imitating Fools’, ll. 25-26, T. E. III. ii., 139-40), the Opposition shifted their attention from architecture to gardening, making it their new design
offensive. The natural style of gardening and the construction of ornamental buildings referring to the Classical and Gothic pasts became the Opposition code for virtue.34

![Figure 6. King Alfred’s Hall.](image)

On the subject of garden architecture, the most important building that Pope designed with Bathurst at Cirencester Park was what is now known as King Alfred’s Hall (see figure 6). Christine Gerrard has dismissed this building as an aristocratic folly. In her discussion of the importance of the Gothic in Patriot propaganda, she argues that discriminations need to be made between Bathurst’s intentions in building King Alfred’s Hall and those of many Opposition Whigs in their Gothic designs:

The Tory Bathurst was equally proud of his crumbling ruin, Alfred’s Hall, built at Cirencester between 1721 and 1731, which slowly evolved from a wooden construction to a stone building with rounded towers [. . .] There is a subtle difference between using Gothic buildings to supply a romantic or antiquarian feature to the landscape and using them to make a statement of political principles. Bathurst’s Alfred’s Hall, this ‘hermitage in the woods’, a ‘pretty little plain work in the Brodingnag style’, was also known indiscriminately as Arthur’s Castle, suggesting a relative indifference to any specific political symbolism.35

We need to judge for ourselves how seriously we should treat King Alfred’s Hall: if it is, as Gerrard suggests, a work of mere whimsy, it might then be possible to see how Pope’s later impatience with Bathurst’s designs evolved. Pope’s collaboration with Bathurst on
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34 Dixon Hunt writes very interestingly about how Opposition gardens were designed to be ‘read’, with the readers of the gardens as active participants, pp 58-59.
35 Gerrard, p. 126
what the latter originally called his ‘wood house’ can be dated from a letter from Bathurst to Pope written on 21 October 1723:

... I must let you know that the scheme I am at present upon is what you will like, for I am resolved to begin the alteration of my wood house, and some little baubling works about it, which you shall direct as you will. (Corr., II, 207)

King Alfred’s Hall, built between 1721 and 1734, was the first use of a sham ruin in landscape gardening. The building served to terminate views and to answer avenues. It was also, according to Brownell, designed ‘to inspire melancholy associations, first with King Arthur, later with Alfred, the Saxon King who became in contemporary political satire the type of the virtuous constitutional monarch contrasted to George II.’ If this is the case, knowing what we do of Bathurst’s cultivation of Henrietta Howard as a link to the future George II, there might seem to be something close to sour grapes about the project. Yet Thomas Major’s romantic engraving seems to belie any political significance and rather

Figure 7. King Alfred’s Hall, engraved by Thomas Major, 1763.

36 Other sham ruins of the period include Kent’s hermitage at Stowe and the ruins at Brympton House in Somerset (1723). Sham ruins dating from the later eighteenth century include those at Hagley Park in Worcestershire, Ravensbury pleasure ground, Belton in Lincolnshire, Reigate in Surrey (1777), Bourne Hill in Wiltshire, Wimpole Hall in Cambridgeshire (built by Lord Chancellor Hardwicke, who had bought Wimpole from the 2nd Earl of Oxford in 1740) and at Milton Abbey (c. 1790); there were sham classical ruins at Virginia Water in Surrey (c. 1750) and a ruined arch at Kew (1760), Jones, p. 55, p. 57, p. 71, p. 137, p. 330, p. 332, p. 340, p. 357, p. 383, p. 397, p. 408.

37 Brownell, pp. 274-75
appears to indicate that, by the latter half of the eighteenth century, King Alfred’s Hall was perceived as an elegant specimen of contemporary garden architecture (see figure 7).

In a letter to Pope, written in 1732, Bathurst refers to the building as his ‘hermitage’: ‘I long to see you excessively, for I have almost finished my hermitage in the wood, and it is better than you can imagine, many things there are done that you can have no idea of.’ Bathurst’s use of the term ‘hermitage’ seems to show how self-conscious was his desire to advertise his quiet life.

Only the simplest architecture was appropriate for a hermit, hence, we might at first think, Bathurst’s later description of the building as his ‘wood house’, wood being considered perhaps the only possible material for a hermit’s cell. Yet the finished structure could not be further from a hermit’s cell, with elaborate stone walls, broken arched doorways and gothic windows, small buttresses and, at the back, stained glass windows (see the gothic features in

Figures 8 and 9. King Alfred’s Hall, details.
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figures 8 and 9). The construction of so convincing a sham ruin must have been expensive; whether this points to Bathurst's seriousness or extravagance is uncertain.\textsuperscript{38} The house's final name, King Alfred's Hall, was a joke against pedantry. Lees-Milne tells how the house in Oakley Wood went through various re-namings: it was first called 'The Wood House', then 'King Arthur's Castle' and finally 'Alfred's Hall'. The reason, Lees-Milne writes, for its final name was that a 'pedantic friend advised Bathurst that the old scribal name for Oakley, \textit{Achileia}, was to be identified with \textit{AEgleah} of Asser's \textit{Life of Alfred the Great}.'\textsuperscript{39}

Apart from its name, King Alfred's Hall was also a snare for antiquarians simply by virtue of its being a fake. Mrs Pendarves (later Delany) wrote to Swift from Cirencester, 24 October 1733, about a visit she and her sister paid to Bathurst and his wife:

\textit{Oakley Wood joins to his park; the grand avenue that goes from his house through his park and wood is five miles long: the whole contains five thousand acres. We staid there a day and half: the wood is extremely improved since you saw it; and, when the whole design is executed, it will be one of the finest places in England. My Lord Bathurst talked with great delight of the pleasure you once gave him by surprising him in his wood, and shewed me the house where you lodged. It has been rebuilt; for the day you left it, it fell to the ground; conscious of the honour it had received by entertaining so illustrious a guest, it burst with pride. My Lord Bathurst has greatly improved the wood-house, which you may remember but a cottage, not a bit better than an Irish cabbin. It is now a venerable castle, and has been taken by an antiquarian for one of King Arthur's, 'with thicket overgrown, grotesque and wild.'}\textsuperscript{40}

Mrs Pendarves' admiration of Bathurst's works also testifies to his ambition: that the Park will one day be, as she writes, 'one of the finest places in England.'

A variation on Mrs Pendarves' anecdote about King Alfred's Hall's having fooled an antiquary also appears in a poem of 1748 about the Park, written by Edward Stephens: \textit{A Poem on the Park and Woods of the Right Honourable Allen Lord Bathurst}. This poem reads like a guided tour of the park and is entirely flattering in its assumption that the greatness of the park reflects that of its owner. On his lines about King Alfred's Hall, Stephens notes:

\textit{The Wood-House, a most curious Imitation of Antiquity, and surrounded with a great Variety of most agreeable Walks. 'Tis a Story well known at Cirencester, and may be somewhat entertaining to Strangers, which is related of an old Woman who shew'd this House: -- No}

\textsuperscript{38} See Barbara Jones, \textit{Follies and Grottoes} (London: Constable, 1953) pp. 32-33; see also her chapter on hermitages, pp. 177-92.
\textsuperscript{39} Lees-Milne, p. 45.
\textsuperscript{40} The \textit{Correspondence of Jonathan Swift}, IV, 199-200. Mrs Pendarves' relaying to Swift Bathurst's flattery of him appears to be an attempt of Bathurst's to mollify Swift after a visit that Swift, Pope and Gay had paid to him when Swift felt that they had been ill-treated. See Swift's letter to Bathurst, 21 October 1735, ibid., IV, 409.
Doubt, says a Gentleman who came to see it, this Building must be very antient; it can't be less than Five or Six Hundred Years old. O, Sir, replies the Woman, my Lord intends soon to build a House SIX HUNDRED YEARS OLDER.  

The humour of Stephens’ anecdote might lead us to downplay the significance of King Alfred’s Hall, perhaps to dismiss it, as does Gerrard. It is possible that Gerrard underestimates Bathurst. John Dixon Hunt sets a context for the inclusion of ruins in the landscape that suggests that, far from being an undiscriminating follower of the fashion for Gothic, Bathurst was one of the leaders in the field:

Under the fresh scrutiny of the antiquarians and in the context of political justifications of 1688 English ruins could be cherished for their own sakes. For if the aristocracy needed to be seen as guardians of public liberties, then as wielders of such influence in mixed government their own ancestry had to be stressed; there was no better way to do so than to champion the antiquities of their landscape, a land from which their power derived. Indeed, the ruins of monasteries around England was often a specific sign of the beginnings of landed power for families who received church lands from Henry VIII. There were historical precedents, too, for associating a modern English political settlement with its non-Roman past: both Magna Carta and King Alfred, the founding father of a system of civic liberty lost at the Norman invasion, sustained the myth of gothic freedom, which in its turn was imaged in eighteenth-century gardens by Bathurst’s restoration of the so-called Alfred’s Hall at Cirencester or Cobham’s triangular gothick Temple of Liberty at Stowe.

It is likely that Gerrard’s interpretation of Bathurst’s sham ruin as frivolous stems from his aristocratic affectation of carelessness about his works. In my opinion, Bathurst’s inclusion of buildings in his park that pointed both to the Ancient and to the Gothic past can only be seen in the new Gothic tradition of garden architecture created by the Patriot Opposition. As such, King Alfred’s Hall might be read as a symbol of political allegiance; likewise, Bathurst’s column to Queen Anne, built a year before Walpole’s fall.

Pope’s opinions on the symbolism of ruins suggest that we should take Bathurst’s King Alfred’s Hall seriously: Pope certainly considered such symbolism to be important, even if we cannot be sure that Bathurst also did. In the letter to Martha Blount about Lord Digby’s Sherborne, from which I quoted earlier in connection with Marble Hill, Pope indicates that he has urged Digby to cultivate the Gothic ruins in his garden as well as to create a Palladian front for his Elizabethan house. This suggests that Palladianism and Gothic ruins were part

---

42 Dixon Hunt, p. 57.
of the original Opposition programme in architecture and landscape design. What Pope has to say about Digby’s genuine ruins suggests the significance that he might have attached to his and Bathurst’s sham ruin in Cirencester Park:

What should induce my Lord D. the rather to cultivate these ruins and do honour to them, is that they do no small honour to his Family; that Castle, which was very ancient, being demolished in the Civil wars after it was nobly defended by one of his Ancestors in the cause of the King. I would set up at the Entrance of ’em an Obelisk, with an inscription of the Fact: which would be a Monument erected to the very Ruins; as the adorning & beautifying them in the manner I have been imagining, would not be unlike the AEgyptian Finery of bestowing Ornament and curiosity on dead bodies. The Present Master of this place (and I verily believe I can ingage the same for the next Successors) needs not to fear the Record, or shun the Remembrance of the actions of his Forefathers. He will not disgrace them, as most Modern Progeny do, by an unworthy Degeneracy, of principle, or of practise. When I have been describing his agreable Seat, I cannot make the reflection I’ve often done upon contemplating the beautiful Villa’s of Other Noblemen, raisd upon the Spoils of plunderd nations, or aggrandiz’d by the wealth of the Publick. I cannot ask myself the question, ‘What Else has this man to be lik’d? what else has he cultivated or improv’d? What good, or what desireable thing appears of him, without these walls? I dare say his Goodness and Benevolence extend as far as his territories; that his Tenants live almost as happy & contented as himself; & that not one of his Children wishes to see this Seat his owne. (22 June 1724?, Corr., II, 239)

Pope’s use of sarcasm (‘I dare say his Goodness and Benevolence extend as far as his territories; that his Tenants live almost as happy & contented as himself’) casts doubt on whether his idea of virtue can be recovered, modelled as it is on the ideals of housekeeping and good stewardship of the land. Digby’s noble ruins are valuable to Pope insofar as they create a link with a past where such virtue was the norm. Bathurst’s sham ruin derives a significance of some kind as part of the evolving Patriot iconography, but it is impossible to judge quite how far Bathurst saw his hermitage’ in this light. As a fake ruin, knowing what we do of Bathurst’s love of a joke, it is hard to rule out the possibility that, while he was indeed conforming to Opposition convention by constructing a Gothic folly, King Alfred’s Hall might also have been an elaborate ruse: Stephens’ note in his fawning poem would seem to support such a view.

Just as we cannot today resolve the question of how seriously Bathurst took King Alfred’s Hall, it is likely that, for the better part of their friendship, Pope, also, found it difficult to assess Bathurst’s seriousness as to his design projects. After Marble Hill, it

---

43 Erskine-Hill reports that Pope saw Digby as ‘an example of true nobility’: see his discussion of their relationship, The Social Milieu, pp. 156-165.
would appear that Pope had little to gain from Bathurst as regards garden design. Where Pope did continue to gain considerable benefits from Bathurst was in his patronage of his poetry. Bathurst became as much as Burlington the 'Partaker and Promoter' of Pope's resentments. As I will show, although Pope might, at first, appear ungrateful to Bathurst by attacking his landscaping, he was to give high praise to him as a patron of his work.

At this point we need further to compare Bathurst as he appears in Pope's writing with Bathurst the historical figure. In a highly significant addition to the the 1735 editions of his Epistle To Burlington, Pope idealizes Bathurst, elevating him into an example of the right use of wealth: 'Who then shall grace, or who improve the Soil?/ Who plants like BATHURST, or who builds like BOYLE' (ll. 177-78). Pope's praise of Bathurst and Burlington in tandem rebuts the accusations of ingratitude towards his patrons levelled at him on account of To Burlington and also marks a tendency in his poetry from To Burlington onwards - we see it also in his Epistle To Bathurst, where Pope links Bathurst with Oxford: 'Who copies Your's, or OXFORD'S better part,/ To ease th'oppress'd, and raise the sinking heart?' (ll. 243-44, T. E. III. ii., 112-13). Pope's linking his patrons together in his poetry makes it difficult for a modern reader to distinguish between them. In the 1735 editions of To Burlington, after the newly-added stately praise of both Burlington and Bathurst, there follows a further new passage that has much more to do with praise of Bathurst than praise of the poem's subject, Burlington:

His Father's Acres who enjoys in peace,
Or makes his Neighbours glad, if he encrease;
Whose cheerfal Tenants bless their yearly toil,
Yet to their Lord owe more than to the soil;
Whose ample Lawns are not ashamed to feed
The milky heifer and deserving steed;
Whose rising Forests, not for pride or show,
But future Buildings, future Navies grow:
Let his plantations stretch from down to down,
First shade a Country, and then raise a Town.
(ll. 181-90, T. E., III. ii., 154-55)

The epic sweep of the passage prepares the ground for the final urging of Burlington to design 'Imperial Works' (l. 204). The feats of landscaping described are expressed in terms of processes that appear to occur naturally under the beneficent influence of such a lord as
Bathurst: 'Whose rising Forests, not for pride or show,/But future Buildings, future Navies grow'. There is none of the indignity described in Pope's letter to the Blount sisters where the landscaping efforts are accomplished by force of will: '[we] draw Plans for Houses and Gardens, open Avenues, cut Glades, plant Firrs, contrive waterworks'. Admittedly, Pope's account in the letter is self-mocking, inviting the Blount sisters to laugh at the image he presents of himself trying to imitate Bathurst, a man in many ways so unlike himself, not least in terms of physical stamina, but there is also some mockery of Bathurst too. In the 1735 editions of the Epistle To Burlington, this mockery is conspicuously absent and the proposed works of landscaping are not seen as the design of a single controlling individual but rather appear sublimely impersonal by virtue of Pope's use of 'let' in the command: 'Let his plantations stretch from down to down,/ First shade a Country, and then raise a Town'.

To a large extent, commentators have followed Pope's rhetorical portrayals of Bathurst and Burlington by seeing them primarily as representatives of the nobility. Bathurst is an important patron of Pope's in sociological terms. In 'Pope and the Social Scene', Rogers chooses Bathurst as a 'representative figure' for the landed aristocracy, describing him as 'a rake of the eighteenth-century kind: more like Old Q than Lord Byron, with a sensuality that was bluff and direct rather than poetic and romantic.' Rogers points out the marked contrast in temperament between Bathurst and Burlington, although I think that his case is a little over-stated and under-estimates Burlington's abilities in architecture. I suggest that Burlington and Bathurst differed most on the score of 'correctness' in the sense of preoccupation with authorities. By the time that Pope left Chiswick, perhaps he was ready to leave behind the 'correctness' of Burlington's world, if not Burlington himself. We might most clearly see the differences in temperament between Pope and Burlington by looking at their architectural tastes. Where Burlington went on to refine his interest in Palladio until he
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45 Although a distinction by means of opposites can be drawn between Bathurst's and Burlington's characters, I think that Rogers exaggerates the difference at Burlington's expense: see ibid., p. 138. In my discussion of Burlington, I attempted to show that to dismiss Burlington as an amateur is misleading.
developed his own austere neo-Classical style, Pope broke, from Twickenham onwards, from the rigours of Classicism and developed his own fanciful, Gothic tastes, which were to find a shape in his grotto.⁴⁶

Another feature of Pope’s relationship with Bathurst that distinguishes it from his relationship with Burlington is that Pope more openly takes the initiative: he asks Bathurst to act as co-publisher of the *Dunciad Variorum*; he has himself invited to stay at Bathurst’s country seats at Cirencester and Richings; he gains his services as financier and he makes his own advice on landscape and forest gardening valuable to Bathurst in order to further his own career in gardening, which in turn brings greater prestige to him as a poet. Where Burlington might be said to have shaped Pope, in the first phase of Pope’s relationship with Bathurst, it was more a case of the poet shaping the patron. Bathurst was not directive as was Burlington but freely lent himself to Pope’s imagination by entertaining him, cultivating his friendship, giving him considerable practical assistance in his business affairs and readily responding to his requests for favours. The distance that distinguishes Pope’s relationship with Burlington has its opposite in the intimacy that seems to characterize his friendship with Bathurst. Pope and Bathurst were as much friends as was possible for a man of letters and a nobleman in the early eighteenth century.

Bathurst was the kind of lord that Pope loved for company. Like Burlington, Bathurst enjoyed associating with artists and literary men: in particular, he liked to have writers about him. Apart from Pope, Gay and Swift, he also entertained Prior at Cirencester and later enjoyed the company of Sterne.⁴⁷ He was particularly close to Gay, who stayed with Pope at Cirencester in the summer of 1718. Probably because of his affection for Bathurst, Pope was more critical of him than he was of Burlington: he would fault Bathurst not only for
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⁴⁶ Brownell, pp. 249-51. See also Dixon Hunt’s discussion of the mixture of the classical and gothic style in Kent’s garden designs, pp. 55-59 and pp. 114-15. Kent’s sketches of Pope at work in his grotto, with their inclusion of the fantastic (in one sketch, the grotesques are three butterflies, one fully formed, another just emerging from its chrysalis and the third in an inbetween stage), show both his own and Pope’s fascination with the gothic.

⁴⁷ Bathurst deliberately sought out Sterne in order to relive the days he had spent in company of the greatest wits of the age, as Sterne’s account of their first meeting makes clear in his letter to Mrs Daniel Draper, March 1767, *Letters of Laurence Sterne*, ed. by Lewis Perry Curtis (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935), pp. 304-05.
‘charitable vanity’ in his gardening and architectural improvements but also for want of taste and lack of ambition.

In further considering what drew Pope and Bathurst to each other, Pope’s poetry most strongly shows how the unquantifiable played a greater part than the quantifiable. Pope was attracted to Bathurst’s ‘lordly insouciance’ which I have discussed in relation to the Epistle To Bathurst in the previous chapter. The aristocratic insouciance with which Bathurst privately treated his gardening works and his public life has its match in the affected insouciance of Pope as regards his poetry. In his Epistle To Dr Arbuthnot, written about the same time as To Bathurst, from 1731-4, Pope’s nonchalance found its greatest expression in his description of how he came about his poetic vocation:

Why did I write? what sin to me unknown  
Dipt me in Ink, my Parents’, or my own?  
As yet a Child, nor yet a Fool to Fame,  
I lisp’d in Numbers, for the Numbers came.  
I left no Calling for this idle trade,  
No Duty broke, no Father dis-obey’d.  
The Muse but serv’d to ease some Friend, not Wife,  
To help me thro’ this long Disease, my Life [. ..]  
(11. 125-32, T. E. IV, 104-05)

It is likely that Pope owed the adoption of this easy attitude to Bathurst. While Pope’s adoption of his patrons’ particular attitudes is part of his gentlemanly persona, he nevertheless has reservations about each approach as a way of dealing with the world. Taken alone, neither Burlington’s ‘correctness’ nor Bathurst’s ‘insouciance’ amount to a code of ethics. Where Pope found a gentlemanly ease an appropriate attitude to adopt in his poetry, he found fault with Bathurst for adopting an attitude of unconcern in his public life and for letting insouciance slide into thoughtlessness in his landscaping activities.

In considering Pope’s relationship with Bathurst as a means for Pope of rising in the world, it is worth taking into account Samuel Johnson’s view that Bathurst was Pope’s only noble friend of whom he did not need to feel ashamed. This opinion of Johnson’s needs to be set in the context of his criticism of Pope for what he sees as snobbery and social-climbing:
His admiration of the Great seems to have increased in the advance of life. He passed over peers and statesmen to inscribe his *Iliad* to Congreve, with a magnanimity of which the praise had been compleat, had his friend’s virtue been equal to his wit. Why he was chosen for so great an honour it is not now possible to know; there is no trace in literary history of any particular intimacy between them. The name of Congreve appears in the Letters among those of his other friends, but without any observable distinction or consequence.

To his latter works, however, he took care to annex names dignified with titles, but was not very happy in his choice; for, except Lord Bathurst, none of his noble friends were such as that a good man would wish to have his intimacy with them known to posterity: he can derive little honour from the notice of Cobham, Burlington, or Bolingbroke.48

Sherburn calls this ‘the quite unwarranted effect of class and party prejudice’ (*The Early Career*, p. 15). There is more to Johnson’s dismissal of Pope’s aristocratic patrons than Sherburn allows. Johnson’s saying that Bathurst was the only respectable lord that Pope knew is a sharp comment on the company Pope kept.49 Johnson nevertheless fails to do justice to Pope: on first impression, we might take the Epistles *Of the Use of Riches* as celebrations of their subjects, Burlington and Bathurst, but, as it turns out, the Epistles intriguingly contain a leavening of satire. Pope is not interested in merely, as Johnson suggests, annexing names dignified with titles to his works. The Epistles *Of the Use of Riches* show him scrutinizing his patrons and his own moral stance towards them. As far as I know, Johnson’s comments on Pope’s having kept poor company on account of what we would today call snobbery are not supported by any other eighteenth-century commentators.50

Recent studies of Bathurst have tended to under-estimate his importance in the formation of Pope’s poetry. Bathurst is often portrayed as an affable member of the nobility who did not distinguish himself in anything in particular.51 While a certain indolence does seem to
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49 Bathurst himself teased Pope for being a courtier in his letter of 19 September 1730, *Corr.*, III, 133-34. Pope wrote to Arbuthnot that he valued the good opinion of ‘worthy men’ and as ‘for that of the Great, or those in power, I may wish I had it, but if thro’ misrepresentations […] I have it not, I shall be sorry, but not miserable in the want of it’, 26 July 1734, ibid., III, 420.
50 It would seem that the mechanism of patronage was such that, for a writer, snobbery was not out of place as a rational response to the situation. Although Swift teased Pope for preferring the company of the Great to that of commoners, he did not find fault him for it but rather pointed out the advantages of more biddable acquaintance, 20 April 1731, ibid., III, 191. In this letter, Swift’s description of Pope’s distinguished society seems to counter Johnson’s criticism of Pope’s friendships with aristocrats. Johnson’s claim that Bathurst was exceptional among Pope’s noble acquaintance is further explicated by Boswell: see *Lives of the English Poets*, III, 205-6n. and *Boswell’s Life of Johnson: together with Boswell’s Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides and Johnson’s Diary of a Journey into North Wales*, ed. by Birkbeck Hill, 6 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934-50), III, 347. Pope’s relationship with Bathurst is presented here as having had nothing to do with the idea of self-advancement: rather he actually enjoyed his company.
51 Hussey gives the impression that Bathurst was essentially apolitical, ‘Cirencester House, Gloucestershire – 1: The Seat of Earl Bathurst’, p. 1797. See also Lees-Milne’s impression of Bathurst as a charmer who himself led a charmed life, p. 26.
characterize Bathurst, he was a figure of more substance than previous studies have shown and of greater significance in his influence on Pope than has yet been recognized. As with Burlington, Pope’s elevation of Bathurst to a symbolic figure in his verse bears much closer investigation than has yet been undertaken.
ii) Bathurst’s and Pope’s correspondence: Pope’s attitude towards their friendship

The lack of evidence concerning Bathurst, both in terms of biography and surviving correspondence, makes it difficult to form an accurate picture of his character and of his relationship with Pope.\(^{52}\) In contrast to that of Burlington, not much survives of Bathurst’s correspondence. In Pope’s correspondence, there are twenty letters from Pope to Bathurst, one letter from Bolingbroke to Bathurst and just nine letters from Bathurst to Pope. It is clear from the correspondence that some letters have been lost. In the published letters of Swift and Gay there are also a few letters from Bathurst, but the impression is that he was not much of a letter-writer but loved himself to receive witty letters from his writer friends.\(^{53}\)

There are four published letters of his addressed to Henrietta Howard, later Countess of Suffolk, in a two-volume collection of the letters mainly between her and her husband, entitled \textit{Letters to and from Henrietta, Countess of Suffolk, and her second husband, The Hon. George Berkeley; from 1712 to 1767}, published in 1824. In the British Library, as part of the Suffolk Papers, there is the second volume of a collection of bound manuscripts entitled \textit{Original Letters written by various persons of distinction to Henrietta Hobart, Countess of Suffolk, during the reigns of King George the First, George the Second, and George the Third, arranged in 1803}.\(^{54}\) This volume contains the four published letters as well as one unpublished letter from Bathurst to the Countess of Suffolk. Bathurst’s letters to the Countess date from 1725 to 1734, ending with a letter of consolation that is at once mocking and in earnest on her retirement from Court in 1734. The Wentworth Papers in the British Library encompass an unbound collection of nineteen letters from Bathurst to Thomas Wentworth (1672-1739), 3\textsuperscript{rd} Baron Raby (1695), Earl of Strafford (1711), Ambassador at Berlin and the Hague, and Plenipotentiary at Utrecht. For my purposes, the
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\(^{52}\) For biographical details, there is only a chapter on Bathurst in Lees-Milne’s \textit{Earls of Creation}, and two articles on Cirencester House and Park by Hussey, published in \textit{Country Life}. Rogers writes briefly but illuminatingly on Bathurst in ‘Pope and the Social Scene’.

\(^{53}\) In Swift’s \textit{Correspondence}, there are just three surviving letters from Swift to Bathurst and eight from Bathurst to Swift. See Bathurst’s letter to Swift quoted in my previous chapter, \textit{The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift}, IV, 132. The new edition of Swift’s correspondence does not contain any new surviving letters, \textit{The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift}, ed. by David Woolley, 4 vols (Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, New York, Paris, Wien: Peter Lang, vol. 1 published 1999).

\(^{54}\) The full title adds the information that the letters were ‘Bequeathed by Lady Suffolk to her Nephew, John Earl of Buckingham, and by his Lordship to his Daughter, Emily Viscountess Castlereagh’.
most interesting of these letters are the letters to Strafford, which I discuss later. We see in these letters Bathurst balancing playing up to his reputation as a carefree dilettante with a sophisticated awareness of the seriousness of Strafford's diplomatic affairs. Strafford was made knight of the Garter in 1712 but, as one of the leading Tories, after the death of Queen Anne and the fall of the Harley administration, he was impeached in 1715 on the charge of conspiring with the French. Bathurst was allied to Strafford through Sir Allen Apsley, Bathurst's grandfather and Strafford's great-grandfather. Bathurst's letters to Strafford date from 1711 to 1736 and, for the most part, fulfil an undertaking Bathurst made with Strafford to report the debates in the House of Lords while Strafford was abroad. There is a gap in the correspondence between 1714 and 1734: the last letter before the gap is dated 6/7 November 1714, not long before Strafford's impeachment in 1715.

In his study of the Tories after the fall of Harley and Bolingbroke, *The Second Tory Party, 1714-1832*, Keith Grahame Feiling writes that Bathurst's son, later Lord Chancellor, burned his correspondence, though without giving further details or sources. The gap in Bathurst's correspondence with Strafford and the thinness of Bathurst's surviving correspondence, as a whole, would seem to support Feiling's claim. It is possible that the destroyed letters contained Jacobite material that might have endangered the Bathurst family. Feiling calls Bathurst's son 'sober', and perhaps infers that he might have burnt the letters to disguise the colourful nature of Bathurst's life.

Mack reports that Strafford was 'Pope's friend and neighbour in Twickenham' (*Alexander Pope*, p. 678n.). Strafford appears in humorous connection with Bathurst, Burlington, Oxford and Cobham in Pope's poem on his Great Dane, Bounce (1736). It was Pope's habit to give Bounce's puppies as presents to his patrons. In the passage below, Bounce reflects on the illustrious fates of her puppies:

> My Eldest-born resides not far,  
> Where shines great Strafford's glittering Star:  
> My second (Child of Fortune!) waits  
> At Burlington's Palladian Gates:  
> A third majestically stalks

Although this poem is a jeu d'esprit, Pope's thumb-nail sketches of his patrons are quite telling and help to place them in his affections. Where Burlington is summed up in terms of 'Fortune' and Oxford distinguished by his charity, Bathurst's life is made up of his friends and his home is one entirely given over to hospitality. Even from this slight sketch, it is easy to see why Pope was more drawn to Bathurst than to his other patrons, or, at least, why he might have wanted to have presented himself in a similar light to Bathurst, rating friendship above fortune.

What distinguishes Pope's friendship with Bathurst from his relationships with other patrons is the apparent generosity of feeling and ease in their treatment of each other. Bathurst's letters are warmly personal in a way that Burlington's are not. Nevertheless, given the small number of letters of Bathurst that survive and, bearing in mind the artifice involved in Pope's publication of his correspondence, it is necessary to take a sceptical approach. Bathurst is actively concerned in his letters about Pope's health and eagerly seeks out his company. One example is a letter from Bathurst, written in 1723, which opens with his sympathy for Pope's being ill, 'I am heartily sorry to find by yours that you have been troubled with a new complaint, but I hope by this time you are free from it, and all its consequences', then gives frank details of his own ill health before outlining his itinerary for his forthcoming journey. It demonstrates remarkable openness, ending with the hope of seeing Pope soon and collaborating with him on an architectural project (Corr., II, 207). In another letter, probably written the following year, he thanks Pope for his 'last kind letter' and then gives a picture of his own ill health, something which, despite his stamina, he and Pope had in common. There follows a humorous portrait of life with his country neighbours:

I went out in the morning to take my usual exercise which lasted till dinner-time. I was forced to entertain at that time two or three odd people, who were not fools enough to be laughed at and yet were far from having sense enough to make a conversation; a most accused

---

56 See Sherburn for an account of how Pope doctored his letters, Corr., I, pp. xvi-xvii.
mediocrity. After this I was obliged to make a visit to a country neighbour. I found him in his hall. I may properly say I found him, for I looked sometime before I could discover him, being enveloped in thick clouds of tobacco. So much civility was paid to me that I was obliged to remove out of the great hall into a little parlour, which by misfortune had just been washed. The honest friends who had been entertaining him before were to follow us into this parlour, and the agreeable smoke which had filled a larger hall was to be transferred to the little room, with the addition of a good deal of other smoke which proceeded from a chimney that had not been incommmoded with fire since last Christmas, and consequently the soot helped to the delightfulness of the smell. Not to trouble you further with this description, our drink was as bad as our conversation, and I have had too much of each. What I write will smell of it. Therefore I will defer the rest which I have to say till I am purified by walking round Oakley wood, and conversing with the hamadryads which you have lodged there. Adieu.

([October 1724?], Corr., II, 262-63)

Bathurst’s ironic description of the burdens of being paid ‘too much civility’ recalls the impression Burlington gives in his correspondence of both expecting deference while being bored by it.

There is a striking parallel between Bathurst’s letter of 1723 to Pope and Burlington’s letter to his wife of June 10, 1735, quoted in my earlier discussion of Burlington:

I was yesterday at York, and passed thro the usual forms. coming back I called at Kilwick to see my Lady A. the whole family tho late, new dressed to receive us, which was not to much purpose for we did not stay ten minutes tho much pressed.57

The tone of Burlington’s letter is detached and there is, I think, a glint of cruelty in his depiction of this particular York family’s disappointment. This comes across particularly in the coda ‘which was not to much purpose for we did not stay ten minutes tho much pressed’.

It is, of course, significant that the letter is written to his wife; in his letters to Pope, Burlington never shares personal information of this kind. Where Burlington’s comic picture suggests a patrician affectation of boredom with social duties and an accompanying frostiness towards inferiors, Bathurst’s humour on a similar subject has a lightness and conviviality that must have endeared him to Pope. Bathurst thoughtfully and gratifyingly ends this particular letter with details of his plans to deliver to Pope ‘all the limes which can possibly be spared’ from his gardens at Richings Park.

Earlier studies of Pope’s relationship with Bathurst have tended to suggest that Pope shaped his tone within the limits determined by their friendship. In his discussion of the

57 Chatsworth MS, 127.4.
Epistle To Bathurst, Rogers writes that, with Bathurst, ‘Pope was addressing a worldly, sociable, cynical nobleman, who carried his stock of learning lightly and put on no false dignity with a man like Pope. So the poet can sometimes adopt a jaunty carriage’. Although Rogers’ overall portrait of Bathurst is accurate, scepticism rather than cynicism, characterized him. Where, I think, cynicism would have alienated Pope, Bathurst’s intelligent scepticism, born out of his experience as a man of the world, intrigued him. Rogers’ impression that Pope could get away with more with Bathurst, both in his letters and in his poetry, is a little misleading: the tone of To Bathurst is a joint achievement born out of the esteem Pope and Bathurst had for each other. As in the letters, so, also, in the poem, each measures his tone by that of his friend. The directness and forthrightness of To Bathurst originates in Pope’s and Bathurst’s letters to each other. Both in the letters and in Pope’s Epistle, Bathurst appears to set this tone but there was much more give and take in the relationship than first appears. Although Pope followed Bathurst’s lead, what emerges from a comparison of Bathurst’s letters to Pope with his surviving letters to his other correspondents, Swift, Gay, Strafford and the Countess of Suffolk, is that Bathurst has something of Pope’s chameleon ability to adapt his style to his correspondent. Bathurst also balances an accommodation with his correspondent with engaging self-mockery and amiable teasing, based on an affectionate understanding of character.

In his letters to Strafford, Bathurst’s tone is genial and balances what approaches an elaborate courtliness with self-deprecating humour. A letter of 20 April 1714 opens:

Since I had ye Honour to write last to yr Lordship there have been severall debates in ye House of Lds whch if I were able to give yu a good acc.t of itt wou’d be a very great satisfaction to me, finding ye last I sent was not unacceptable to yr Lordship. But my misfortune is, that I never have time to write, tho’ I have nothing else to do, & yet I do assure yr Lordship if I really had a great deal of business upon my hands I shou’d be ready to neglect any part of itt rather than fail to obey yr lordships comands, but being constantly engag’d in some party or other every night, ye greatest difficulty is to sitt down to write.

---


59 BL, Add. MS 22221, f. 109.
By means of banter, Bathurst plays on what we can take to be Strafford’s expression of pleasure at receiving his last letter. Other letters from Bathurst show how conscious he was of Strafford’s being engaged, at the time, in the highest affairs of state at Utrecht, and so we see how artfully he teases Strafford by letting him know that, though he has no business at all to attend to, he cannot put pen to paper. In addition to this is the elaborate mockery of courtesy in his assurance that he would readily neglect any business, had he any, ‘rather than fail to obey yr lordships commands’.

In another letter, written in May of the same year, Bathurst plays up to his reputation as a lover of pleasure rather than politics, again teasing Strafford who, we might infer, is looking for serious reports of the debates in the Lords:

. . . I never was inquisitive after News before now, & always abhorred a long debate, but ye hopes of having something to write to you (after yu have been pleas’d so very obligingly to accept of my poor Correspondence) makes me long for an occasion yt may furnish me with matter to give yu some entertainment.60

Bathurst’s self-mockingly characterizes himself as one bored by politics. Throughout the early correspondence with Strafford, Bathurst jokes with his friend on the serious-sounding ‘commission’ he has received from him to report on the Lords, by promising to write about what interests himself, not Strafford: news that makes for ‘entertainment’ and ‘diversion’. Despite his banter, in the event Bathurst accomplishes his task fairly conscientiously, reporting the main debates in some detail. In the above excerpt, he also plays up to his reputation of a worldly dilettante by saying that he is not a good letter-writer. In the tone of his parenthesis ‘(after yu have been pleas’d so very obligingly to accept of my poor Correspondence)’, there is mischievous amusement in the mockery of ‘so very obligingly’. Bathurst’s meaning is that Strafford may very likely already be regretting his decision to ask him for this particular favour, knowing his somewhat giddy and unreliable reputation. As for Bathurst, he cannot lose, as Strafford will afterwards be obliged to him. Bathurst offers wit to enliven otherwise quite dry letters, while Strafford’s request for the favour speaks of his trust in him.

60 Ibid., f. 117.
The geniality of Bathurst’s tone and the humorous elegance of his syntax in his letters to Strafford suggest his ease in the sophistication of Strafford’s world. Both by exaggerating Strafford’s seriousness and by exaggerating his own frivolity, Bathurst shows considerable sensitivity and perception. In his letters to the Countess of Suffolk, his geniality modulates into flirtatiousness. In the 1824 collection of Henrietta Howard’s letters, he opens a letter dated about 1725 by teasing her about the glittering distractions of Court and the power that she has over him:

That a poor Country gentleman should be forgot by his court friends is no new thing – that he should be troublesome to them is as little extraordinary; therefore, to keep in the ordinary course of things, it is proper for me to put you in mind of your promise of coming here one day this week, for I am obliged to remove from hence the next. […]

I am convinced I shall make but an awkward courtier, and I could perceive that some of the folks I met there the last day looked upon me as a wild beast whose teeth and claws had been lately pulled out; but perhaps they may grow again the next winter, and the creature may be found to be tame only to those it likes, and submit to nothing but the Royal Blood. But what if the rest of our herd should grow tame too, and leave off roaring? Your hunters would complain of want of sport, and you may be accused of having spoilt their diversion. You do not know what you have done. I give you fair warning, therefore, whatever happens, do not hereafter accuse your, &c.

Bathurst⁶¹

Bathurst’s beauty and the beast scenario is flattering to Henrietta Howard while grounded in the political reality of the time: the ‘herd’ refers to the Opposition. Bathurst creates a beguiling picture of the incongruities of the court and a ridiculous but strangely sad picture of his own appearance in its midst. Seemingly artlessly, he writes ‘I am convinced I shall make but an awkward courtier’, then reveals this to be a comic understatement, given some courtiers’ contempt for him. Bathurst’s description of how Henrietta Howard has tamed him merits close analysis since it suggests considerable imaginative powers. In this letter he not only charms Henrietta Howard but also displays a wit and refinement which helps towards our understanding of how he won a special place in Pope’s affections. The comparison between a man out of place and a beast in the wilderness was a conventional one: Bathurst’s treatment of this conventional idea shows a delicacy of mind that pointedly contradicts his depiction of himself. There is quite an agility of mind in his shifts of tone and mood, from

⁶¹ Letters to and from Henrietta, Countess of Suffolk, and her second husband, The Hon. George Berkeley, I, 178-80.
the detached and submissive tone which gives quiet dignity to his account of humiliations at Court, 'some of the folks I met there the last day looked upon me as a wild beast whose teeth and claws had been lately pulled out', to the mischievous 'but perhaps they may grow again the next winter', which shades into the defiance of 'and the creature may be found to be tame only to those it likes, and submit to nothing but the Royal Blood'. His final witticism, speculating on the demise of the Opposition, is particularly complex in tone. There is a degree of bitter irony in 'But what if the rest of our herd should grow tame too, and leave off roaring? Your hunters would complain of want of sport', which, at the same time, suggests a feeling of sad powerlessness at the image of lions, symbolic of royalty, charmed enough to 'leave off roaring'. There is also considerable irony, verging on contempt, in Bathurst's depiction of his opponents' frivolity and cruelty in treating the persecution of their enemies as 'diversion'.

Bathurst combines playfulness with seriousness in this letter to Henrietta Howard, perhaps enlivening his gallantry with an audacious reference. The words, 'You do not know what you have done', seem to echo Christ's words on the cross. In the collection of original letters, arranged in 1803, Bathurst's ending to this letter appears simpler, and more moving, than in the published version: 'you don't know what yu have done, I give yu fair warning therefore wtever happens don't hereafter accuse/ yr most faithfull/ & obedient servt./ Bathurst.'

There is a strange gravity in the caveat, 'wtever happens', whereby a note of seriousness creeps into the playful warning not to 'accuse' him, which recalls the trials and impeachments of his Tory friends. Despite the affection of his tone in writing to Henrietta Howard, the seriousness that emerges at the end of his amusing letter suggests that he did not know her well enough to be able to trust her. Throughout the letter he plays with the vital difference between them: she is in favour, though he warns her that this favour may be a
precarious one, whereas he is not. We might reasonably imagine Bathurst and Pope exchanging such views on their shared ‘outsider’ status and how such conversation must have appealed to Pope, knowing his fondness for ‘Statesmen, out of Place’ (*Imitation of Horace*, Sat. II. i., l. 126, T. E. IV, 17).

When writing to Swift, Bathurst takes on something of the energy and drive of Swift’s style. In one particular letter, written in June 1730, Bathurst not only attempts to catch Swift’s directness and boldness but also pays tribute to the character of his imagination. He writes here to Swift on his fears for his safety under Walpole:

> Observe how naturally power & Dominion is attended with fear & Precaution when I am in the Herd I have as little abt me as anybody, but now that I am in the midst of my own Dominions, I think of nothing but preserving them, & grow fearfull lest a certain great man shou’d take a fancy to them & transport them into Norfolk to place them as an Iland in one of his new-made fish-ponds or if yu take this for too proud a thought I will only suppose it to be hung out under a great Bow-window [. . .].

Bathurst refers here to the construction of Houghton and the layout of its grounds from 1722 to 1735 and also to Walpole’s lodge in Richmond Park which had bow-windows. The satire on Walpole’s Houghton and Richmond Park as places of monstrous, Brobdingnagian proportions pays tribute to Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels*, published in 1726. Bathurst shows considerable wit in picturing his estate transformed into a window-box. There is the suggestion, despite the jesting, that Bathurst felt considerable insecurity under Walpole: it is likely that these fears were warranted. Knowing, though, his tendency to respond to the preoccupations of his friends in kind, his expression of insecurity might also be his way of attempting to come to a rapprochement with Swift, playing the part of fellow outsider, alienated by the current regime and fearful for his safety. Bathurst was probably doing both: he was genuinely insecure but he was also playing a part to gratify Swift.

Admittedly, Bathurst wrote in his friends’ style with varying degrees of success (he did not succeed in charming Swift, although perhaps this might say more about Swift than it does about Bathurst), but doubtless this particular kind of sensitivity to his friends had strong attractions for Pope. Accustomed as Pope was to pleasing his patrons by accommodating

---

63 *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift*, III, 401.
himself to their tastes, it must have been gratifying to find a patron like Bathurst who so enthusiastically entered into the spirit of their friendship. It would be useful here to compare the above letter from Bathurst to Swift, written in June 1730, with a later letter from Bathurst to Pope, written in September of that year. In this later letter, Bathurst reproaches Pope for not coming to visit him using similar Brobdingnagian imagery:

"I design to stay here all the next month at least, if you have a mind to make up the quarrell I have with you, you must come down to me; your curricle can bring you with a Pair of Horses as far as Abingdon. My Chaise shall meet you there & bring you to dinner the next day; I will meet you there my self & drive you hither for the security of your Person; if you stay but one day with me, you can’t be much tir’d with the Place or the Company. I’ll cutt you off some little corner of my Park (500 or 1000 acres) which you shall do what you will with, & I’ll immediately assign over to you 3 or 4 millions of plants out of my Nursery to amuse your self with. if you refuse coming I’ll immediately send one of my wood-Carts & bring away your whole house & Gardens, & stick it in the midst of Oakly-wood where it will never be heard off any more, unless some of the Children find it out in Nuttingseason & take possession of it thinking I have made it for them. I beg of you, if it be possible lett me see you here. You know that I love & Esteem you most heartily & Sincerely. (Corr., Ill, 134)"

Although the joke about extremes of scale is similar, the tone of the two letters is quite different. Bathurst’s is fanciful and echoes Pope’s letters with their capricious and prodigious imagination and sometimes fevered speed. In his letter to Pope, Bathurst’s humour is light and endearing. Bathurst flatteringly and mockingly writes to Pope as if he is a brilliant child who must be pandered to and kept amused but whose obstinate behaviour must sometimes be treated severely: ‘if you refuse coming I’ll immediately send one of my wood-Carts & bring away your whole house & Gardens, & stick it in the midst of Oakly-wood’. There is charm in the letter, particularly in the fairytale image of the children in nutting season mistaking Pope’s house and gardens for toys: in like fashion, Pope’s letters to Bathurst, for the most part, are written with charm and diversion in mind. Where with Swift, Bathurst’s tone is serious before diverging into the fantastically ridiculous, with Pope, Bathurst is simply playing, and aptly aims to impress by means of light-hearted humour rather than politically-engaged satire. The similarity between the two letters suggests that Bathurst might not have been entirely sincere in his protestations of fearfulness under Walpole: in his later letter to Pope, Bathurst takes Walpole’s place as tyrant.
iii) Pope’s criticism of Bathurst: *A Master Key to Popery*

In 1732 Pope had begun seriously to treat of Bathurst and their friendship in his poetry and prose. Both of the works that he completed in this year, *A Master Key to Popery* and the Epistle *To Bathurst*, registered a note of ambivalence on his part towards Bathurst and their friendship. For the first thirteen years of their friendship, it would seem that he had been willing to play along with Bathurst, as a man ‘resolv’d to laugh’. By 1737, with the publication of his Epistle II. ii., his ambivalence had resolved itself into disillusion.

It would seem that there was a difference of opinion of some kind between Pope and Bathurst, though there is no evidence that points conclusively to any specific event or issue which might have divided them. Their correspondence and Pope’s poetry demonstrate that it was Pope who changed in his feelings towards Bathurst: there is no indication that Bathurst treated Pope any differently from 1732, although, not surprisingly, Bathurst’s last surviving affectionate letter to Pope is dated 1736, the year before the publication of the Epistle II. ii.

Pope’s and Bathurst’s work on the gardens at Marble Hill in the 1720s was motivated and buoyed up by hopes of success with the future king shared by their whole circle: Bolingbroke, Arbuthnot, Peterborow, Swift and Gay were amongst those of Pope’s friends who cultivated Henrietta Howard. Although he was barred from royal preferment on the ground of religion, Pope was as much a lover of courts as Bathurst and it is likely that both once imagined that Henrietta Howard’s mediation might help restore them to royal favour; in 1735 Pope wrote that there was a ‘greater court now at Marble hill than at Kensington’ (To Fortescue, 2 August 1735, *Corr.*, III, 478). When their hopes were dashed, it is not surprising that Pope’s and Bathurst’s friendship suffered. Each regained their lost ground in different ways. Bathurst immersed himself in the design of his wood at Cirencester and Pope allied himself with the Patriot opposition.

---

64 Bathurst to Swift, 29 March 1733, *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift*, IV, 132.
65 From 1728, Bathurst began a courtship of the new Prince of Wales, repeating a pattern of behaviour which, it seems, Pope mocked as futile. The evidence for this is in the diary of his friend, Mrs Caesar, as Erskine-Hill points out, ‘Under which Caesar? Pope in the journal of Mrs Charles Caesar, 1724-1741’, *Review of English Studies*, New Series, 33 (1982), 436-44 (p. 442).
In the years leading up to the publication of the *Epistle II. ii.* and afterwards, Pope became unsparing in his criticism of Bathurst’s landscaping works. Where, in his letter to Martha Blount, probably written in 1724, he had elevated Digby for his genuine ruins and praised him for his good stewardship, in the second phase of his friendship with Bathurst, he found fault with him both for his ornamental buildings and for his stewardship of his land. We find the beginnings of his misgivings about Bathurst’s gardening in his letter to him of 1728, which marks a turning-point in their relationship. Here he criticizes him for his thoughtlessness in architecture and his carelessness in the felling of trees. It is on this last issue, the levelling of trees in order to plant new ones, that Pope and Bathurst seem most clearly to part company. The letter concerns a visit Pope paid to Cirencester when, by ill-luck, Bathurst was away.

![Cirencester House](image)

Figure 10. Cirencester House, the view from the Home Park, Rudder’s *Gloucestershire* (1779).

Pope is scathing about Bathurst’s improvements, in particular, mocking him for the absurd way that the steeple of Cirencester Church now seems to rise directly out of the roof of the newly rebuilt house (see figure 10):

> However my Visit to your House was not wholly void of all Comfort to me; for I saw the Steeple of Ciceter stand on one side over it, and the great Vista in Oakley wood to the said Steeple by being widened beyond its former Hedges, borderd now only with some low thing which I took to be a Box-Edging on either side: Moreover I beheld with singular consolation the Back of the high Wood pierced thro, & every Tree that bore the least pretence to be Timber, totally cut down & done away. Wherby I see with delight not only the bare Prospect
you have made, but also another, of the Necessity you are now reduced to, of raising some Building there: And I form to myself yet a third prospect, that you will so unwillingly & grudgingly undertake the said building, that it will be so small & inconsiderable as to oblige you to pull it down again another year, to erect a bigger & more adequate. Nevertheless my Lord (to prove I am not angry, but with a mixture of charity inclind to rectify, what I disapprove) I would not advise you to an obelisque which can bear no Diameter to fill so vast a Gap unless it literally touch'd the Skies; but rather to a solid Pyramid of 100 ft square, to the end there may be Something solid and Lasting of your works. As to the church Steeple, I am truly sorry for it, yet I would not however pull down the House. I would rather the Reformation began, as reformations always ought, at the church itself; not that I would wish the Body of it entirely taken away, but only the Steeple lower'd: This would bring matters to Some Uniformity, & the Dissenters & Quakers be greatly obliged, as it is the High-tower itself which above all they hold in abomination (wherby your Lordships Interest in the next Elections might vastly be strength'nd) [...] (Corr., II, 517-18)

Pope’s facetious solutions for what he sees as Bathurst’s blunders reflect his disappointment in him both as his collaborator and his patron. Furthermore, Pope’s sarcasm – ‘Wherby I see with delight not only the bare Prospect you have made, but also another [...]’ – shows how much he took this personally; Bathurst has failed to live up to his ideal of patron and, in some way, broken faith. Apart from this, Pope cannot tolerate the felling of trees for the sake of aesthetics. Bathurst is clearly not respecting the ‘Genius of the Place’ in his actions. While no one could disagree with Pope on the odd appearance of the house, which Bathurst himself admitted – he wrote to Pope on the house being ‘so oddly bad’ (14 August 1718, Corr., I, 488) – Pope’s criticism of Bathurst’s methods of forest design is uncertain. Pope accuses Bathurst of thinking in the short-term but one might argue that the opposite was the case. Bathurst’s long-term planning rewarded him since he lived to see the horse-chestnuts lining the Broad Avenue become great trees.

Pope’s early letter to Bathurst of 1719 lampooned those leading gardening critics who ‘are for rooting up more than they plant’ (Corr., II, 14); it seems that, as time went on, Pope became hostile to any felling of old trees. Pope’s letter to Martha Blount describing the gardens at Sherborne gives special emphasis to the presence of dense woodland and ancient trees. The park is ‘finely crownd with very high Woods, on all the tops of the Hills, which form a great Amphitheatre sloping down to the house’. Describing the ‘venerable Wood’, he

---

66 Interestingly, in Stephens’ poem about Cirencester Park, Bathurst’s blunder in the matter of the steeple of Cirencester Church is presented as transforming Cirencester House into a cross between a temple and a castle, A Poem on the Park and Woods of the Right Honourable Allen Lord Bathurst, II. 61-64, p. 7. Pope’s sarcastic letter of 1728 perhaps had a considerable influence since Stephens’ ridiculous flattery appears knowingly undercut by his note to line 62: ‘The Tower of Cirencester Church, which appears to a Spectator at this Place to arise from the Middle of the House’.
comments that its very old trees create ‘the deepest Shade’ and make for an atmosphere ‘inexpressibly awful & solemn’ (22 June 1724?, Corr., II, 237-38). Around this time he described gardening as ‘more Antique & nearer God’s own Work, than Poetry’ (To Oxford, 8 October 1724, Corr., II, 264). In this light, his objection to the felling of trees in his 1728 letter to Bathurst can be seen as part of his effort to draw attention to the destruction of the countryside. In his correspondence there is a late letter to Burlington which takes the shape of a petition to save a tree in the grounds at Chiswick. The petition is light-hearted in its use of legal terminology and signed by members of Burlington’s family and circle, including his wife, his daughters, Lord Euston and the Duke of Grafton. The petition is in Pope’s hand and jokingly accuses Kent of conspiring with Satan to destroy the tree for the purpose of creating an ‘Upstart Terras’. Beneath the jesting, however, it is clear that Pope’s petition is much more than another exercise in courtly wit. The tone of his appeal for the tree is entirely heartfelt. He first of all paints a picture of the tree’s having ‘suffered & endured all the Changes & Vicissitudes of Wind Water & Weather in the Worst of Times’ for about twenty years and then gives a sketch of the petitioners’ benefits from the tree:

We, Your Honour’s humble Petitioners who have many years known, accustomed & frequented the said Tree, sitten, reposed or disported under the Shade thereof [. . .] Do, for ourselves & our Posterity, most earnestely, & jointly as well as Seperately, petition & pray, that the said Tree may remain, subsist, continue & flourish in his place, during his or her natural Life (not being absolutely certain of the Sex of the said Tree) to enjoy the Small Spot of Ground on which God & your Lordship’s Ancestors of ever blessed memory have placed it. ([?1741], Corr., IV, 323)

The bearing that this petition of 1741 might have on Pope’s relationship with Bathurst is quite clear: we can presume that, if Pope could, albeit humorously, launch such an appeal for a single tree, he might well have been horrified by the wholesale levelling and felling of trees carried out by Bathurst.

The slight element of criticism in Pope’s praise of Peterborow in his *Imitation of Horace*, Satire II. i., published in 1733, where Peterborow ‘tames the Genius of the stubborn Plain’ (T. E. IV, 19), rather than consulting it, is part of Pope’s re-assessment of the talents of his collaborators at Marble Hill and his re-thinking of his relationships with his patrons, Peterborow and Bathurst, and professional gardener, Bridgeman. The beginnings of this new
attitude on Pope’s part towards Bathurst can be found in his defence of the poem and himself against the charges of ingratitude, *A Master Key to Popery* (1732), Pope’s ‘key’ to the supposedly sinister meanings of *To Burlington*. The mock self-incriminating remarks with which Pope defended himself against the charges of attacking Bathurst and Bridgeman, were originally intended in jest, but I would argue that, in the process of writing the *Master Key*, his attitude towards Bathurst began to change. We can detect in his thinking the beginnings of real satire. As we saw from his letter acting as a preface to later editions of *To Burlington*, his new target became the ‘Meanness’ and ‘Miseries’ of the English aristocracy.

In designing the gardens at Marble Hill, Pope’s association with Bridgeman might appear to have been highly prestigious. Bridgeman had been apprentice to Wise and would become his successor as royal gardener in 1728. As a professional gardener, he was something of a rising star. Where, at first, the impression might be that it was Pope who stood to gain prestige by working with Bridgeman, in actual fact, the reverse was true: Bridgeman gained prestige by his association with Pope, his noble friends and the Prince of Wales. Pope’s amateur status as gardener kept him on a fairly equal footing with Bathurst and Peterborow, while, in his capacity of professional gardener, Bridgeman could not be anything other than their social inferior.

Nevertheless, Pope learned a great deal from Bridgeman and his high opinion of his abilities is shown in a letter of 1731 to John Knight where he presents Bridgeman’s Stowe in Buckinghamshire as the non plus ultra of the natural style of gardening: ‘if anything under Paradise could set me beyond all Earthly Cogitations; Stowe might do it’ (*Corr.*, III, 217).67 The owner of Stowe, Viscount Cobham, was a sound Whig and distinguished military man. Pope addressed one of his Moral Epistles to Cobham as one of the leading lords who had gone over to the Opposition as a result of the Excise Crisis. In the Epistle *To Burlington*, Pope’s admiration of the gardens at Stowe is, by metonymy, a tribute to their owner:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Still follow Sense, of ev'ry Art the Soul,} \\
\text{Parts answ'ring parts shall slide into a whole,} \\
\text{Spontaneous beauties all around advance,}
\end{align*}
\]

67 Pope’s esteem of Bridgeman is also shown in his letter to Oxford of 8 October 1724, quoted later in this chapter, *Corr.*, II, 264.
Start ev'n from Difficulty, strike from Chance;
Nature shall join you, Time shall make it grow
A Work to wonder at – perhaps a STOW.
(65-70, T. E. III. ii., 143)*

In *A Master Key to Popery*, Pope appears to express evidence of his high opinion of Bathurst and Bridgeman. I will begin with Pope's remarks on Bridgeman:

Here we have a fling at honest Bridgeman. I don't wonder to see his name at length, for he is his particular Acquaintance. What a Malicious Representation of one who lives by his profession, as taking pleasure to destroy and overflow Gentlemens fine Gardens!

The vast Parterres a thousand hands shall make
Lo Bridgeman comes, & floats them with a Lake.

As if he should have the Impudence, when a Gentleman has done a wrong thing at a great Expense, to come & pretend to make it a right one? Is it not his business to please Gentlemen? to execute Gentlemen's will and Pleasure, not his own? is he to set up his own Conceptions & Inventions against Gentlemen's fine Taste & Superior Genius? Yet is this what the Poet suggests, with intent (doubtless) to take the Bread out of his mouth, & ruin his Wife & Family.

*Prose Works*, II, 415-16

Pope presents himself in this 'key' as a spirit of mischief acting in outrageous independence of his patrons and, what is worse, maliciously attempting to sabotage the relationship that Bridgeman has with his patron. Although Pope ridiculed the suggestion that he had attacked Bridgeman, he nevertheless substituted 'COBHAM' for 'Bridgeman' in the 1735 editions of *To Burlington*. It is noticeable here how Pope classes Bridgeman as an employee of Cobham, paid simply to execute his patron's designs, whereas Pope stood by his reputation as his patrons' friend. By showing the limitations of the conventional patron-professional gardener relationship, Pope sets himself above such convention.69

Although Pope denied it, it is highly likely that Bathurst was indeed one of the foolish gardening lords that he had in mind in his Epistle *To Burlington*. There is no record that any pamphleteer took the lines in the Epistle *To Burlington* about Villario to be about Bathurst. There is also no evidence that Lord Hervey made this identification, as Pope suggests he did.

---

68 Bridgeman probably designed gardens for other influential patrons of Pope's. Peter Willis writes that Pope implies that Bridgeman may have advised Bolingbroke on Dawley's lay-out (see Pope's letter to Bridgeman, [1725], *Carr.*, II, 327) and points out that between 1720 and 1724 Bridgeman frequently visited Wimpole, Harley's seat, *Charles Bridgeman and the English Landscape Garden* (London: A. Zwemmer Ltd, 1977), pp. 79-80. 69 Pope's dismay that Bridgeman had taken offence at what had, so he said, been intended as praise in *To Burlington* is shown by his continuing preoccupation with the incident in his composition of his Epistle, *To Dr Arbuthnot*. A manuscript version of *To Dr Arbuthnot* pictures Pope cursing fame: 'If Bridgman, while his head contrives a Maze/ Good man, mistakes my Satyr from my Praise', *The Last and Greatest Art*, pp. 428-29.
in the *Master Key to Popery*. The Villario sketch attacks the destructive whimsy that results in the levelling of a garden:

> Behold Villario’s ten-years toil compleat;  
> His Quincunx darkens, his Espaliers meet,  
> The Wood supports the Plain, the parts unite,  
> And strength of Shade contends with strength of Light;  
> A waving Glow a bloomy beds display,  
> Blushing in bright diversities of day,  
> With silver-quiv’ring rills maeander’d o’er –  
> Enjoy them, you! Villario can no more;  
> Tir’d of the scene Parterres and Fountains yield,  
> He finds at last he better likes a Field.  
> (ll. 79-88, T. E. III. ii., 145-46)

In the *Master Key to Popery*, Pope seems to use Bathurst as a shield against the attacks on him for ingratitude to Chandos by suggesting that Bathurst is the model for Villario. That Pope himself makes the suggestion that Villario might be Bathurst, claiming that it is absurd, makes it entirely probable either that he did, in fact, have Bathurst in mind, amongst others, or, more likely, that this idea occurred to him in the process of writing the *Master Key*. Grounds for this speculation can be found in the way in which Pope’s later criticism of Bathurst, in the Epistle *To Bathurst* and *Epistle II. ii.*, are framed in the style of the *Master Key*: there also, Bathurst is accused of inconstancy, arbitrariness and vanity in his designs. In a private letter written in early 1733, Hervey makes no direct connection between Bathurst and Villario:

> [. . .] I know no other news, but that Pope has put out another Satire which he calls the *Use of Riches*, and dedicates to Lord Bathurst. He is so abusive in it, and in so much plainer terms than in his Chandois-performance of impertinent memory, that it is very probable some of those to whom he pretends to teach the proper use of riches may teach him the proper use of cudgels.\(^{70}\)

Hervey’s criticism seems to be fairly general and, without further evidence, the detail that Pope goes into in the *Master Key to Popery* to prove his innocence, while mocking the tortuoseness of his accusers, appears an over-reaction.

First, Pope pretends that Hervey might have been in league with the author of the Epistle *To Burlington*, by suggesting that Villario was Bathurst, since this would divert attention

---

\(^{70}\) To Henry Fox, [January 16] 1732/33, *Lord Hervey and his Friends*, p. 153-54.
from the attacks supposedly made on Burlington and Chandos: 'I wonder this piece of Malice has escap’d all the Criticks; and I suspect it was to screen this Author, that his gentle Friend Lord Fanny apply’d to this Nobleman the Character of Villario'. Then Pope goes on to ‘prove’ the malice of the portrait by defending Bathurst’s character:

For first, my Lord Bathurst is known to be of the most constant temper in the world in all his Pleasures. Secondly, he never was a Florist, is so much an Enemy to nice Parterres, that he never mows, but grazes them, & thirdly, has no water at Cirencester to squander away in Maeanders. I should rather think we are still at Chiswick, abusing all my Ld Burlington’s Friends & Neighbours. I know such a Garden, which has an Out-let too into the Fields, where this Nobleman sometimes takes the Air, the name of Villario shews him to live near the Town; where Flowers & Parterres are most in Vogue; & (which is more with me than all other circumstances) where this very Author has been often receiv’d in a manner far superiour to his deserts. (Prose Works, II, 414)

Pope links Burlington and Bathurst in self-defence, significantly, given what we know of his tendency to praise them in tandem. His humorous portrait of Bathurst allows him to make the enquiry into hidden meanings at once sinister and ridiculous. His indignant rebuttal, ‘Secondly, he never was a Florist, is so much an Enemy to nice Parterres, that he never mows, but grazes them’, also denigrates the decorative and formal approach to gardening over broader principles of garden design. Thus far, he is ludicrously scoring points.

More serious are Pope’s remarks in the Master Key concerning the destruction of ancient woodland. He appears to identify Bathurst with both Sabinus and his son: ‘If he [Lord Burlington] had one [a male heir], he had been probably treated like another of his Friends, the Lord Bathurst: whose noble Plantations at Cirencester he prophecy’s with like Malignity shall be destroy’d & lay’d levell by his Lordships Son; for which no doubt, that ingenious and sober young Gentleman is much oblig’d to him.’ The changes effected by Sabinus’ son recall Bathurst’s felling of trees at Cirencester: ‘Foe to the Dryads of his Father’s groves,/ One boundless Green, or flourish’d Carpet views,/ The thriving plants ignoble broomsticks made,/ Now sweep those Alleys they were born to shade’ (ll. 94-98). Pope’s note to line 96 again concerns the destruction of the forest trees:

Touches upon the ill taste of those who are so fond of Ever-greens (particularly Yews, which are the most tonsile) as to destroy the nobler Forest-trees, to make way for such little ornaments as Pyramids of dark-green, continually repeated, not unlike a Funeral procession. (T. E. III. ii., 146)
Pope's love of the natural landscape is shown by the image he creates of 'beautiful woods' which 'adorn' and 'defend' a man's house and his elevation of the 'nobler Forest-trees' above ever-greens which nevertheless aptly seem to mourn their loss. In a note added to the 1735 edition of the Epistle To Burlington, on lines 75-76, 'Or cut wide views thro' Mountains to the Plain,/ You'll wish your hill or shelter'd seat again', he once more calls attention to the destructive effects of thoughtless landscaping:

This was done in Hertfordshire, by a wealthy citizen, at the expence of above 5000 l. by which means (merely to overlook a dead plain) he let in the north-wind upon his house and parterre, which were before adorned and defended by beautiful woods. (T. E., III. ii., 144)

Bateson notes that this is a reference to Moor Park, Rickmansworth, where Swift had been secretary to Sir William Temple. These notes form part of a considerable body of evidence that shows how passionately Pope sought to defend the landscape, and, in particular, ancient woodland, against careless modern improvements.

Although the Master Key was not published, it was certainly circulated amongst Pope's friends and patrons. In his remarks on Bathurst in the Master Key, we might suppose that Pope is counting on his readers' knowledge of Bathurst's reputation as an easygoing, lackadaisical fellow. Significantly, however, while Pope's humorous treatment of the gardening debate has the effect of clearing him of charges of ingratitude towards Burlington, Chandos and Bathurst, his humour also makes Bathurst and his works look ridiculous. The archness that we saw in Bathurst's own self-mockery in his letters to Strafford — Bathurst alludes to his sophistication as much as to his frivolity and failings — is absent from Pope's depiction of him. We might gather from this how hard it is to be harsh with oneself or, more to the point, how little plain self-criticism contributes to witty conversation and writing. In his Epistle II. ii., when Pope criticizes Bathurst, the impression is that, though Bathurst appreciates and even relishes the hint of the ridiculous about himself, he does not know how truly ridiculous he is. We might think of a couplet from the Epistle To Dr Arbuthnot: 'Out with it, Dunciad! let the secret pass,/ That Secret to each Fool, that he's an Ass' (ll. 79-80, T. E. IV, 101).
As for Bathurst, it would seem that, until Pope’s outspoken criticism of him in his *Epistle* II. ii., published in 1737, he took a characteristically insouciant approach to Pope’s fault-finding. A letter from Bathurst to Henrietta Howard, dated July 1734, creates a sense of their shared view of Pope as a beloved but comically irritable character:

Pope endeavours to find faults here, but cannot; and instead of admiring (as he ought to do) what is already executed, he is every day drawing me a plan for some new building or other, and then is violently angry that it is not set up the next morning.\(^1\)

The above excerpt captures the hopelessness of what Pope appears to have tried to do with Bathurst. In his attempt to instil good taste into Bathurst, he appears only to have made things worse by urging him on to execute more designs. It is not surprising that, in time, a sense of futility began to oppress him in his friendship with Bathurst. Gradually, it would seem, he began to withdraw from Bathurst, no longer volunteering to collaborate with him. Where Bathurst had once only half-jokingly assumed the airs of a Restoration patron by summoning him to help him with his gardening designs, Pope now asserted the equality of their friendship by means of the freedom of his criticism.

\(^1\) Bathurst to Henrietta Howard, July 1734, *Letters to and from Henrietta, Countess of Suffolk, and her second husband, The Hon. George Berkeley*, II, 81.
iv) Pope's *Imitation of Horace, Epistle* II. ii.: friendship and dependence

We find in Pope's treatment of Bathurst in his *Epistle* II. ii. what at first appears to be a strange mixture of affection and mockery. Despite his criticism of Bathurst's use of wealth as evidenced in his gardening schemes, Pope's willingness to accommodate Bathurst is a mark of his gratitude towards him and his dependence upon him as his most supportive patron. In 1735, the year that he revised *To Burlington* to include a substantial new passage in praise of Bathurst, Pope wrote to him about Peterborow's death and Bolingbroke's fleeing from the country, suggesting that these three patrons were of the highest importance to him:

Let not th'insulting foe my fame pursue,
But shade those Laurels that were rais'd by You.

Do not think this a florid Flamm, 'tis the serious Wish of my heart, to be lov'd as much as you can, & protected by You. I feel the want of you in all my little distresses; if any other hurts me, I am like a Child that comes to complain to its best friend who has humourd it always; and if I play the fool, I want to complain to you against my self: I know you to be so much a better friend to me than myself. I think I am in an abandon'd state, if it is to be yet 2 months before you see the Town. Your Lordship is almost my only Prop. Two of those with whom my soul rested, & lean'd upon, are gone out of the Kingdom this Summer. Every one that makes Life enjoyable to me is absent now. The greatest pleasure I can have will be to have some glympse open'd of your more speedy Return: of which if there by any prospect, pray give it me. (Corr., III, 500)

Of the other patrons Pope numbers with Bathurst, Peterborow had died in Lisbon in 1735, while Bolingbroke had gone to France and did not return until 1738. The quotation is from Dryden's *Epistle To Congreve*, the last four lines of which run:

Let not the Insulting Foe my Fame pursue;
But shade those Lawrels which descend to You:
And take for Tribute what these Lines express:
You merit more; nor cou'd my Love do less.
(II. 74-77)\(^2\)

In his epistle, Dryden enlists Congreve, the younger man, as a defender of his own reputation after his death. There is clearly irony in the reversal of the situation with Pope, where he, as the younger man, enlists Bathurst, his elder by four years, as the protector of his

---

reputation. Where Dryden writes ‘But shade those Lawrels which descend to You’, Pope has ‘But shade those Laurels that were raisd by You’, another reversal, where he credits Bathurst for his poetic reputation and also entrusts it to him. Pope’s tribute speaks of a genuine admiration of Bathurst for his imaginative powers and his appreciation of literature, a measure of which we have seen in his correspondence both in his flexible handling of tone and his wearing his learning lightly. There is no suggestion that Pope has a successor for his laureateship.

Of all Pope’s patrons, Bathurst seems to have been the most valuable to him, both for the practical reasons that I have discussed but perhaps more for philosophical reasons, as a landed nobleman who was also an old-fashioned patron of men of letters. Pope expresses his dependence on Bathurst most intensely in a letter written in 1735:

You cannot know, how much I love you, & how gratefully I recollect all the Good & Obligation I owe to you for so many years. I really depend on no man so much in all my little distresses, or wish to live & share with no man so much in any Joys or pleasures. I think myself a poor unsupported, weak Individual without you. (Corr., III, 480-81)

In this letter, Pope’s expression of vulnerability appears genuine, owing to the sense of his real attachment to Bathurst. This rare instance of what seems to be Pope’s real expression of feeling towards a patron supports my argument that Bathurst was a more substantial influence on his life and work than has yet been recognized.

The importance of Bathurst’s patronage to Pope made it essential that he should be able to praise him truthfully in his poetry. Pope wrote with considerable freedom to Bathurst in the letter of 1728, where he criticized his ‘improvements’ to his house and park. Where, however, it was possible for Pope to complain sarcastically to Bathurst about his changeability in a private, unpublished letter, it was not possible for him explicitly to criticize the nobility in his poetry, as is clear first from the outcry against the Epistle To Burlington and, subsequently, from his defensive A Master Key to Popery and his additions to the 1735 editions of To Burlington. Given the risks of drawing his enemies’ fire and of jeopardising his friendship with Bathurst, how did Pope come to express his doubts about
Bathurst's use of wealth in his *Epistle* II. ii.?73 Specifically, in this poem, why did gardening become their main point of difference?

The motives behind Pope's criticism of Bathurst in verse can be traced first to the growing seriousness with which Pope was treating gardening in general and, secondly, to its place at the heart of their friendship. In the year before the publication of the *Epistle* II. ii., Pope described himself to Swift as 'as much a better Gardiner, as I'm a worst Poet, than when you saw me: But Gardening is near a-kin to Philosophy, for Tully says *Agricultura proxima sapientiae* (25 March 1736, *Corr.*, IV, 6). In November of the same year, he wrote that his 'Garden like my Life, seems to me every Year to want Correction & require alteration, I hope at least, for the better' (*Corr.*, IV, 40). Behind such comparisons is the conventional idea expressed in the adage 'As is the Gardener, so is the Garden'.74 In view of the fact that Bathurst was the gardening patron closest to Pope, it is not surprising that Bathurst's over-ambitious gardening designs became in Pope's verse a metaphor for his character and that both gardens and gardener seemed to him to require 'Correction' and 'alteration'. When his appeals to Bathurst's reason in his letters and in life failed, it would seem that, as a last resort at this late stage in their friendship, he turned to verse.

By 1737, Pope seems to have come to the conclusion that Bathurst's landscaping works were, disastrously, motivated by the 'pride or show' that he had castigated in *To Burlington*. Where the syntax of the description of landscaping in the 1735 editions of *To Burlington* creates the impression of a grand and noble enterprise free from personal pride, Pope's later passage on Bathurst and landscaping in his *Epistle* II. ii., echoes his early letter to the Blount sisters. The difference between the letter to the Blounts and the Epistle *To Burlington* is that the tone has shifted from light to dark, with the effect that the humour becomes pointed irony. Where in the Burlington passage, Bathurst's presence was subtly implied in Pope's vision of great stewardship and forestry and, as we will see, in the original, Horace describes in general terms the vanity of possessions and improvements, in his *Epistle* II. ii., Pope

---

73 As far as I can tell, there were no pamphlet attacks on Pope on account of his portrayal of Bathurst in *Epistle* II. ii.
74 Thomas Fuller, *Gnomologia: Adagies and Proverbs, Wise Sentences and Witty Sayings, Ancient and Modern, Foreign and British* (London, 1732), No. 701. I owe this quotation to *The Garden and the City*, p. 4.
makes his satire directly personal by naming Bathurst’s proposed works as examples of vain and misguided landscaping:

All vast Possessions (just the same the case
Whether you call them Villa, Park, or Chace)
Alas, my BATHURST! what will they avail?
Join Cotswold Hills to Saperton’s fair Dale,
Let rising Granaries and Temples here,
There mingled Farms and Pyramids appear,
Link Towns to Towns with Avenues of Oak,
Enclose whole Downs in Walls, ’tis all a joke!
Inexorable Death shall level all,
And Trees, and Stones, and Farms, and Farmer fall.
(ll. 254-63, T. E. IV, 183)

The above passage follows an exploration of the advantages of leasing rather than seeking to own property. In the course of this exploration, Pope has praised the poem’s probable addressee, Anthony Browne, for leasing Abscourt Farm near Walton-on-Thames. The desire to own property is presented as futile because ‘The Laws of God, as well as of the Land,/ Abhor, a Perpetuity should stand’ (ll. 246-47, T. E. IV, 183). Pope’s ten-line passage specifically about Bathurst is based on just three lines in Horace’s original epistle. In Horace, these three lines form part of a five-line passage:

Sic, quia perpetuus nulli datur usus, & haeres
Haaredem alterius, velut unda supervenit undam:
Quid vici prosunt, aut horrea? Quidve Calabris
Saltibus adiecti Lucani; si metit Orcus
Grandia cum parvis, non exorabilis auro?
(ll. 175-80, T. E. IV, 182)

Thus since the perpetual possession is given to none, and one man’s heir urges on another’s, as wave impels wave, of what importance are houses, or granaries; or what the Lucanian pastures joined to the Calabrian; if Hades, inexorable to gold, mows down the great together with the small?

Pope’s lines containing his direct address of Bathurst are immediately preceded by a condemnation of human vanity that marks a dramatic departure from the original Horace: ‘Man? and for ever? Wretch! what wou’dst thou have?/ Heir urges Heir, like Wave

---

75 Cirencester Park had two temples, ‘Hartley’s Temple’ and the ‘Horse Temple’. Rudder’s Plan of Home Park, A New History of Gloucestershire. Pope’s ‘Pyramids’ recall both the ‘solid Pyramid of 100 ft square’ with which he mockingly suggested Bathurst should fill his ‘bare Prospect’ in his letter to Bathurst, 15 September 1728, Corr., II, 517, and the ‘Pyramids of dark-green’ in the note to his Epistle To Burlington, which he described as ‘little ornaments’ which have required the destruction of ‘the nobler Forest-trees’, I, 96n., T. E. III. ii., 146.
76 The identity of the poem’s addressee remains uncertain; see T. E. IV, 164, 182-83.
77 Smart, p. 296.
impelling Wave’ (ll. 252-53, T. E. IV, 183). Such an introduction seems clearly to make Bathurst an example of the improper use of wealth. Where Pope congratulates the poem’s addressee for wisely leasing Abscourt Farm, he appears starkly to rebuke Bathurst for wasting time and money on improvements at Cirencester Park. Yet Stack has shown that Pope’s changes emphasize his ‘personal involvement’ in the ‘loss and failure implicit in Horace’s epistle’. As Stack points out, the most telling departure from the original is the poet’s direct address of his patron: ‘What a superb touch the possessive “my BATHURST” is’.  

The tone of Pope’s ten-line passage about Bathurst mingles affection with regret and disillusion so that the opening rhetorical question comes across as a sigh (l. 256). His mockery of Bathurst’s grand improvements mutates into regret with the tenderness of his address. Pope’s ‘alas’ recalls his early letter to Bathurst of 1719 where he jokingly lamented Bathurst’s intentions to execute his fantastic designs: ‘Alas what a Fall will that be?’ (Corr., II, 14). What appeared grand and noble in the 1735 To Burlington passage nevertheless now appears vain and self-important. In his Epistle II. ii., Pope again uses the impersonal ‘let’ construction in the command ‘Let rising Granaries and Temples here,/ There mingled Farms and Pyramids appear’, but where, in To Burlington, the use was justified by the grandeur of Pope’s vision (‘Let his plantations stretch from down to down,/ First shade a Country, and then raise a Town’, ll. 189-90, T. E. III. ii., 155), in the Epistle II. ii., the effect verges on the mock-heroic since the buildings and follies sprinkled around Bathurst’s lands do not match the tone set by the ‘let’ command: rather, an implication creeps in that the architect is puffed up with a pride that exceeds his works. The sense of failure that seems, at last, to characterize Pope’s view of his friendship with Bathurst was, if humorously, incipient in his view of Bathurst’s earliest projects.

In To Burlington, Bathurst’s and Pope’s proposed designs contribute towards the greatness of the nation, but, here, Bathurst’s ‘Granaries’ and ‘Farms’, serving the community and from

---

which Bathurst derived the entire income of his estate, are incongruously paired with landscape follies, ‘Temples’ and ‘Pyramids’. The implication might be that Bathurst does not grasp the importance of the balance between utility and beauty in the management of an estate. More generally, the impression is one of earthly impermanence: *sic transit gloria mundi*. The lightness of tone mutates into disturbing frivolity, suggesting a thoughtlessness and randomness that makes Bathurst appear ridiculous: notice how the trite rhyme ‘here’/‘appear’ nonchalantly conjures things into existence, as if by magic. We might here recall a letter of 1722 from Pope to Digby where Pope humorously refers to himself as a kind of magician in Bathurst’s landscape, joking about the many buildings and changes he and Bathurst projected:

I’m told you are all upon removal very speedily, and that Mrs Mary Digby talks in a Letter to Lady Scudamore, of seeing my Lord Bathurst’s Wood in her way. How much I wish to be her Guide thro’ that enchanted Forest, is not to be exprest: I look upon myself as the Magician appropriated to the place, without whom no mortal can penetrate into the Recesses of those sacred Shades. I could pass whole Days, in only describing to her the future, and as yet visionary Beauties, that are to rise in those Scenes: The Palace that is to be built, the Pavilions that are to glitter, the Colonades that are to adorn them: Nay more, the meeting of the *Thames* and the *Severn*, which (when the noble Owner has finer Dreams than ordinary) are to be led into each other’s Embraces thro’ secret Caverns of not above twelve or fifteen Miles, till they rise and openly celebrate their Marriage in the midst of an immense Amphitheatre, which is to be the Admiration of Posterity a hundred Years hence. But till the destin’d time shall arrive that is to manifest these Wonders, Mrs Digby must content herself with seeing what is at present no more than the finest wood in England. (Corr., II, 115-16)

Bathurst’s project of joining the Thames and the Severn, as I have mentioned in my previous chapter, was undertaken by his son, Henry Bathurst, 2nd Earl Bathurst, fourteen years after his death. Where, in 1722, there is a kind of humorous enchantment to Bathurst and his park, by 1737, the charm has worn off. It is likely that, for Pope, the enchantment of Bathurst’s plans lay in the fact that they belonged to the realm of the imagination: in his humorous description of the joining of the two rivers and the amphitheatre, Pope does not suggest that he expects Bathurst ever to attempt to execute his designs. Initially, it would seem that his friendship with Bathurst was based on what he mistakenly took to be their shared understanding that what was delightful to imagine would be pure folly in reality.

In the *Epistle* II. ii., we see Bathurst’s failure to live up to Pope’s expectations. The description of Bathurst’s landscaping activities, actual and future, is no longer sublimely
impersonal but appears egotistical. There are echoes of the letter to the Blount sisters in the use of transitive verbs. Where in Pope's letter to the Blounts, the list of activities ran 'open Avenues, cut Glades, plant Firrs, contrive waterworks', so in the Epistle II. ii., there is a similar pattern: 'Join Cotswold Hills to Saperton's fair Dale/... Link Towns to Towns with Avenues of Oak,/ 'tis all a joke!' The rhyme recalls Bathurst's 'joke' in To Bathurst: 'You hold the word, from Jove to Momus giv'n,/ That Man was made the standing jest of Heav'n' (ll. 3-4, T. E. III. ii., 83). The lightheartedness of the earlier letter owes its tone to the early days of their friendship where Pope could laugh along with Bathurst at his schemes: at that time, Bathurst's plans appear relatively modest and, in Pope's letter to Digby of 1722, charmingly unrealizable. A further echo from his correspondence is found in Pope's letter to Bathurst of 1730 where he complained of Bathurst's neglect: 'I also am sensible, that many Great & Noble Works, worthy a large Mind & Fortune, have employ'd your cares & time; such as Enclosing a Province with Walls of Stone, planting a whole Country with Clumps of Firrs, digging Wells (which were extremely wanted in those parts for the very necessities of Life) as deep as to the Center, erecting Palaces, raising Mounts, undermining High ways, & making Communications by Bridges' (Corr., III, 130). That Pope chose to select from this satirical description of Bathurst's supposedly great enterprises the scheme about 'Enclosing a Province with Walls of Stone', altering it slightly in his Epistle II. ii. to 'Enclose whole Downs in Walls' (l. 61), indicates his shock at Bathurst's disregard for 'the Genius of the Place' in his urge to put his stamp on a landscape treated as just another of his 'vast Possessions' (l. 254).

By 1737, it would seem that Pope's enthusiasm for Bathurst's schemes had gone. While it clearly made sense for Pope to please or humour Bathurst in the early days, the tone of the early poetry suggests that his expression of pleasure was sincere. As Bathurst changed, growing more ambitious in his projects, so Pope's attitude towards him changed. Pope's objection to Bathurst and Burlington lay in their failure to make proper use of their wealth. Faced with Bathurst's works, in particular, it would seem that Pope's response became
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increasingly like the reaction of visitors to Timon’s villa in To Burlington: “‘What sums are thrown away!’” (l. 100, T. E. III. ii., 147). Pope’s employment of satire in his treatment of Bathurst can be traced to his own self-scrutiny: as the poet of such a patron, his own reputation was at stake. In this light, a charge of ingratitude might be ruled out. Far from acting inconsistently in his public criticism of Bathurst in Epistle II. ii., Pope’s rebuke appears entirely in keeping with his understanding of his role as a poet. There are, nevertheless, certain elements of his criticism of Bathurst in the Epistle which seem to contradict such high-minded motives.

It is useful to compare the Epistle II. ii. with a further passage from To Burlington where similar syntax is used to describe landscape designs but with different effects. I am thinking here of the well-known passage beginning ‘Consult the Genius of the Place in all’ (l. 57). Here it is not man, but the ‘Genius of the Place’ that performs the real design work: ‘Calls in the Country, catches opening glades,/ Joins willing woods, and varies shades from shades,/ Now breaks or now directs, th’intending Lines;/ Paints as you plant, and, as you work, designs’ (ll. 61-64, T. E. III. ii., 142-43). When we put Pope’s description of Bathurst’s project to join ‘Join Cotswold Hills to Saperton’s fair Dale’ side by side with his earlier suggestion that it is the ‘Genius of the Place’ that rightly ‘Joins willing woods’, Bathurst’s later plans appear ridiculously arrogant. In his Epistle II. ii., Pope’s tone implies that, despite his good heart, Bathurst is now dangerously close to displaying Timon-like characteristics.*

Pope’s ending his list of Bathurst’s plans with ‘‘tis all a joke!’ is all the more apt, considering what we know about Bathurst’s description of himself as a man ‘resolv’d to laugh’. Pope turns the tables on Bathurst with this grim joke made at Bathurst’s expense.

Death is one thing, the sardonic tone implies, that Bathurst will not be able to laugh off. We are left at the end of the passage with a humbling list of what Bathurst’s schemes will degenerate into: ‘Inexorable Death shall level all,/ And Trees, and Stones, and Farms, and Farmer fall’ (ll. 262-63). There seems to be a macabre joke on ‘level’; given what we know

---

80 A letter of Pope’s to Digby, 12 August [1725], in which he jokes about the wild ambition of some of Bathurst’s schemes prefigures Pope’s later satire. Sherburn notes that the evidence of Pope’s textual revisions suggests that Bathurst ‘did not altogether relish this letter’, Corr., II, 314-15 and 314n.
of Bathurst's apparent obsession with levelling, we might imagine his surprise at finding himself 'out-levelled' by time in this poem. Pope's incorporation of Bathurst's idiosyncrasies (his love of a joke and, particularly, his fondness for levelling and for telling people about his levelling activities) conveys the distinctiveness of his personality. Pope's use of these idiosyncrasies against Bathurst shows something of the unsparing attitude of his keenest satire. It is at this point in the Epistle that Pope's criticism of Bathurst's works seems to take on a deeply personal character. Although Pope seems to reserve judgement on Bathurst (in that there is still hope that he might make better use of his wealth), the personal element in his ridicule of Bathurst's works comes close to direct criticism of Bathurst himself. In the light of the tradition, 'As is the Gardener, so is the Garden', Bathurst becomes a ridiculous example of 'the misery of affluence'. Yet Pope's satirical mimicry of Bathurst is subdued by the tone of his opening, with its regret that Bathurst has, so far, failed to achieve the self-knowledge to which Pope had prompted him in To Bathurst. The final couplet of the passage on Bathurst makes a link with its opening, referring to the social pretensions that often come with architectural and landscaping projects: 'All vast Possessions (just the same the case/ Whether you call them Villa, Park, or Chace)' (ll. 254-55). The modish terms, 'Villa, Park, or Chace', seem to indicate that Bathurst should know better than to fall for the lastest jargon for 'improvements'. Pope appears here to choose to elevate the nameless Man of Ross over Bathurst, while he humbles Bathurst by calling him a mere 'Farmer', last in the list of elements in what amounts to a pile of rubble, Bathurst's once great works.

For a background to Pope's apparent humbling of Bathurst, we might turn to a letter from Bathurst to Swift where Bathurst conventionally excuses himself for not being able to come up with witty stories because he has been immersed in the country. The letter is dated 6 December 1737 and Bathurst's address is 'Scarcliffe farm':

I have attended Parl many years, and never found that I cou'd doe any good; I have therefore enter'd upon a new Scheme of life, & am determin'd to look after my own affairs a

---

81 Bolingbroke's teasing letter to Bathurst of 1730 opens 'Are you planting? Are you levelling? What are you doing?', quoted in Hussey, 'Cirencester House - II: The Park', p. 1884. Bathurst's letters to Strafford and to Pope in 1736 revolve around 'all this levelling work', BL, Add. MS 22221, f. 140, and report his having 'begun to level the hill before the house', Bathurst to Pope, 14 August 1736, Corr., IV, 25.
little, I am now in a small Farm-House in Darby Shire, & my chief business is to take care that my Agents don't impose upon my tenants [sic.]. I am for letting them all good bargains that my Rents may be pay'd as long as any rents can be pay'd, & when the time comes that there is no money, they are honest fellows & will bring me in wt corn & cattle I shall want [...]

Since I found by yr last that yr hand and yr head are both in so good a Condition lett me hear from yu sometimes, & don't be discourag'd that I send yu nothing worth reading now, I have talket with no body for some time together but Farmers & Plowmen, when I come into good Company again I may possibly be less insipid, but in wt ever condition I am, I shall always be most ambitious of yr friendship, & most desirous of yr Esteem, being most faithfully & sincerely/ Dear Sr/ yr obedient humble servt/ Bathurst

Although we have no reason to doubt that Bathurst was a fair landlord, he does appear a little calculating in his presentation of himself in a good light, trying, as it would seem, to impress Swift with a modest account of his just management of his farms. But the tone of his sign-off has a note of desperation. It is tempting to speculate about whether Pope and Swift might have exchanged opinions about Bathurst's attitude to farming and farmers during Swift's long stays at Twickenham. Given Pope's obsessive interest in letters and their publication, it is likely that he might have seen this letter, or at least heard of it. To return, though, to the Epistle II. ii., we might now interpret Pope's reference to Bathurst as a 'Farmer' as his means of insinuating that Bathurst's 'politeness', seen in the natural distinction he draws for Swift between 'good Company' and the company of farmers, blinds him to his own vanity.

A letter from Pope to Bathurst first published in 1996 sheds further light on his concerns about Bathurst's stewardship. The letter is dated 8 October 1737 and refers to a visit he has paid to Bathurst in that year. His excuse for not writing earlier probably concerns the publication of the Letters of 1737: 'What has made me so remiss in writing, was what corrupts & degenerates all mankind, the Study of money, & Encrease of Fortune, whereby I find my self richer this month than the last by 300l.' Erskine-Hill points out what might be a coincidental echo of the line 'The proper study of Mankind is Man' from An Essay on Man (1734, II, 2, T. E. III. ii., 142-43); the inference follows that the improper study of mankind is money, a witty point if Bathurst recognised the connection, and perhaps a self-mocking

---

* The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, V, 78-80.
* I am very grateful to Professor Erskine-Hill for drawing my attention to this letter.
* For this and all further references to Pope's letter of 8 October 1737, see Alexander Pope: A Letter to Lord Bathurst, ed. by Erskine-Hill (Foundling Press, 1996).
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reference to Pope’s own reputation as a poet writing in the gentlemanly tradition of English
drama, for instance, in a function not directly related to his poetry. Erskine-Hill describes this letter as ‘an informal and friendly Horatian discourse about
whether it is better to seek satisfaction in one’s lifetime, which is Pope’s professed position
here, or in the hope of fame after one’s death, which is the position he attributes to his
literary friend “the Dean”, Jonathan Swift’. The second echo of Pope’s verse in the letter
suggests that Pope might not merely be contrasting himself with Swift in his method of
seeking satisfaction but also, indirectly, with Bathurst. Comparing himself with Swift, Pope
writes:

For my part, I like better to live upon Enjoyable annuities for life, than the most glorious
Imaginary Perpetuities: A few good Deeds done me, a few valuable Friendships allowed me,
as I want them, & while I can be sensible to them, are what I pray for & am content with; and I
do not exaggerate the matter at all, when I say I prefer some ten or twelve months of my whole
life spent at Cirencester, Dawley, & so forth, to a long & glorious Reign of an hundred years
upon Parnassus after my death.

As Erskine-Hill points out, the phrase ‘the most glorious Imaginary Perpetuities’ echoes
Pope’s *Imitation of Horace, Epistle* II. ii.: ‘The Laws of God, as well as of the Land,/ Abhor,
a *Perpetuity* should stand’ (ll. 246-47). These lines come immediately before lines which
are, in turn, linked to the Epistle *To Bathurst*, so that a close reader of Pope’s verse is led to
compare ‘Estates have wings, and hang in Fortune’s pow’r/ Loose on the point of ev’ry
wav’ring Hour’ (*Ep. II. ii.*, ll. 248-49, T. E. IV, 183) with ‘Riches, like insects, when
conceal’d they lie,/ Wait but for wings, and in their season, fly’ (*To Bathurst*, ll. 171-72, T.
E. III. ii., 107), both allusions to *Proverbs* XXIII, 22: ‘Wilt thou set thine eyes upon that
which is not? for riches certainly make themselves wings; they fly away as an eagle towards
heaven’.

Both descriptions of the elusive nature of wealth in Pope’s verse thus illuminate his direct
address to Bathurst in the succeeding lines of his *Epistle* II. ii., published in April 1937. In
his letter of October 1737, Pope’s mention of his ‘Enjoyable annuities for life’ seems to be a
hint that he depends on Bathurst’s ensuring that his own estates prosper, avoiding the fate of
those he has described in his *Epistle* II. ii.. In this light, Pope’s humorous suggestion that
Swift’s living for posterity makes for poor ethics barely conceals his anxieties in this letter about Bathurst’s use of wealth. In retrospect, writing about six months after his publication of the *Epistle* II. ii., Pope might have reflected that Bathurst seemed set to outdo Swift in folly because, unlike Swift’s works, his extravagant building projects threatened to amount to nothing both in this life and in the next: ‘All vast Possessions (just the same the case/ Whether you call them Villa, Park, or Chace)/ Alas, my BATHURST! what will they avail?’ (*Ep.* II. ii., ll. 254-56, T. E. IV, 183).

Pope’s somewhat tutelary preoccupation with good stewardship in his relationship with Bathurst is again demonstrated in a letter of 23 November 1738 where he writes to him of the Prince of Wales’ neglect of his estate in Cornwall:

... I am told that his estate there is miserably neglected, to the annual loss of about 20,000l. You see, my lord, I acquaint myself a little with the value of estates; and it is no compliment to you to tell you, I am grieved extremely, when any friend of mine, or any good and beneficent man, even though he be a prince, loses too lightly his just rights and advantages, whereby the bounty of the greatest, and the quiet and independency of the meanest members of a community, is checked, if not destroyed; lessened, if not lost. So though I wish with you, my lord, that your labour and trouble were over, I do not wish your care so. Besides, as you are my financier, when you enrich yourself, you enrich and secure me, who consider myself as one of your children, and I hope the poorest of them, but, however, one whom you have taken very good care of, these very many years. (Corr., IV, 148-49)

The contrast that Pope makes between the Prince of Wales’ neglect of his estate and Bathurst’s good stewardship both acts as praise and warning: the subtle hints and affected nonchalance of Pope’s letter of October 1737 have given way to direct address and unconcealed anxiety. He encourages Bathurst to take care of his estate for the sake of virtue while seemingly contradicting himself with the self-interested reminder of Bathurst’s financial responsibilities to himself as his investor. Pope’s warnings to Bathurst were clearly based in fact since, in the following year, Bathurst’s reckless over-spending forced him to sell Richings Park to Lord Hertford.\(^5\)

In his last surviving letter to Pope, written the year before the publication of the *Epistle* II. ii., Bathurst hopes for a visit from Pope and, as usual, writes of some architectural plans on

---

\(^5\) Lees-Milne, p. 35.
which he seeks his advice. Amongst these, Bathurst refers to plans for an obelisque, attributing this particular design to Pope:

> Nothing is wanting but your direction to set the work forward. I have also begun to level the hill before the house, and an obelisk shall rise upon your orders to terminate the view. I am sure you will not now make any feigned excuse, and I hope you will have no real one to prevent your coming. (14 August 1736, Corr., IV, 25)

It would seem from Bathurst’s teasing Pope about a ‘feigned excuse’ that he is aware of a possible reluctance on Pope’s part to make the journey to Cirencester. Pope’s misgivings about Bathurst were most likely intensified by this letter; Bathurst’s plan for an obelisque necessitated further levelling, possibly involving the felling of trees that he had urged him against. It is highly likely that Bathurst’s letter exacerbated Pope’s irritation with his improvements and provided him with the material for satire that emerges in his Epistle II. ii..

Pope’s last letter to Bathurst is dated 28 April 1741 and concerns the marriage of William, 4th Earl of Strafford and Anne, second daughter of the 2nd Duke of Argyle. The young earl was a distant relation of Bathurst. Pope directs Bathurst to turn his thoughts from the worldly success of this marriage to their own friendship:

> [...] recollect your present, cooler age, of Friendship & Philosophy: And in that recollection, remember one, who has out-lasted twenty, (or twenty thousand) of your Mistresses, in affection, attachment, & gratitude to you. If you should leave this world (I mean this corrupt & corruptible world within the Vortex of the Court & City) without One sober Visit, one Spiritual Retreat, to Twickenam and the Grotto of Friendship & Liberty; whatever you may hope to do with your Electors, you can never answer it to the Muses. (Corr., IV, 342)

Whereas in his letter of 1736 Bathurst invited Pope to come to view his latest levelling and to set in motion his plans for his latest monument, Pope here invites Bathurst to his otherworldly grotto. Although he jokingly refers to Bathurst’s reputation as an old-fashioned rake, the tone of his reproach has a degree of seriousness. Pope’s parenthetical suggestion that Bathurst is part of the ‘corrupt and corruptible world’ is a reference to Bathurst’s new Court appointments of Privy Councillor and Captain of the Band of Gentlemen Pensioners. Walpole had resigned in February of that year. The impression is that Pope has almost given up on Bathurst, but his affection for him is still strong enough to hope that he will visit him once more at Twickenham and, by doing so, prove that ‘Friendship & Philosophy’ matter

---

86 For further details of Bathurst’s involvement with the Court at this time, see Colley, p. 138.
more to him than 'the Vortex of the Court & City'. Pope's moving appeal, 'remember one', recalls his letter to Bathurst of 1735 where he appealed to Bathurst to defend his reputation after his death with his variation on Dryden's Epistle To Congreve. Pope's final warning, 'whatever you may hope to do with your Electors, you can never answer it to the Muses', also recalls his earlier hopes that Bathurst would be as loyal to him in death, as he had once seemed in life.

Pope's mockery of Bathurst's gardening projects and the high value that he set on him as his patron are so far from being contradictory that they can exist in the same poem, the Epistle II. ii. Pope's admonishments are at once rooted in the classical tradition by which a poet reminds the Great of their responsibility to society and strikingly modern in that he makes them on the equal terms of friendship. In this regard, in this poem and, to a lesser extent, in his Epistles Of the Use of Riches, he does for Burlington and Bathurst what he regretted, in his Epistle I. i., that Bolingbroke, as a friend and patron, could not do for him. Pope's role of poet gave him the licence to rebuke his patrons, who he insisted were also his friends, when they needed it. Where such behaviour from poet to patron might once have been seen as an outrageous liberty, the fact that, by his Epistle II. ii., Pope could immortalize his patrons not merely for their virtues but for their follies, might be thought to signal a remarkable change in the status of poets in society.

Although in 1723 Pope paid tribute to Swift for having taught him the 'Top-pleasure' of his life, 'how to gain, & how to use the Freedomes of Friendship with Men much my Superiors', my exploration of Pope's relationships with Burlington and Bathurst has shown how hard-won was this greatest of pleasures. The transitional nature of poets' relationships with their patrons in the early eighteenth century created the conditions for Pope's most difficult of balancing acts. His privileged relationships with his patrons depended on the projection of his self-image as a gentlemanly amateur and yet were underpinned by his exceptionally profitable relationships with booksellers. Whereas in the past, a poet's relationship with a patron had been governed by need, Pope could claim that his relationships with his patrons were governed both by need and friendship, although this
claim was strictly true only of his relationship with Bathurst. My research has shown that Pope's patrons were important to him even after he had achieved financial independence: patronage still mattered a great deal in the early eighteenth century.
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