



# The swift-pope "Miscellanies" of 1732

## Citation

Sherburn, George. 1952. The swift-pope "Miscellanies" of 1732. Harvard Library Bulletin VI (3), Autumn 1952: 387-390.

## Permanent link

<https://nrs.harvard.edu/URN-3:HUL.INSTREPOS:37363613>

## Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

## Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.  
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

Presumably Phillips was not responsible for the alteration of the 1661 title to *The Religion of the Hypocritical Presbyterians*; if he had had anything to do with the edition, he would not have allowed the text to be based on the earlier printed version. Furthermore, it must be remembered that 'Presbyterian,' particularly after the Restoration, was frequently used in the generic sense of 'Puritan' instead of in the more restricted sense. In other works as well, Phillips did not make a fine distinction between Puritan and Presbyterian. He was aware, however, that 'Presbyterian' could be used to include more than one sect; for when he wrote against the vindication of the Catholics, he explained:

These men . . . would fain throw their Crimes upon the *Presbyterians*; under that Notion aiming at the whole Body of the Protestants in general.<sup>42</sup>

Nothing John Phillips wrote in all the subsequent years of his literary career was so popular as *A Satyr against Hypocrites*. We can only regret that, once he had found his true vein of expression, he did not exploit it further. The pride which he him-

<sup>42</sup> Dr. Oates's *Narrative of the Popish Plot, Vindicated* (London, 1680), sig. Orr (p. 49).

self took in the work is indicated in one of the contemporary references to him:

Then firing a *Volley of half Oaths, and compleat Ones,*  
He heartily swears both by *little and great Ones;*  
They may talk what they will, but there ne'er was a *Satyr*  
Since *His* against *Hypocrites* writ, wou'd hold *Water*.<sup>43</sup>

Although the wit and humor of the *Satyr* must have been admired even during the Commonwealth era, its greatest success naturally came after the Restoration. It is of special value historically because it offers a vivid though unquestionably biased description of religious abuses at the very time they were taking place. The images, drawn as they are with such striking realism and biting satire, are not easily forgotten. Despite later misrepresentation of his purpose, Phillips succeeded in exposing the hypocrisy of those who used the sham of self-righteousness to hide their own immorality. His moral serves for all times.

FREDERICK L. BEATY

<sup>43</sup> *A Search after Wit; or, a Visitation of the Authors* (London, 1691), sig. Bar (p. 3).

## The Swift-Pope *Miscellanies* of 1732

**A** HITHERTO unknown document in the hand of Jonathan Swift, recently acquired by the Harvard College Library, helps to clarify the confused proceedings that accompanied the publication in October 1732 of the final volume of the *Swift-Pope Miscellanies*. One may re-

call that the third volume of these *Miscellanies* (March 1727/8) was called on the title-page 'the last,' though already a fourth was contemplated; and now in 1732 this final volume is called 'the third.' Further complexities arose over difficulty with the booksellers employed.

Benjamin Motte was Swift's preferred publisher in London. He had done *Gulliver's Travels*, and, by an agreement signed by Swift and Pope on 29 March 1727, had been employed as publisher of the first three volumes of *Miscellanies*. The 'last' volume (1728) had been delayed because Pope got more interested than he intended in his new poem, *The Dunciad*. This was to have been the first piece in the 'last' volume, but, perceiving its sensational value, Pope decided to publish it separately, and substituted his *Peri Bathous* in the *Miscellanies*. The failure to secure *The Dunciad* evidently irked Motte, and Motte's failure to fulfill monetary aspects of the agreement of 29 March annoyed Pope. This agreement is printed in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for October 1855 (p. 363), and there is a signed manuscript copy in the Pierpont Morgan Library. The comment in the *Gentleman's Magazine* (p. 366) is not in accord with the documents presented. The agreement stipulated that Motte should pay the authors within four months after publication. Only strong-arm treatment by Pope made him complete his due payments *fifteen months* later. Motte got his receipt 1 July 1729. The correspondence between him and Pope is to be found in Elwin-Courthope (Pope's *Works*, IX, 524-529) and in Ball's edition of Swift's *Correspondence* (IV, 480-487). In January 1729 Pope wrote that if and when this past agreement was fulfilled, he would give Motte full title to the first three volumes, and for an additional £25 would give him a title to the projected final volume when it appeared — 'to which you shall have liberty on my word to

add the poem' (i.e., to reprint *The Dunciad*).

Further correspondence implies that when Motte got his full discharge from Pope on 1 July 1729, both of them were inclined to call it quits, and Pope seemed at liberty to employ anyone — as presently he did employ his current bookseller, Lawton Gilliver — to bring out the final volume of *Miscellanies*.

Elrington Ball (Swift's *Correspondence*, IV, 342 n. 2) has told the story of this volume in a fashion needlessly prejudicial to Pope. Swift and Pope had made the agreement of March 1727 with Motte jointly, and there is no evidence of real profit-mongering on Pope's part in 1732; it was Motte's failure to pay according to past agreement that had annoyed Pope. It is not quite true, as Ball says, that the correspondence concerning the fourth volume 'has been destroyed.' Not all of it has survived, but much has.

For example, on 12 June 1732 Swift replies to Pope's request for copy for the volume, and depreciates the quality of the pieces he has to offer. Swift seems at no time eager to have this volume appear; but that attitude is a common pose with him, and since he is dealing with three agents for the publication of his 'little accidental things,' one must conclude that he was not averse to publication in itself. The truth seems to be that in trying to be kind to all he succeeded only in being difficult. He was not eager to let Pope publish, but he does not refuse, and in fact (Ball, IV, 307-309) practically tells Pope what he may publish.

Swift found a second agent in Motte, who, learning that Pope planned a final volume, suddenly began to take an in-

terest in the matter. This surprised Pope (Elwin-Courthope, IX, 529), who had employed Gilliver, but presently allowed Motte to join Gilliver as publisher. Both names appear on the title-page.

But meanwhile Swift began dealing with a third agent — his not too creditable protégé the Reverend Matthew Pilkington. In the summer of 1732 Swift secured for Pilkington the post of chaplain to the current Lord Mayor of London (Alderman Barber), and gave the clergyman a curious document conveying publication rights in some of his works to Pilkington — who wished to use William Bowyer of London as publisher. This is the document in Swift's hand already mentioned as now in the Harvard Library. It is very characteristic of Swift, and reads as follows:

Whereas severall scattered Papers in prose and verse for three or four years last past, were printed in Dublin, by Mr George Faulkner, some of which were sent in Manuscript to Mr William Bowyer of London, Printer, which pieces are Supposed to be written by me, and are now by the means of the Reverend Mathew Pilkington who delivered or sent them to the sd Faulkner and Bowyer, become the Property of the sd Faulkner and Bowyer, I do here without specifying the sd Papers, give up all manner of right I may be thought to have in the sd Papers, to Mr Mathew Pilkington aforesd, who informs me that he intends to give up the sd right to Mr Bowyer aforesd.

Witness my hand. Jul. 22. 1732 /  
Jonath: Swift.

From the Deanry-house in Dublin, the day and year above written.

The striking thing about this document is the fact that the works con-

veyed to Pilkington are nowhere in it named — a fact which of course made the document legally of little value. Since Pilkington in a letter to Bowyer of 28 August 1732 (Ball, IV, 483-484) gives a list of eighteen works that Swift has given him, we do know what the pieces were. Several of the things Swift seems also to have sent to Pope; for at least eight of them appear in the 1732 volume of *Miscellanies* — a volume very largely composed of Swift's work. What, if anything, Swift sent directly to Motte we do not know; but his desire to have Motte remain his sole London publisher is strongly expressed in his letter to Motte of 15 July 1732 (Ball, IV, 317), and it doubtless influenced Pope to employ Motte with Gilliver and to neglect Bowyer. Swift was apparently unaware of Motte's part in the publication, since he writes, a month after the volume is out, to Motte (4 November 1732) complaining of the volume, and saying, 'I have sent a kind of certificate owning my consent to the publishing this last Miscellany, against my will. . . .' The certificate was not preserved by Gilliver, Pope, or Motte, apparently.

Meanwhile, (also in November?) Pope writes to Pilkington to report on information that he has had from Swift:

. . . the Dean answered no man had any title from him more than Curll. Nevertheless I writ again that Bowyer had something under his hand. He answered, his intention was nothing of a perpetuity, but a leave only to reprint [to] Mr. Faulkner and him, with promise not to molest them. . . . (Ball, IV, 485).

Pope hereupon leaves the dispute to Gilliver and Bowyer to settle: he has no more to say about it.

Nor had Swift, so far as we know. Pope had protested to Gay against Swift's dealings with other agents, having heard that 'Motte and another idle fellow [Pilkington?] . . . have been writing to the Dean to get him to give them some copyright. . . . Surely I should be a properer person to trust the distribution of his works with, than a common bookseller.' This remark Gay retailed to Swift in a letter of 28 August 1732. The document

here first printed had already been composed — with no works named in it. Doubtless the absence of titles in it was a part of Swift's fixed policy of not admitting authorship of anything. His dealings with three agents led to a recording of the titles involved, and to some slight unpleasantness with his agents. The affair is a curious example of his attitude towards publication — secretive, but very casual.

GEORGE SHERBURN

## Dividing Library Catalogues

A PROPOSAL for consolidation of the two Widener catalogues, as outlined in the Winter 1949 and Winter 1950 issues of the *BULLETIN*, was discussed over a period of three years by the Library Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the Library staff, and, toward the end of that period, administrative officers of the University. The final decision was that it would be unwise to carry out the proposed merger at this time. Division of the catalogue or catalogues into two or more alphabets has also been under consideration during this period. If the verdict on consolidation had been favorable it would have been necessary to reach a decision on division at once, for the two projects ought to have been carried out together. There is now no urgency; either or both of the catalogues could be divided at any time, but it has been decided that action ought to be postponed indefinitely.

It is always easy to suggest changes in library records and procedures, but, generally speaking, it is desirable to

put off expensive reorganizations until there seems to be a real necessity for them; sometimes it turns out that they never become essential. Thoroughgoing discussion of such proposals is desirable, however, in order to make sure that they are not rejected simply because of inertia. Division of the Widener catalogues has been debated at length, and may need to be considered again five or ten years from now; consequently it seems worth while to summarize the arguments for and against division that have been presented during recent months.

The public catalogue will probably outgrow its present room within ten years, and some of the cards will then presumably have to go either into the reading room, where readers will be disturbed by an intrusion of the catalogue, or into the marble lobby, which is cold and drafty during the winter and is ill designed, both practically and aesthetically, for the housing of catalogue cases and consultation tables. At that time, if a printed catalogue has not yet replaced the cards, it will be neces-

## List of Contributors

WILLIAM VAN LENNEP, Curator of the Theatre Collection in the Harvard College Library

LESLIE MAHIN OLIVER, Assistant to the Librarian in the Houghton Library, Harvard University

WILLIAM A. JACKSON, Professor of Bibliography and Assistant Librarian of the College Library in charge of the Houghton Library, Harvard University

EDWIN E. WILLIAMS, Chief of the Acquisition Department of the Harvard College Library

GÉRAUD VENZAC, Professeur à l'Institut Catholique de Paris

ANNA C. HOLT, Librarian of the Faculty of Medicine and School of Public Health, Harvard University

ARCHIBALD T. DAVISON, James Edward Ditson Professor of Music and Curator of the Isham Memorial Library, Harvard University

FREDERICK L. BEATY, Harvard University

GEORGE SHERBURN, Professor of English, Emeritus, Harvard University

KEYES D. METCALF, Professor of Bibliography, Director of the Harvard University Library, and Librarian of Harvard College

ROBERT F. METZDORF, Secretary of the Boswell Editorial Committee and Curator of Manuscripts, Yale University Library

DMITRY CIZEVSKY, Lecturer on Slavic, Harvard University

PHILIP HOFER, Lecturer on Fine Arts, Curator of Printing and Graphic Arts in the College Library, and Secretary of the William Hayes Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University