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Abstract of Thesis

Part 1: Commentary

An Introduction discusses the nature and subject-matter of Monboddo's printed works, and modern reaction to them, as well as identifying the principal task of the present thesis: an examination of Monboddo's views on poetry, and the presentation of an edited text of some of the principal MSS in which these views are expressed.

Chapter 1 traces the genesis of an unpublished Volume VII of Monboddo's Of the Origin and Progress of Language, and infers its intended form from the MSS incorporated in Part 2.

Chapter 2 examines and evaluates Monboddo's writings on aesthetics as contained in both the published works (Origin and Progress and Antient Metaphysics) and unpublished MSS. His opposition to the prevalent empiricist school, and to the inner sense theorists, is demonstrated. Unresolved tensions in Monboddo's own theory of poetic imitation are attributed to his espousal of incompatible Aristotelian and Platonic doctrines; Monboddo's rationalist theory of beauty, asserting it to consist in system, is analyzed, and his debt to Shaftesbury commented on. Monboddo's concessions to the cult of sensibility are noted, and the rationale by which he applies his aesthetics to literary criticism studied. Monboddo's relations with other critics, particularly Dr. Johnson, are documented.

Chapter 3 assesses the state of prosodic theory at the time Monboddo wrote, then investigates his own view that modern scansion is a degenerate form of the classical; and places his views in context against those of his acquaintances.
Chapter 4 assembles a collection of Monboddo's criticism of individual poets, drawn from his printed and MS writings. Homer is identified as the standard against which all modern poetry is to be measured. The entire medieval era Monboddo dismisses out of hand. Shakespeare's "barbarity" is censured, but his characters praised. Monboddo's informed and valuable criticism of both the style and content of Milton's poetry is examined in depth, and the prosodic licence of Monboddo's interpretation of Dryden's Alexander's Feast criticized. Shaftesbury Monboddo praises; Pope (although decadently Gallic in style) is esteemed as a satiric force, as is Swift; Fielding's use of epic devices, however, is censured. Thomson's Castle of Indolence and Armstrong's Art of Preserving Health are admired, and the works of "Ossian" considered as food for linguistic thought. Among dramatic works, Monboddo particularly approves of Home's Douglas.

Part 2: Text and Notes

Part 2 provides an edited text of six MSS of particular importance in shedding light on Monboddo's theory of poetry, his poetic criticism and the nature of Origin and Progress VII. An Apparatus Criticus records all textual alterations; Notes elucidate literary allusions, explicate difficult passages and provide miscellaneous points of information.
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Part 1

Commentary
INTRODUCTION

In this thesis I provide an edited text of unpublished MS material on the theory of poetry by James Burnett, Lord Monboddo (1714 - 1799). In a preceding critical commentary I examine various aspects of Monboddo's poetic criticism, with reference to the MSS here presented, other unpublished MS materials, and Monboddo's published works Of the Origin and Progress of Language (1773 - 1792) and Antient Metaphysics (1779 - 1799).

In Part 1 I first discuss the textual significance of these poetical MSS in so far as they indicate the contents of a projected seventh volume of Monboddo's Of the Origin and Progress of Language. In my second chapter I discuss the aesthetic theory underpinning Monboddo's critical judgements and opinions. Chapter 3 assesses Monboddo's MSS on the theory of prosody, which comprise a substantial portion of his literary tracts; and in Chapter 4 I draw together Monboddo's criticism of individual poets with a view to demonstrating how he conceived of the historical development of European poetry.

The six MS items which form the text of Part 2 are chosen both for the poetical doctrines they contain and for the light they shed on the probable form of Origin and Progress VII. They do not include all the MS materials which I quote in Part 1; nor do they amount to
a completed MS version of Volume VII. They do, however, demonstrate the development of Monboddo's thinking on poetic matters; and illustrate his authorial methods in the course of a sustained piece of writing, so as to complement the necessarily fragmentary quotations from the MSS which enter into the first half of the thesis. Of Poetry (MP 243) is definitely intended for Origin and Progress VII, and is here followed by MP 235, Of Rhythm, and MP 241, Of English Verse, which can be assigned with a fair degree of certainty to the same volume. MP 309, Origine of Language & c Vol 4th, and MP 232, Of Versification, are included to show how Origin and Progress IV would have developed if Monboddo had adhered to his original intention of devoting Volume IV to poetry. Finally, Of Poetical Stile (MP 227), dating from the 1760's, shows how far Monboddo's poetic theory had developed at an early stage in his writing career, before any volume of Origin and Progress had been published.

My study is based largely on the Monboddo Papers in the National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh, a collection of MSS and letters pertaining to the Burnett family and ranging from the 17th to the 20th centuries. The great majority of these papers relate to James Burnett, and consist of over 300 MS items on topics similar to those of Monboddo's printed works; a series of bound MSS and a collection of Pocket Books on the same subjects; a number of letters to and from Monboddo; extensive legal papers
reflecting Monboddo's career as a Judge; and various items collected by Monboddo in connection with his authorial activities.

The material contained in these MSS reflects the highly eclectic nature of Monboddo's thought which will be familiar to any reader of the printed works. Any attempt to categorize the subjects discussed in them must contend with Monboddo's inability to confine himself to one particular line of enquiry: a tract on language will digress into a historical treatise, or a philosophical MS will be transformed into a diatribe against modern degeneracy. This said, it is still useful to distinguish four classes of topic:

(1) Philosophy
Many MSS relate to Monboddo's intention of defending Aristotelianism against the onslaughts of modern empiricism. Monboddo's philosophical MSS also have bearings on his psychological and religious thinking.

(2) The Sciences
Monboddo attempted, with minimal sympathy for the rationale of the modern experimental method, to provide a coherent Aristotelian system of mathematics, physics, zoology and astronomy.

(3) The Human Sciences
In keeping with the spirit of the Scotland of his time, Monboddo gave much thought to the topic of man as a social animal. His MSS contain substantial materials on anthropology, history, politics, law, education and economics.
Into this category fall those MSS dealing not only with literature but with the art of language itself, as well as music. Within the field of literature, it is only with the sphere of poetry that this thesis deals; I omit any discussion of such branches as historical writing and rhetoric. In so doing, I am guided not only by limitations of space, but because Monboddo’s opinions on poetry do not receive the same airing in Origin and Progress as do his views on the other types of literature mentioned above. Whereas an entire volume of Origin and Progress is devoted to rhetoric, and nearly as much again to history, Monboddo’s account of poetry never progressed beyond the MS form in which it exists in the Monboddo Papers.

The two voluminous works to which Monboddo devoted so much of his energies, Of the Origin and Progress of Language and Antient Metaphysics, failed signally to establish themselves as the standard philosophical works for which he intended them, but did endow him with a lesser reputation as an eccentric whose anthropological speculations and rampant Graecism gave much scope for amusement to his contemporaries. There are indications, however, that the philological and anthropological doctrines espoused in Monboddo’s works are in the process of re-assessment as a reasoned and integral part of the scientific debate of his age. One of the earliest attempts to treat Monboddo as a thinker rather than as a
mere comic figure is William Knight's *Lord Monboddo and Some of his Contemporaries* (London: John Murray, 1900), which, although editing his letters in highly cavalier fashion, prints a selection of Monboddo's correspondence along with an account of his life and philosophy. More recently, Chauncey Tinker, Arthur Lovejoy, Gladys Bryson and Ronald Meek have helped to draw attention to Monboddo as an anthropologist meriting consideration; and Monboddo's philological theories have been subjected to scrutiny, and frequently praised, by Otto Funke, Hans Aarsleff and Stephen Land. Scholars, then, are now prepared to accord Monboddo the status of a serious thinker in the fields of human and linguistic science, albeit one whose principles ran counter to the empiricism


of most of his contemporaries; and it is my present task to extend this rehabilitation to the complementary literary part of his writings. Some steps have been taken in this direction already: as early as 1922, J. Blickensderfer, in an unpublished thesis (Joseph P. Blickensderfer, "A Study of Lord Monboddo and his Works," Diss. Harvard 1926), discusses Monboddo's ideas concerning literature as part of his general study of Monboddo's work, although handicapped by having no access to the MSS. And Miss E. Cloyd has recently gone some way towards outlining Monboddo's role as a literary critic in her concise study, James Burnett, Lord Monboddo (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), although her interest in Monboddo is essentially biographical, and stops short of a close analysis of his literary theory.

It is only recently that the Monboddo Papers have been available for study in Edinburgh, and it is my hope that this first analysis of the poetical criticism contained in them will help to increase our estimation of a critic whose high seriousness and deep thinking deserve to excite our approbation as well as our curiosity.
Chapter 1
Textual Introduction

It is evident that despite its bulk and prolixity the *Origin and Progress* is incomplete. From the first volume of Monboddo's *magnum opus* onwards, the author's delineation of the structure of his work shows that a detailed account of the nature and style of poetry represented an integral part of his scheme. In Monboddo's introduction to Volume I, his passion for Aristotelian dissection of his subject-matter is already evident, and we are promised a work which is apparently divisible into three clearly distinct parts. The first part, says Monboddo, will be a philosophical investigation of the origins of language; the second, a systematization of the art of language; and the third, an examination of the corruption of language which Monboddo saw exemplified in all post-classical literature. To the second of these sections was assigned Monboddo's account of style; and hence his treatment of poetry: "I think it will not appear foreign to my subject to say something likewise of poetry and rhetoric, being arts of which language furnishes the materials" (*O&P*, I,4). Monboddo quickly found, however, that this tripartite classification was too restrictive to encompass the full extent of his views on the realm of language and its varied forms; his treatise burgeoned into a fabrication of Shandean proportions, and the section on poetry turned out to be no more than a constantly receding terminus ad quern, repeatedly postponed to a future volume.
By Volume II of the *Origin and Progress*, Monboddo had dealt with his first section, and was devoting himself to a somewhat turgid handbook of universal grammar, in accordance with the proposed content of his second. Here, little mention is made of poetry, but for the injunction that no amount of original genius is to be considered as compensating for a grounding in grammatical science: "Nor must the poet, inspired as he is by the muses, pretend to be exempted from the rules of this art" ([O&P,II,224-25]). Any elaboration of this is postponed: "What other learning is required for excelling in poetry and rhetoric, I shall mention when I come to treat of those arts."

However, although Monboddo thus defers a consideration of poetics, it is only in terms of his own esoteric conception of poetry that Monboddo can be said to avoid the topic. Volume II of the *Origin and Progress* contains three books: Book I, dealing with the grammatical elements of language; Book II, containing an analysis of the factors contributing to the sound of language; and Book III, concerned largely with the manner in which these latter elements interact in a work of art. In Books II and III, Monboddo develops his views on classical and modern prosody; however, by terminological fiat it is denied that Monboddo thereby enters into any discussion of poetry itself: "It may be thought, that according to the rules of method, I ought to have delayed this i.e. a theory of prosody till I came to treat of poetry: but, according to my notion of that art, verse is not at all essential
to it; but there may be excellent poetry, and I think I know some such, in prose; as on the other hand, there may be verse without poetry" (O&P,II,384). So it is that Monboddo elaborates in Volume II the prosodic theory which came to be associated with him, and which was challenged, with such decorum on the part of both parties, by Joshua Steele’s An Essay towards Establishing the Melody and Measure of Speech (1775): English verse is formed by the interaction of stressed and unstressed syllables, unlike classical verse, which displays the beauties of quantitative rhythm and variety of musical pitch. Part of the value of the Monboddo Papers lies in the account they contain of how these principles are applied to ancient and modern poetry.

At the close of Volume II, Monboddo expresses his intentions of concluding the Origin and Progress with Volume III, which will "treat of stile in general, and of the rhetorical in particular" (O&P,II,588); poetry was evidently not looming large in Monboddo’s mind at this point. As it is, Monboddo fulfils the first half of his promise, providing a general account of style, mentioning such matters as figures of speech and various types of style; he distinguishes, as general characters of style, the simple, ornamented, middle, sublime, mock-heroic, ridiculous, witty and humorous. Progressing to particular characters of style, he enumerates the conversational, epistolary, didactic and historical styles, but curiously postpones once again his account of rhetoric
and poetry. Instead, he launches into a favourite theme: the manifest superiority of the ancients to the moderns, and the lamentable condition of modern literary style. Indeed, so firmly did this topic entrench itself in Monboddo's mind that the entire first book of Volume IV is devoted to a systematic comparison of the Greek, Latin, English, French and Italian languages; this despite the fact that, after the completion of Origin and Progress III, Monboddo's intention was to devote Volume IV entirely to poetry. In a letter to Sir George Baker, Monboddo promises "if I ever shall carry on my Work upon Language, and write upon Poetry, which ought to be the Subject of a fourth Volume, I will certainly make Homer my Text, who, I think, is the Standard of all kinds of writing" (Monboddo to Baker, 2 October 1782; MP Box 22, fol. 7/87, p.[2]).

Associated with this stage in the evolution of the Origin and Progress are two other MSS: Box 17, fol. 4, and MP 309. The former of these, bearing the endorsement "Notes from the MS. for the purpose of Vol. 4 of the Origin of Language," consists of a number of headings referring to poetry, rhetoric, the corruption of language and literary style in general. These are merely gleaned from other Monboddo MSS, and show no signs of having been set in any order which might reflect that of the intended Origin and Progress volume. More helpful in this respect is another MS (MP 309), in the form of an introduction to a proposed Volume IV devoted entirely to
poetry, "the Noblest & most artificiall Use of Language that hitherto has been made" (MP 309, p.[1]). In this introduction Monboddo outlines his plan to begin Volume IV, on poetry, with a comparison of Greek and modern languages, demonstrating by scientific methods the superiority of Greek as a medium for poetry.

We must imagine that during the early 1780's Monboddo was more concerned with the philosophical topics of Antient Metaphysics (Volume II of which was published in 1782) than in directly literary controversies, and that material for future Origin and Progress volumes was kept in abeyance till the exposition of Aristotelian metaphysics which filled Antient Metaphysics I - III had worked its way to a conclusion. At one point prior to 1787 it was evidently intended to devote a third Book of Origin and Progress IV to extending the comparison of modern and ancient arts to cover philosophy as well; the hundred-page MP 308, endorsed "To be inserted in the third Book of Vol. 4. of Origin of L.", provides a detailed and boring recapitulation of Monboddo's attitude to the deficiencies of modern philosophy, but was jettisoned before Origin and Progress IV appeared, probably because of the overlap with the domain of Antient Metaphysics. In the breathing-space between Antient Metaphysics III and the "History of Man" which comprised its Volumes IV - VI, Monboddo returned to literary matters. Origin and Progress IV duly appeared in 1787; but it did not take the form envisaged in 1782. The comparative account of
Greek and its inferior descendants certainly finds its way into print; but the treatment of poetry, centring round Homer, which Monboddo promised Baker is postponed. In its place is a section reverting to an analysis of particular styles, this time defined in terms of their subject-matter: epistolary, dialogue, historical, didactic, rhetorical and, finally, poetic. A letter from Monboddo, dated 23 February 1785 (MP Box 22, fol. 8/107), shows now these changes in the form of Volume IV came about. In this letter Monboddo is assured of the confidence and good-will of his correspondent, Lord Stormont (later Earl of Mansfield), a figure prominent in legal and government circles who would have ingratiated himself with Monboddo by virtue of his efforts in Latin verse. His defences lowered by Stormont's defence of *Origin and Progress* III, Monboddo relates his satisfaction that the book has sold out despite adverse reviews, and his plans for extensive additions to Volume III, to be included in a second edition. Scheduled for this edition of Volume III are the comparison of classical and Romance languages which eventually surfaced in *Origin and Progress* IV, and an examination of the excellence of Homer's poetic language; the very topics, in fact, which Monboddo had earlier intended for Volume IV. Monboddo also has in mind for this second edition of Volume III a kind of "History of Stile" (MP Box 22, fol. 8/107, p. 4) from the ancients to Gibbon and Dr Johnson; and a comparison of "the writing Art" (p. 5) with sculpture and painting.
Recourse to the existent form of *Origin and Progress* shows how the plans were modified in the event: the comparison of languages appeared, but was held over from the second edition of Volume III (1786) to a separate Volume IV (1787). So, too, did part of the history of style, to be concluded in Volume V (1789). The treatment of Homer's language, however, was postponed to a proposed later volume, along with the comparison of language with the other fine arts; a comparison with my conjectural framework of *Origin and Progress* VII below will indicate the similarity between Volume VII and these omissions from the fourth volume.

As well as outlining his plans for this proposed second edition, Monboddo adds "I have not lost view of the fourth Volume of the Origin of Language which you mention, and of which I propose the Subject should be Rhetoric" (MP Box 22, fol. 8/107, p. 5). By 1785, then, the Volume IV which Monboddo had envisaged in 1782 has disappeared, rendered redundant by these proposed additions to Volume III; and has been replaced by an intended volume on oratory. The remaining stages in the genesis of *Origin and Progress* can now be filled in. The residue of material from Volume III filled Volume IV and spilled over into Volume V, so that in his preface to Volume IV Monboddo is writing "I Here present to the public the fourth volume of THE ORIGIN AND PROGRESS OF LANGUAGE; and, in order to accomplish my plan, I have promised a fifth" (*O&P*, IV, [1]).

At the time of writing this preface Monboddo evidently
meant to include in Volume V a discussion of the historical, didactic, rhetorical and poetic styles; in fact, however, Volume V extends only to the first two of these, so that by 1789 the last two, rhetorical and poetic, are destined for a concluding Volume VI. To this period belongs an entry in PB 16, headed "For the 6th Volume of the Origin of Language" (p. 1), in which Monboddo notes information from the papers on rhythm (MP 237-240) to be used in an Origin and Progress VI which was at this point evidently meant to treat not only of rhetoric but also of poetry. By late 1789, however, Monboddo is envisaging not one but two volumes in which to bring his work to a conclusion: the endorsement of MP 243, dated Autumn 1789, mentions a projected Origin and Progress VII; and in Volume VI he is content with "leaving what I have to say of the antient verse to the last volume of this work, in which I am to treat of the Stile of Poetry" (O&P, VI, 131). Again, Monboddo directs the reader to an examination of modern methods of pronouncing ancient verse, "in the next volume upon the subject of poetry" (O&P, VI, 157). Finally, Monboddo concludes with a sketch of this proposed volume, worth quoting for the clues it provides as to Monboddo's poetic theory and authorial practice: "The next volume, with which I propose to conclude this work, will treat of Poetry, the finest of all the fine arts, if the poet be not a mere versifier, or servile copier of history or nature, but be what his name imports, a maker, or what may be called a
creator, which I hold to be the greatest effort of the genius of man, showing more than any other art he practises, the particle of divinity that is in him. For this work I have collected a great many materials, -- --- --- quae --- Multa dies et multa litera coercuit; --- and, if I shall live to put these materials in order, and to finish this great work upon Language and Stile, I think I may venture to say, that it will be the greatest work of the kind, (whether well or ill executed, does not belong to me to determine), that has been published in later times" (Q&P,VI,472-73).

Before his death in 1799, Monboddo managed to produce the final three volumes of his other compendium of classical teaching, Antient Metaphysics; but this projected volume on poetry never progressed beyond the form in which we see it today: a collection of manuscripts, scattered, often incomplete, and frequently repetitive of material already incorporated, in more general form, in the Origin and Progress. It is no part of my intention in this thesis to provide an apologia for Monboddo's defensively grandiose assessment of his work. The type of evaluative criticism which awards points to the thinkers of past ages according to their approximation to our own opinions will dismiss Monboddo's critical apparatus and verdicts at the outset, incensed by the more gross effusions of his Graecist bias. Instead, I wish to demonstrate, by means of these MSS, that Monboddo was more au fait with the intellectual milieu of his friends and
contemporaries than one might gather from the greater part of his works; Monboddo's tailed men might bring down opprobrium and ridicule on his head, but his views on the excellence of Douglas are an expression of the national consensus concerning the "Scottish Shakespeare." Furthermore, Monboddo's mania for classification, analysis and scrupulous theoretical detail means that we see fully bodied forth in Monboddo's poetical speculation theories which are only sketched in pastel shades by his contemporaries. Monboddo's critical principles, with their own often perverse logic, are discernible in the works of Blair and Beattie.

Thus far, then, I have traced the growth of the ideas of Volume I through the printed volumes of the Origin and Progress. As we have seen, Monboddo kept having to delay his treatment of poetry, and this partly explains the disorganised nature of the remaining MSS on the subject. These range in date from the 1750's to the 1790's; sometimes the work on poetry is described in them as Volume IV, sometimes as Volume VII. The position is complicated further by the fact that although never dealing in depth with poetry in Origin and Progress I - VI, Monboddo nevertheless manages to insinuate into these volumes a wealth of incidental references to, and criticism of, both ancient and modern poetry. This is due partly to Monboddo's idiosyncratic definition of poetry, as mentioned above; partly to his painstakingly methodical approach, which induces him to reiterate in his discussion of individual
literary styles the general principles laid down in Volume II; and partly to his simple inability to keep to his stated subject. Hence the snippets of poetic criticism which occur throughout Monboddo's printed and MS works, and which will be discussed so far as they shed light on the form Volume VII might have taken. I will proceed, however, by concentrating on those MSS which bear internal evidence of having been written specifically with Volume VII in mind; and will use these MSS to infer the structure of the intended volume.

The MS which can incontrovertibly be assigned to Volume VII is that entitled Of Poetry (MP 243), dated "Autumn 1789" and endorsed "To be Printed in the 7th Volume of the Origin of Language." As one might expect in the work of an author whose instinct always leads him to resort to first principles when faced with an unfamiliar realm of knowledge, Monboddo voices his intention of beginning his poetic theorizing by examining its philosophical aspects (MP 243, p. [1]). On more than one occasion, Monboddo acknowledges that his overwhelming debt to Aristotelian doctrine extends to the realm of literature as well: "I am not ashamed to acknowledge, that, if I had not read the Poetics of Aristotle, though it be little better than a mutilated fragment, I should not have known what poetry was, but should have confounded it, as most people do, with versification, splendid diction, and fine sentiments" (Q&P, V, 402-403). Aristotle, then, is the source of the definition which permits Monboddo to hedge
off a discussion of versification from one of poetry; and in Aristotle, too, lie the origins of Monboddo's views on the imitative nature of art. All the fine arts are imitative, asserts Monboddo, and proceeds to enumerate the entities they imitate. The distinction between the mental and the physical (with the laurels going, naturally, to the former) which pervades Monboddo's work is brought into play on this occasion. The subjects imitated in the fine arts must of necessity be "things perceived by the Intellect" (MP 243, p. 2). The sensual objects of imitation are either visual (copied in statuary, sculpture, painting and dancing) or auditory (copied in music and metrical discourse). Next, Monboddo highlights an essential ingredient in the art-work: ideal beauty. The beauty represented by the artist must correspond to an idea of perfection in the artist's own mind, not simply to natural objects in the external world. By reaffirming the generally accepted notion of the artist as depicting "la belle nature," Monboddo provides the opportunity to cite his other favourite ancient authority, by giving a Platonic account of epistemology and aesthetics. Monboddo applies the distinction between natural and ideal beauty to the visual arts: a portrait, the mere representation of a form existent in nature, is to be differentiated from a picture, which depicts an idealized form. The other branch of Monboddo's mental-physical dichotomy is explained too: as well as sensual beauties, those of mental qualities and attributes are imitated in art. These, too, are to be depicted not as found in the natural world but in idealized
form. Monboddo prefixes to his discussion of poetic imitation an application of his principles to the other fine arts. The painter depicts either inanimate, animal or human subject-matter. Of the first of these is formed a landscape painting, which will be only of a lowly order unless the artist has performed whatever rearrangement of and addition to his donee is required to do justice to his idea of beauty. Animal painting is closely allied to the painting of inanimate nature. As far as the painting of humans is concerned, the ideal/real distinction is applied here too: a faithfully realistic portrayal of a historical scene lacks ideal beauty. Monboddo presumably has in his mind Aristotle's opinion that history, being concerned only with the particular, is less philosophical than poetry. Monboddo makes it clear that he is not advocating that artists should avoid using familiar subjects; indeed, he is in favour of a subject which is attractive by virtue of its being known and recognized. Monboddo's preference for the spiritual over against the physical is discernible in his injunction that a yet higher beauty is achieved in the expression of "Characters, Manners Sentiments and Passions: and in short of Mind" (MP 243, p. 12).

Monboddo next turns his attention to music; in his insistence that music, too, is an imitative art he puts forward the startling notion that "the Hen's March, which imitates the Cackling of a Hen when She lays an Egg" (MP 243, p. 13) is more essentially musical than most Italian music. The chief power of music, however, is its
affective power, which in Monboddo's mind makes it a useful moral force, especially in instilling appropriate sentiments in the young.

Eventually Monboddo comes to the ostensible subject of his treatise. After again citing Aristotle as his source, Monboddo proceeds in negative fashion by showing what poetry is not, firstly reiterating his assertion that versification and ornate diction alone do not constitute poetry, then drawing distinctions between the poetical and the historical, didactic and descriptive styles. On the positive side, Monboddo adheres closely to Aristotle, making rational action the proper subject of poetry. In accordance with Monboddo's aesthetic theory in Antient Metaphysics, beauty is said to consist in system, and (again according to Aristotle) to be of a certain magnitude. As to the action of a poem, Monboddo is of the opinion that historical facts, suitably embellished so as to produce ideal beauty, provide a sound basis, and illustrates his point by citing the historical origins of the Iliad and Odyssey. The personages depicted in the poem are to be men; the morally exalted are allotted to epic and tragedy, the less so to comedy.

After a quick enumeration of the materials employed in the various arts, Monboddo passes on to an examination of different methods of employing these materials. This turns out to be slight: after some cursory comment on narrative and dialogue, a fairly irrelevant account of the Greek orcheistic art, or dancing, is appended. The main
thread of Monboddo's account is taken up again when he endeavours to demonstrate the superiority of poetry over the other arts: poetry exercises man's highest faculty, the intellect; it is capable of combination with the other arts; and, most importantly, it is naturally suited to depicting a succession of events rather than a solitary incident. This capacity for the development of a sustained and continuing plot enables poetry to raise a reader's mind to a pitch of receptivity when confronted with the crisis of the piece; as Monboddo demonstrates with copious reference to Home's *Douglas* (1756).

Such, then, is the theory of poetry with which Monboddo intended to usher in his seventh volume. With this treatise can be considered MP 227, *Of Poetical Stile*, which being in the hand of William Robertson, an early scribe of Monboddo's, can be dated to the 1760's, and can be seen as an early version of the mimetic theory of art presented in MP 243. In this tract, Monboddo initially explains his insistence on the split between poetry and figured versifying: to maintain that the factor differentiating poetry from prose is the presence in the former of versification and figures of speech is to confound poetry and prose, asserting the difference between them to be one of degree when in fact it is one of kind. Next comes Monboddo's contribution to the "ut pictura poesis" tradition, reinforced by Milton's comment in *On Education* that poetry is "more simple, sensuous and passionate" (Columbia, IV, 286) than rhetoric. Monboddo sees this as confirming that it is the business
of the poet to eschew generalization and abstraction, and to present to the imagination highly particularized sense-impressions. After instancing Milton, Homer and Virgil in this respect, Monboddo moves on to a comparison and contrast of the poetic style with the rhetorical, historical, epistolary and didactic styles.

These MSS, then, indicate the general principles of poetry with which Monboddo intended to start his final volume. In making inferences as to the form the remainder of the volume would have taken, we are justified in taking as models the other critiques of particular characters of style to be found in the Origin and Progress; Monboddo attests to this himself: "In treating of these arts [i.e. the rhetorical and poetical], I shall follow the same method that I have followed in treating of the grammatical part of language, and of the other kinds of stile of which I have spoken" (O&P, VI, Introduction, ii). A page later Monboddo declares his purpose to be "to explain the nature, and shew the proper use of rhetoric and poetry" (iii). We are to expect, then, that consequent on Monboddo's elucidation of the nature of poetry will be an application of these broad principles to their practical application in existent poetry. In the case of rhetoric, Monboddo proceeds by passing from an initial account of the nature and subject-matter of oratory to one of its style, and eventually to a critical discussion of those who have excelled in the art. MP 235 indicates that this pattern was to be repeated in the volume on poetry too: "Having thus explain'd
the Nature of Poetry, & Shewn the Rank which it holds among the fine Arts, I come now to treat of the Stile of it, which is properly the Subject of this Work" (MP 235, p.1). Also incorporated in MP 235 are excerpts from a number of other MSS on the subject of rhythm, papers from which Monboddo also gleaned the views which appeared in *Origin and Progress* VI on the rhythm of prose. One of the rhetorical topics which Monboddo wished to discuss in Volume VI was the rhythmic and melodic patterns of prose; he therefore extracted from MP 235, a MS dealing with predominantly poetic matters, whichever paragraphs bore relevance to a discussion of prose rather than, or as well as, poetry. Hence it is that two chapters of Volume VI (Book II, Chs. 4 and 5) contain almost verbatim copies of corresponding sections from MP 235 (see pp. 566-567).

A final version of MP 235, as it would have appeared in *Origin and Progress* VII, would naturally have had excised from it those passages used in Volume VI; Monboddo did not perform this task. But it is clear that he was reworking the MSS on rhythm until a very late date. Page 20(1) of MP 238, for instance, which was to be incorporated in MP 235, carries a 1794 watermark. *Origin and Progress* VI was published in 1792, and we can safely conclude that if Monboddo was adding to MP 235 after this date it was with a view to compiling a seventh volume, on poetry. The picture is complicated by the fact that a final section of MP 238, taken into MP 235, also bears this 1794 watermark, and is endorsed "To be printed" (pp.31-39).
The content of this chapter, however, is mere recapitulation of Monboddo's previous dicta on pronunciation; perhaps he subsequently decided against its inclusion in Volume VII. And one of the last MSS, Of the formation of language and particularly of the Radical words (MP 306), is dated 1796, but cannot be imagined to be intended for publication in Origin and Progress VII despite its concern with the role of rhythm in verse: its exposition of the usual prosodic opinions is sketchy and generalized, and MP 235 - 240 are referred to as "the several tracts that I have written on Rhythm" (MP 306, p. 40), a form of reference that would be inappropriate to a printed work.

In MP 235, then, Monboddo continues the account of poetry begun in MP 243. Despite his frequent observations that versification and figures are incidental to poetry, Monboddo realizes that since most poetry nevertheless is marked by these very features, it behoves him to provide a close analysis of them. Hence Monboddo's plan to discuss first verse, then poetic diction. Both ancient and modern verse are to be examined; and, in view of the superiority, so manifest to Monboddo, of the former, Greek and Roman verse are to be discussed first, in order to erect a paradigm against which modern poetry is to be measured and found wanting. Monboddo begins, then, by identifying the most distinctive features of the ancient languages: their quantitative rhythm, and their melodic pitch. In Chapter 2, he concentrates on the former of these, showing it to consist in the alternation of long
and short syllables. Confining his discussion to the type of verse from which, he believes, all other verse was derived, he embarks on an analysis of the classical hexameter. After detailing the feet employed in this type of verse, and listing the pauses interspersed throughout the hexameter verse by which variety is maintained, Monboddo praises the sound of the Greek language, as being suited to the production of euphonic and harmonious poetry. The proviso is added, however, that Monboddo is talking of the beauty of the ancient languages as spoken by the ancients themselves, not by those moderns who still attempt to study the classics in a modern and degenerate world. Chapter 3, in fact, is devoted to a proof that the modern pronunciation of classical verse ignores the pristine beauties of Greek and Latin quantitative metre, substituting for them the lowlier rhythm of loud and soft syllables which Monboddo found to be the hallmark of English verse. The genesis of MP 235 as an integral part of the Origin and Progress is further evidenced here, where Monboddo refers to his remarks on English metre "in the second Volume of this Work" (MP 235, p. 34). At the close of Chapter 3, Monboddo poses two questions arising out of his assertions on this matter: granted that the English pronunciation of Greek and Latin is marked by the replacement of quantitative rhythm by one of stresses, what is the rationale by which this is done? And why should ancient verse thus travestied still be a source of pleasure to the modern reader? (It will be recalled that Monboddo
had promised an examination of this very topic in *Origin and Progress* VI; see p. 14 above.) In Chapter 4 Monboddo turns his attention to answering these questions, prefacing his replies by tracing the rise of modern stress rhythm, which Monboddo sees as having been introduced, consequent to the demise of quantitative metre, as a means to avoid monotony in verse. After digressing into a criticism of Bentley for having attributed to the Romans the inferior rhythm of loud and soft which Monboddo confines to modern verse, Monboddo answers the former question by proposing a resumé of the rules governing the practice of modern pronunciation of classical verse. He distinguishes cases where ancient and modern practice coincide, and cases where the nature of English accents has necessitated a deviation from ancient practice, and describes and accounts for English usage in both cases. The latter question is answered by explaining that modern accent, like ancient, is a source, albeit an inferior one, of uniformity and variety, and hence of beauty. Monboddo makes the point that the metrical principles he has adduced are no more than inductive generalizations based on an empirical study of actual practice: the assumptions underpinning such practice (namely, that a particular syllable in a particular Greek or Latin word is pronounced long rather than short) are arbitrary, and therefore not susceptible of rational analysis. This leads Monboddo to one of his favourite hobby-horses in his prosodic writings: his contention that the time spent in public schools both on ingesting rules
of classical quantity and on fabricating masses of inferior Latin verse would be better employed in producing exponents of the spoken rather than the written word: orators rather than pedants.

This brings us to the end of MP 235; the thread of Monboddo's argument is taken up again in MP 241, Of English Verse, which is endorsed "To be Printed." A reference to a late volume of the Origin and Progress ("See what I have said in Vol. 5 p. 467 of our Rhyming Verse" (MP 241, p. 25, n.)) dates this MS to 1789 or later, and shows that this item too is part of the work. Monboddo here completes the transition from ancient to modern poetry, by bringing under his scrutiny English poetry. The first chapter of Of English Verse recaps the gist of Monboddo's thought in MP 235, reiterating the difference between ancient and modern rhythm, as well as tracing the gradual process by which the one was replaced by the other. In Chapter 2, Monboddo shows how the modern rhythms are utilized in metrical feet, directing the reader to the "English prosody" in Origin and Progress II on which he prided himself so much. Monboddo here talks only of iambic, trochaic and anapaestic feet in English verse (MP 241, p. 9), despite the fact that in the earlier MP 232 he had gone to extraordinary lengths to show how Dryden introduced a variety of other feet into Alexander's Feast (MP 232, pp. 67-83). By this stage Monboddo had presumably either forgotten or repudiated the extravagant claims made there. The presence or absence of rhyme in a poem is a factor which Monboddo sees as
differentiating two disparate bodies of verse; of which he treats blank verse before rhymed. Monboddo sees blank verse as possessing two capital advantages over rhymed, both of which advantages are derived from the imitation of classical poetry: a variety of stops or pauses, and frequent enjambment. Throughout, Milton is Monboddo's example of the heights to which English blank verse can be raised, bearing in mind the intrinsic shortcomings of the English as set against the classical. Chapter 3 is devoted to English rhyming verse, in which even the pause between verses and the caesural stop only serve to reinforce the "tedious uniformity" of the style. Monboddo adduces Milton's remarks on rhyme in the preface to Paradise Lost to add authority to his claims, and raises a critical eyebrow over Milton's own endeavours in the way of rhyming poetry, although condescending to admit that his shorter poems in that manner can be pleasing enough. These reservations, however, give way to a wholesale eulogy of Milton as being the most eminent of modern writers, both in verse and in his prose works. Finally, Monboddo appends a somewhat superfluous recapitulation of his opinions on the sound of language, "which may serve as a Summary or Epitome of all that I have said upon the Subject in this and other parts of my Works" (MP 241, p. 46).

This, then, is a sketch of how Monboddo envisaged the first two sections of his seventh volume: those dealing with the philosophy of poetry, and with its style in general. Other MSS show that at this juncture he was to
turn to a study of individual authors, especially Homer. But it is expedient, before proceeding to the extant portions of this final section, to consider another two MSS which together constitute the form the first and second sections denoted above might have taken, if Monboddo had carried out his intentions of devoting Volume IV, and not Volume VII, to poetry.

From a bibliographical point of view, MP 232 is of great interest, bearing signs of having been re-read by the author exactly before the point at which he decided not to include a treatment of poetry in *Origin and Progress* IV. The words on which this observation hinges are in the form of a small footnote, in which Monboddo alludes to an earlier quotation: "See p. 235 of this Vol." (MP 232, p. 48(1)). The passage referred to can be traced to *Origin and Progress* IV, and is indeed on p. 235; the curious fact is that MP 232 itself is not printed in the Volume IV. Monboddo evidently had to hand the proofs of Volume IV, up to at least p. 235, and was therefore able to provide the requisite page reference. (A later footnote in MP 232, in fact, directs readers to pp. 269-278, thus determining even more accurately the extent to which Volume IV had been set in proof (MP 232, p. 57, n.)). By referring to Volume IV as "This volume," Monboddo indicates that MP 232 was intended for that volume too; he was obviously underestimating the dimensions to which his account of style was to swell. As mentioned above, the Volume IV which was eventually published was barely sufficient to contain
the introduction to Monboddo's discussion of history, let alone accommodate those on the didactic, rhetorical and poetical styles.

MP 232 (which also incorporates part of MP 242, On Rhyming Poetry) is therefore a prototype for part of Origin and Progress IV, abandoned when Monboddo was contemplating a revamped work on poetry. Even after the decision had been made to omit MP 232 from Origin and Progress IV, it was still Monboddo's intention to use the material for a later volume on poetry; such, at any rate, is the inference to be drawn from the fact that Monboddo continued to add to MP 232 after the publication of Volume IV. An inserted passage directs the reader to Monboddo's discussion of dialogue in Origin and Progress IV (see MP 232, p. 9).

Although proceeding from the same views on prosody to which Monboddo adhered throughout his writing life, the examples chosen by Monboddo in MP 232 to illustrate his theories often vary from those in the MSS for Volume VII. MP 232 is therefore worthy of presentation in its own right, as complementing the later version.

Chapter 1 of MP 232 covers ground familiar to us from MP 243 and 227, making the same points on the definition of poetry; its imitative nature; its dependence on human action; and its concern with ideal beauty. However, in Chapter 2 Monboddo faces up to some of the more paradoxical implications of his esoteric (although, in Aristotelian terms, valid) definition of poetry. Monboddo
in fact parades his willingness to throw out the baby with the bath-water: the *Georgics*, Horace's *Odes*, most of Pope and all of Shakespeare except *The Merry Wives of Windsor* are denied the title of poetry. Monboddo's blithe incomprehension in his verdicts is palliated by the more perceptive pieces of incidental criticism interspersed throughout this chapter.

Chapter 3 ushers in a transition from the subject-matter of poetry to its style. Still intent to drive a wedge between the poetic and the versified, Monboddo declares that comedy and the novel are both species of prose poetry. Prose suits the lowly incidents of such works; but weighty matters require appropriate stylistic treatment; verse is therefore a fitting ornament of the tragic and the epic. Here too we are given an account of ancient and modern metre; although at this point in the development of his ideas Monboddo merely mentions the possibility of the systemization of English pronunciation of Greek and Latin which he later provided in MP 235. Here, too, Monboddo examines the feet, pauses and rhythm of the ancient verse, finally insinuating another re-airing of the educational precepts discussed above (pp. 26-27).

In Chapter 4 Monboddo's subject is rhyme, which is traced as to its origins and historical progress, and which is characterized as acceptable in small servings in the noble ancient languages and as a pragmatic necessity to combat the monotony of much English verse. The history of rhymed verse in general, and of Spenser's and Milton's
in particular, is viewed as the lamentable subjugation of poetic genius to the needless bondage of jingling rhyme.

Chapter 5 brings Monboddo's account of rhyming verse up to date, by delivering his verdicts on recent English poetry. Pope's poetry combines admirable sentiments and diction with an execrable uniformity of rhyme and pause; Dryden's fares somewhat better in this respect; but Thomson's Castle of Indolence elicits enthusiastic approval from Monboddo, unparalleled in the case of any modern except Milton. Turning from rhymed to blank verse, Monboddo dismisses Shakespeare and Jonson in cursory fashion, while bestowing the by now familiar encomium on Milton. An honourable mention goes to John Armstrong's Art of Preserving Health. Chapter 6 consists mainly of a study of Dryden's versification in Alexander's Feast, closely linked to the text.

This, then, is what remains of Monboddo's general comments on the nature and style of poetry. As to the criticism of individual authors which we must assume would have completed Volume VII, there are fewer materials which can be positively identified as belonging to the work on poetry. My main account of Monboddo's Homer criticism I postpone to Chapter 4; it will suffice here to note that Monboddo's principal MS on Homer, that catalogued under MP 132 and MP 230, was originally intended for a Volume IV on poetry; was tapped for its linguistic content when Monboddo later decided to devote Volume IV
to strictly linguistic matters; and was subsequently added to, presumably for the purposes of Volume VII.

It seems at least possible that Monboddo would have added to this Homeric criticism an assessment of ancient drama as the other great branch of Greek poetry. However the principal MS on the subject, MP 307, Of the Chorus of the antient Tragedy, and the several uses it served, carries no evidence of ever having been considered for inclusion in Volume VII. It is in the hand of John Hunter, one of Monboddo's scribes in his earlier years as a writer, and shows every indication of having been extracted from Volume 4 of the bound MSS. As such, it belongs to an era before even the first volume of Origin and Progress was published, and in which a specific treatment of ancient drama was not even mooted. It would be quite wrong, then, to hazard any conclusions as to a possible account of Greek tragedy in Origin and Progress VII. (On a bibliographical level, certainly, the concluding pp. 266 - 69 of MP 307 are of interest, bearing as they do an 1800 watermark; Monboddo died in 1799, and there is therefore evidence here that Kirkpatrick Williamson, Monboddo's final scribe, cared enough to rewrite a presumably untidy or damaged portion of the MS.)

These, then, are the MSS which can be attributed either positively or with a high degree of probability to the poetry volume of Origin and Progress, in either its Volume IV or Volume VII form. In exploring particular aspects of Monboddo's views on poetry and on literature
in general, I will naturally base my account on these texts; but whenever relevant this procedure will be supplemented by reference to Monboddo's writings both in the printed works and in other MSS from the Monboddo Papers.
Chapter 2

Monboddo's Aesthetic Theory

The main expositions of Monboddo's theory of beauty are *Antient Metaphysics*, which has theorizing as to the nature of beauty dispersed throughout it, and a tract "Of Taste" (BF MSS, 6, 35-69), endorsed "To be printed," but which never saw the light of day. Further details may be sketched in by reference to MP 227 and 243.

Monboddo's theory of beauty is a hybrid one, based on Aristotle but also owing allegiance to Plato when it is to Monboddo's advantage to do so. This hybridity can be best described by saying that from Aristotle Monboddo takes the concept of the poet as a selector, an imitator; and that from Plato Monboddo takes the concept of the transcendent power of the mind. It should be noted that Monboddo paid no attention to those sections in Plato which vilify the status of poetry, holding the poet to be a mere trickster dealing in third-hand imitations; but chose instead to emphasize the Platonic notion of a higher metaphysical realm of ideas, allying to this the postulate that it is within the power of the poet to ascend to this realm.

Enough will have been said to make the point that Monboddo's aesthetic theory lies solidly within the main tradition of neo-classical thought, and is to be seen as representative rather than innovative. At the same time, attention should be paid to the individualizing characteristics of Monboddo's particular application of well-tried
classical concepts of art, which set it apart from those of his contemporaries.

Most importantly, Monboddo sees himself as being in opposition to the prevalent school of aestheticians who extend to the theory of art the empiricist orientation introduced by Locke. The main tenets associable with the more extreme disciples of this school which Monboddo queries are that aesthetic judgments are subjective, arbitrary or relative; and that the perception of beauty is analogous to the perception of impressions by means of the senses. An alternative method of expressing this is to say that Monboddo postulates a cognitive core in the case of every aesthetic judgment; and that it is the perception of an objectively verifiable configuration of artistic qualities which validates an aesthetic judgment, and not simply the occurrence of an experience, analogous to a sense-experience, on the part of the perceiver.

Monboddo's intention, then, is to rescue the category of the beautiful from the attentions of empiricist mental philosophers who, by relating aesthetic experiences solely to the perceiving mind, and not to the perceived object, subjectivize and hence belittle it. On occasion Monboddo rashly talks as if modern philosophy has quite evaded its responsibility to provide any aesthetic theory, declaring that the beautiful "has not been treated of by any modern philosopher, as far as I know, except by Mr. Payley, who denies the existence of it, in his book upon Morals" (AM, V, 134). PB 6, in fact, contains a violent tirade
against Paley's *Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy* (1785) (PB 6, pp. 21-28). Monboddo forcefully states his position that a denial of a sense of beauty entails a denial of all the fine arts, as well as virtue: "In short we must give up entirely the Muses and the Graces, and every thing we call Genteel and Elegant in the Manners and behaviour of a Gentleman" (PB 6, pp. 23-24). The assiduity with which Monboddo goes on to lambast not only Paley's opinions but even his literary style, which he believes to rise no higher than that of "a Review or common Newspaper" (PB 6, p. 25) shows how seriously Monboddo took the "atheistic" threat of Paley's utilitarian stance. Monboddo's blindness, at this late stage in his career, is probably to be attributed to his failing faculties rather than a lack of awareness of the considerable mass of aesthetic theorizing being written in his time; especially in the light of Monboddo's having noted, in an earlier volume, that "A great deal, indeed, has been written upon the subject in modern times, both in French and English" (AM, II, 106). Monboddo testifies, in fact, to his having found "lively and agreeable things" in these works, which, however, had to be rejected on the grounds, watertight in Monboddo's estimation, that their authors were not sufficiently cognisant of the ancient philosophy.

In general, then, Monboddo sees himself as replying to a fairly clearly-defined enemy rather than as a sole modern explorer in the virgin territory of aesthetics. With respect to the denial or diminution of the beautiful,
Monboddo sees the whole evolution of philosophy from Locke through Berkeley and Hume to Paley as accelerating these errors: in *Origin and Progress* VI he writes that the last of these "had no sense of the Beautiful and Graceful, any more than Mr David Hume" (*O&P*, VI, 211, n.). This is, for Monboddo, the gravest of insults; and Monboddo's aesthetics are correctly seen as a rebuttal of the relativism of Hume's positivist rejection of artistic debate.

Monboddo's disparaging reference to Hume indicates that he did not take kindly to Hume's unequivocal assertion in the *Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* that "Morals and criticism are not so properly objects of the understanding as of taste and sentiment. Beauty, whether moral or natural, is felt, more properly than perceived." Nor can Monboddo's response to Hume have been ameliorated by Hume's then proceeding to concede a certain rational basis to feeling by acknowledging considered moral verdicts to depend on "some internal sense or feeling" (*Enquiries*, p. 173). A combination of radical subjectivism and internal sense theory was, as will become evident, anathema to Monboddo. And Monboddo's reaction to those postulating an aesthetic sense operative in a non-judgmental manner similar to the

five external senses is contained in the following extract from "Of Taste": "It may be thought want of Deference to the new Philosophy which hath sprung up among us and gained so much Ground of late years That in this Disquisition I have made no mention of the Moral Sense, the Sense of Beauty, Grandeur, Novelty, and I do not know how many other Senses that have been added by this Philosophy to the five Senses commonly known" ("Of Taste," p. 60). The butt of Monboddo's attack here is, of course, the moral sense school (ironically, in view of the inspiration they received from Shaftesbury, in whom Monboddo found so much to admire); and, although Monboddo does not choose to name his opponent, his attack is evidently against the originator of the school, Francis Hutcheson. Monboddo's "But says the Founder of this Sect of Philosophy by Sense I mean, a Determination of the Mind ... to receive Ideas independent of the Will" ("Of Taste," p. 60) is clearly a recollection of Hutcheson's definition of a moral sense as "a Determination of the Mind, to receive any Idea from the Presence of an Object, which occurs to us, independently on our Will."¹ In the first place, says Monboddo, these philosophers' use of "sense" is not in accordance with normal usage. Monboddo decides that three things are usually referred to as a sense: the faculty of perception

by the intervention of the organs of the body; the organ itself; and the perception itself; and maintains that in none of these cases has beauty any connection with sense as such. Hutcheson, however, provides his own definition of a sense as "a determination of the mind"; a formula which Monboddo sees as an attempt to explain away by a newly-coined ambiguity exactly the operation which is under discussion: that is, the process by which the perception of a beautiful object occasions in the beholder the perception of beauty. Monboddo understands Hutcheson to mean by a determination of the mind no more than "a Habit or Disposition of the Mind" ("Of Taste," p. 60); his own rewording removes the suggestion of necessity which accompanies Hutcheson's "determination." Monboddo wants to evade the suggestion that the aesthetic reactions are instinctive, holding as he does that it is by a rational operation of the mind that a perceiver has the idea of beauty, and that "the Mind must consider the Similarity and Proportions of the Object, before it can have the Idea of Beauty" ("Of Taste," p. 61).

If Hutcheson's "determination of the mind" cashes out in terms of a mere tendency for the mind to have a certain idea independent of the will; and if all such instances of unwilled reception of ideas are to be attributed to the operation of a sense; then, concludes Monboddo, the necessary result is an unbounded proliferation of separate senses to be acknowledged by the philosopher; even more, Monboddo thinks, than Hutcheson himself
sanctions. In fact, says Monboddo, every discursive act of the mind takes place without the intervention of will, and, according to Hutcheson's premises, must be attributed to the operation of a sense. Monboddo's awareness of, and antipathy to, the moral sense school comes across in another MS, Of the Origin of Virtue (MP 8):

"And here according to the notion of some of our Modern Philosophers, I might very soon dispatch this Inquiry [into ethics] by saying that the Idea of the ἀναγνωστικόν was the perception of a Sense, vizt. That Internal sense appropriated to the perception of such objects, & that such Ideas being simple, are undefinable" (MP 8, p. 6).

He goes on to rebut this claim by asserting that aesthetic perceptions are in fact definable through analysis of the causal links connecting subject and perceiver. Such an interpretation of internal sense theory is, as I suggest below, unfair to those theorists who do not rule out the validity of such enquiries as Monboddo favours; but the passage does serve to throw light on Monboddo's stance.

Another consideration brought to bear on the analogy between aesthetic perception and sense perception by Hutcheson, and confuted by Monboddo, relates to the type of pleasure concomitant with both. Hutcheson maintains that in the act of aesthetic perception, as well as of normal sensual perception, the perceiver is aware of a pleasure which arises immediately, and which cannot be erased by other considerations (Hutcheson, pp. 10-11). Hutcheson takes this similarity in the occurrence of
pleasure to imply an affinity between these two modes of perception; Monboddo specifically denies the basis of Hutcheson's proof in "Of Taste," pp. 61-62. He agrees with Hutcheson with respect to the necessary connection between the perception of beauty and pleasure; in the light of Monboddo's observations elsewhere that τὸ καλὸν is all-pervasive in human deliberation and action, this is hardly surprising. In Antient Metaphysics II Monboddo holds that to ask why beauty causes pleasure is inappropriate, since beauty is itself "the ultimate cause of the pleasure" (AM, II, 131). Monboddo is even prepared to concede here that aesthetic pleasures and sensual pleasures are on a par in that both are self-justifying and inexplicable; sensual pleasures "please us for no other reason but because they are Pleasures of Sense" (AM, II, 131). But Monboddo parts company from Hutcheson in his belief that these sensual pleasures are not necessary, as Hutcheson claims, but merely contingent, and in some cases lacking: some objects are indifferent with respect to their capacity to induce pleasure, and some are positively painful ("Of Taste," p. 61).

Monboddo backs up his claim by maintaining that even if sensual pleasures were, as Hutcheson claims, not contingent but necessary, so that the analogy between aesthetic and sense perception was valid at least in this respect, it would still be "a strange kind of Language" ("Of Taste," p. 61) which would identify as a definable sense every capacity of the mind to experience pleasure.
Monboddo twice opines that to talk of a moral or aesthetic sense is to indulge in a quibble over linguistic usage. Earlier in "Of Taste" he denies that those who advocate the extension of the senses to the realms of moral and aesthetic perception "have done any more than introduce a new Language into Philosophy" ("Of Taste," p. 60). Monboddo is even prepared to concede that if it is merely the immediacy with which aesthetic judgment registers to which modern philosophers' talk of a sense refers, then "a sense of Beauty is not an improper expression" (AM, V, 123).

Something resembling the same point is made by Alexander Gerard, who in assessing the appropriateness of talking of tastes as types of sensation remarks that "To enquire whether they are or are not, may perhaps be deemed a dispute about words" (Gerard, Essay on Taste (1759), p. 161, n.). Both writers acknowledge that any talk of taste as akin to sensation is metaphorical; the difference between them is that Gerard believes the metaphor, even if not running on all fours, at least to be more even-gaited than Monboddo would allow. Gerard inclines to the view that taste, like sensation, operates in isolation from reason, and sees this as an important validation of the analogy between the two; Monboddo, as we have seen, insists on the rational basis of aesthetic perception.

One might ask why, if the moral sense theorists' case degenerates into the recommendation of an ill-advised alteration in critical vocabulary, Monboddo is so concerned to call it in question. The answer must be sought in
Monboddo's abhorrence of any philosophy which he sees as excluding Mind from the workings of the universe. The Hutchesonian concept of an aesthetic pleasure necessarily attendant on the perception of a beautiful object, without the mediation of the rational mind, would have for Monboddo connotations of a mechanical world bereft of the omnipresent administrations of a divine animus mundi. Monboddo would wish to insert into the spectre of an automaton instinctively reacting to pleasurable stimuli a rational act of mind which informs each aesthetic perception; to reiterate, "the Mind must consider the Similarity and Proportions of the Object, before it can have the Idea of Beauty" ("Of Taste," p. 61). It is, of course, unfair to impute any such atheistical intentions to Hutcheson; indeed, there are no real grounds for dispute between the two men. Although postulating a sense-like aesthetic faculty, Hutcheson does not draw any conclusions which would preclude debate as to the type of object which gives rise to a pleasurable response in this aesthetic sense. Indeed, he goes to considerable length to describe the class of aesthetically pleasing objects, referring to them by the famous blanket description: "those in which there is **Uniformity amidst Variety**" (Hutcheson, p.15). This is essentially the same view as Monboddo himself espouses; why, then, is there such antagonism on Monboddo's part? An answer requires that attention be paid to the conclusion of Hutcheson's exposition of the uniformity-in-variety thesis, where he makes the claim that aesthetic
pleasure is communicated even to those who are not possessed of a knowledge of the philosophical basis of their delight (Hutcheson, p. 26). The claim is at first sight an unexceptionable one; children, for instance (and, for that matter, practically all adults), appreciate a picture without caring in the least about its configuration combining uniformity and variety. Monboddo disagrees, however, believing that a true aesthetic perception implies an awareness on the part of the perceiver of the grounds on which his pleasure is based. Thus while Hutcheson takes the line that a child participates in a form of aesthetic awareness which is generically similar to that of the most refined aesthetician, albeit less intensely felt, Monboddo believes that a child and an adult, although perceiving the same work of art, do not perceive the same beauties in it. Instead, the complexity of the beauties which each discerns in the work is determined by the extent to which the rational faculties of each have developed ("Of Taste," p. 50). Hence a child is pleased first by the rhyme and rhythm of a poem, since these are easily apprehended. In time his awareness will extend to an appreciation of the literary devices employed by the poet, then to the sentiments and characters; until he comes ultimately to an understanding of the poem's plot, and the contribution of the poem's individual elements towards an organic whole. Hutcheson postulates an inner sense in which all participate to a greater or lesser extent; Monboddo, a plurality of levels of aesthetic awareness which are more conspicuous
by their differences, as defined by the differing complexities to which the Hutchesonian model draws attention.

With respect to his criticism of the inner sense school as such, it is fairly clear that Monboddo's attack is aimed specifically at Hutcheson in the first instance. Monboddo broadens the scope of his attack, however, to talk of an entire school of philosophy which has accepted the tenets of Hutcheson; an assumption, it may be noted, which was quite justified. In his attack on the multifarious separate aesthetic senses which inner sense theory frequently spawned, Monboddo, as we have seen, also generalized, painting a picture of a pandemic zeal for isolating a host of distinct aesthetic senses. An example of this type of work, and one to which we can imagine Monboddo to have taken great exception, is Gerard's Essay on Taste mentioned earlier; an excellent example of the species, although not referred to specifically by Monboddo, which proceeds from an initial adoption of Hutcheson's terminology to a statement, presented as indiscutable fact, that taste encompasses no less than seven principles: the senses of novelty, sublimity, beauty, imitation, harmony, ridicule and virtue (Gerard, p. 2). It is reasonable to suppose, too, that Kames's Elements of Criticism (1762) is another of the works whose conclusions Monboddo sought to correct and oppose. Kames, like Gerard, finds a plurality of aesthetic categories: such as the beautiful, the sublime, the grand, the novel and the ridiculous. Whether Kames is to be included in the inner sense school is more debatable. He
generally talks as if he is defining only emotions, such as the emotion of beauty or of sublimity, rather than attributing a distinct sense to each in the manner which Monboddo found so offensive. But other passages support the opposite view: he talks of "a sense of congruity or propriety" (Elements of Criticism, II, 6), as well as affirming that "our sense of beauty is the true test of what is beautiful" (Elements, II, 55-56). But Kames makes no attempt to labour the point that aesthetic perception is quasi-sensuous; he is more concerned to systematize the supposed principles of association than to enlarge on the internal sense theory which had in any case now been largely eroded by associationism. What really sets Kames's theory at odds with Monboddo's is his account of beauty as essentially visual rather than intellectual as Monboddo would have it. "The term beauty, in its native signification, is appropriated to objects of sight" (Elements, I, 242), says Kames; talk of tactile or auditory beauty is figurative. Kames also divides beauty into intrinsic and relative beauty; the former is discerned in a purely visual perception, in accordance with Kames's notion of beauty as an essentially sensuous quality, while the latter "is accompanied with an act of understanding and reflection" (Elements, I, 244). This distinction between non-rational intrinsic beauty and rational relative beauty Monboddo would dispute, holding as he does that even the perception of intrinsic beauty involves a rational element. Furthermore, the type of rationality introduced by an
appeal to utility is not the type of reasoning which Monboddo wishes to ally with aesthetic perception; I will return to this point in due course.

In the first instance, then, we may set Monboddo's aesthetic philosophy apart from that of most of his contemporaries by stressing its pointedly anti-empiricist slant. But, more positively, we can point to the philosophic rigour which Monboddo applied to the working out of his theory of beauty. The most significant chapters of both Monboddo's works, from a philosophical point of view, are those in which he defends an Aristotelian theory of ideas against modern alternatives which merely equate ideas with sense-impressions. In the course of distinguishing his own proper use of "idea" from those of Locke, Reid and Hume, Monboddo is driven to a detailed account of his terms, and a corresponding discriminatory precision which is not to be found in less thoroughly philosophical aesthetic treatises.

It would be too much, however, to claim that we find in Monboddo a clearly-defined analysis of neo-classical aesthetics which elucidates the ambiguities characterizing the pronouncements of so many other comparable critics. The ambiguities are still present in Monboddo, whose often contradictory statements on poetry and beauty bear witness to his indecision concerning such matters as whether or not poetry is rational; whether it generalizes or particularizes; whether it is primarily imitative or creative. What I would maintain, however, is that these contradictions,
being more clearly enunciated in Monboddo's theorizing than in others', stand as a perfect specimen of the tensions generated by a poetic based on a multiplicity of philosophical sources. I will proceed to examine these tensions, commencing with that between the theory of the poet as an imitator, and of the poet as a creator.

One exposition of "the poetical faculty," in Antient Metaphysics I, attributes only a fairly lowly role to the poet. Drawing a distinction between sensation (the perception of a present object) and imagination or phantasia (the representation to the mind of a previous sensation) Monboddo says that in the case of the brute creation the phantasia is limited to the recollection of things as they exist in nature, whereas the ability to rearrange the images of existing objects into representations of non-existents is a peculiarly human one. There is no suggestion here that the construct produced by this fresh combination of images is of a more elevated order than the fragments of sense-experience which make it up. In particular, the operations of the imaginative faculty are subordinate to those of the intellect, although comparable to the extent that both are not directly dependent on sense-impressions for their actions (AM.I, 94-96). Two features of poetry, as defined in Antient Metaphysics I, are of particular significance: (a) poetic creation is held to be generically similar to dreaming, and therefore equally prone to depart from the rational and pleasing; and (b) even when the deliverances of the imagination are
harnessed to produce "all the fine arts of imitation and design," these works of art, far from playing an important role in life, serve only to amuse; to "make the delight of human life" (AM, I, 113). This view is maintained in the subsequent volume, where Monboddo cites Philoponus concerning the two-fold role of the phantasia as both a simple repository of sense perceptions, and "a kind of Painter" (AM, II, 170); the latter corresponding to the human, poetic aspect of this faculty. The general estimate of the poet's status here is dismissive, and on a par with Monboddo's comment elsewhere that "a Poet is nothing else but a skilful castle-builder" (AM, II, 232). The lowly role of the poet at this juncture is indicated by the metaphor which Monboddo uses to describe the activity, no more important than the provision of mere amusement, in which the poet participates: the imagination is the "magic lanthorn" (AM, I, 90; AM, II, 252) of the mind. (AM, I, 90; AM, II, 232; the phrase appears in the earlier MP 22, Of the Human Mind, p. 22: "with respect to his Imagination [man] can call up what pictures in it he pleases, and can use it like a Magic Lantern or perspective Glass"). Whether these combinations of sense perceptions in the latter case occur "in a very strange and fantastical manner" (AM, II, 170), or whether they give rise to art of the highest order, is decided solely by Nature. If the phantasia is so constituted as to assemble its impressions "in the most beautiful and graceful manner" (AM, II, 170), the result is genius. Without further refining, however, the
family resemblances between these effusions of natural
genius and the monsters produced by the sleep of reason
are all too apparent; it must be remembered that for
Monboddo the controlled artifice of Milton is at all
times preferable to the untutored and erratic products of
Shakespeare. Hence, concludes Monboddo, it is only when
genius is subjected to the discipline of formal education
that it produces "Poets, Painters, Musicians, and Archi-
tects" (AM,II, 170). The same considerations apply to
the other branch of the taste/genius dichotomy: although
the mind can, by the simple employment of "its naturall
and unexercised Facultys" ("Of Taste," p. 56), attain to
a certain appreciation of artistic beauties, it is only
by a systematic study of the nature and ends of art that
a fully comprehensive understanding not only of what is
beautiful, but also of why it is beautiful, is achieved.
Reference might be made to Monboddo's notion of a progress
in taste in the individual by which he proceeds from a
delight in the lowly attractions of poetic numbers to an
insight into the organic unity of the plot (p. 50; see
p. 45 above).

In his depiction of the poet's function as the
reorganisation of sense impressions, Monboddo has already
substantially committed himself to an imitative theory of
art; if all the materials at the poet's disposal are
mental representations of particulars in the external
world, the poetic constructs towards which these images
contribute must perforce be imitations; if not of whole
existent objects, then of particular aspects of them. By superimposing on this rudimentary empiricism the kudos of Aristotle's theory of artistic imitation as contained in the *Poetics*, Monboddo takes a step away from the view of the poet as a mere regurgitator of previous experiences; and a step towards a more elevated concept of artistic representation.

Monboddo is careful to state that it is not imitation per se which forms the basis of an aesthetic work; and that the pleasure we derive from witnessing a convincing imitation is not the same as aesthetic pleasure: "if there be nothing else in the Subject imitated that we can commend, besides its Likeness to the Original, there we have no Perception of Beauty" (*Of Taste,* p. 49).

This statement has important implications for Monboddo's aesthetics, which become apparent in MP 243. There, Monboddo provides his interpretation of Aristotle's remarks on art as imitation. He identifies the objects of imitation, dividing them into those perceived by the senses and those perceived by the intellect; and limits the former to the deliverances of the sight and the hearing (MP 243, pp.1-3). He goes on to stipulate that the objects to be copied must themselves be beautiful, otherwise the art employed in imitating them can be none other than the art of mimicry, and is not eligible for inclusion among the fine arts. This section of Monboddo's argument is carried on independent of his definition of what it is that constitutes the beauty deemed requisite in these works.
Monboddo's concern here is not with the nature of beauty as such, but the location (literal or metaphysical) of such beauty, and the means by which the poet is to find it.

In accordance with a principal line of Renaissance thought, Monboddo holds that the beauty to be depicted by the artist is not that to be found in material objects, the raw input of the poet's imagination, but a beauty "superior to any thing we see in Nature" (MP 243, p. 4). It is by this means that Monboddo introduces the notion that the poet is something more than a mere purveyor of jigsaw pictures: "It is a Beauty of which the Artist conceives the Idea in his own Mind, & from thence is called the Ideall Beauty" (MP 243, p. 4).

Monboddo's subsequent comments show him accommodating his theory both to Aristotelian and Platonic teaching, as if desirous to reconcile the two. The idea which forms the basis of the beauty depicted by the poet is determined, in Monboddo's theory, by two ideals: those referred to by M. H. Abrams as the empirical and the transcendental ideal.¹ The former of these is approached as follows: Aristotle's remark in the Poetics that poetry deals in universals, while history is concerned rather with singulars, carries with it the implication that since the natural world is composed of singulars the poet's task is not to represent items in the natural world, but to select from these particular elements which will enable him to present universals in his poetry. This poses the question as to how universals

¹ The Mirror and the Lamp (New York, 1953), pp. 35-46.
are to be formed from empirical particulars: which elements are to be copied, how they are to be combined, what it is that elevates them from particular to general. Although Monboddo's main attraction is to the Platonic, or transcendental, ideal, much of MP 243 is to be seen as relating to the Aristotelian empirical ideal, with its emphasis on the fact that the ideal is to be approached by mankind principally through acquaintance with the empirical world. The importance of the world of sense in Monboddo's theory is evident in his statement that "the more beautifull" the natural Objects, we see, are, the more perfect will our Ideas of Beauty be" (MP 243, pp. 5-6).

One way in which Monboddo and others intended that the empirical should provide the data for the ideal was through the synthesis in one image of parts found separately in nature. Abrams talks of the unremitting regularity with which eighteenth-century critics have recourse to the story of Zeuxis the painter, who took as his models a number of maidens, representing in his painting the most comely features of each (Abrams, p.37). Monboddo serves to substantiate his point, chiming in with the declaration that "Zeuxis the Painter was certainly in the right" (MP 243, p. 6).

A simpler version of this process of selection, also advocated by Monboddo, is seen when the artist concentrates on the representation of one empirical particular, rather than selections from several, but presents a more pleasing
aspect of the original by removing any imperfections marring its approximation to the ideal, or by regrouping the elements of the particular into an aesthetically superior configuration. This version is in fact a corollary of Monboddo's previous premise that the objects of imitation must themselves be beautiful: instead of rejecting a flawed model and continuing the search (a doomed one, in view of the fact that earthly beauty is necessarily inferior to the ideal) for a truly beautiful one, the artist can, as it were, perform mental surgery on the subjects of his representation so as to render them fit for the task of embodying the universal. This version is applicable primarily to the visual arts, and is so used by Monboddo. A sharp distinction is drawn between a portrait, which is an exact copy (to indulge in anachronism, a photographic record), and a picture, in which there is evidence of a heightened gracefulness introduced by the artist; only the latter is a work of art. Similarly, a landscape which adheres too closely to the scene in real life is inferior, even when the artist is George Lambert, whom Monboddo knew in London, and whose work has on occasion been sold as Poussin's. Lambert confided to Monboddo that several of his landscapes were the result of direct copying of natural scenes, presumably with a view to refuting Monboddo's claims; but, Monboddo adds, "they never answered in the Piece" (MP 2:3, p. 9). Sometimes the requisite alteration to real objects is no more than "some touches of the Ideal Beauty so as to make them different in some
degree from what they really are"; but the principal changes to be made are in "the order and Arrangement of them" (MP 243, p. 9).

It will be seen that Monboddo is now conceding to the artist a much more important role than simply shuffling the contents of his fancy: there is now superadded a need for discrimination and judgment, as can be seen in Monboddo's dictate that, with respect to the painting of animals, "it must be the Genius of the Artist, and his idea of what is beautiful of the kind" (MP 243, p. 10) which determine the form taken by the art-work. An added complication in the case of animal paintings is that when "actions and Attitudes" (MP 243, p. 10) are given to the beasts, the artist is called upon to depict not only physical but also mental qualities. This point, however, has bearings on Monboddo's whole philosophy of the more elevated end of the artistic spectrum, and will be discussed in greater detail later; for the moment I will complete my sketch of Monboddo's opinions on the lower types of artistic imitation, by examining his account of descriptive poetry.

Monboddo draws an analogy, which a considered verdict must pronounce misleading, between descriptive poetry and landscape painting. Just as he maintains that a landscape painting which is an exact representation of a real natural scene cannot be classified as art, since the artist has made no attempt to improve upon the flaws inherent in mere nature; so, too, the descriptive poet, who produces "a mere transcript from Nature" (MP 243, p. 18)
fails to turn the real beauty of what he describes into the ideal beauty which ought to enhance his description, and is therefore no artist. This distinction between true poetry and mere description is applied to Thomson: The Castle of Indolence contains "Scenes which certainly do not exist in Nature, but only in the Imagination of the Poet," whereas The Seasons contains "Natural Appearances not of Scenes of fancy or Imagination" (MP 243, p. 18). It will be seen that Monboddo thus introduces a double criterion of ideality:

(a) the painter (and, by implication, the poet) may introduce the ideal into his work by minor "touching-up" or minimal rearrangement of his model or models. By this criterion a natural scene can form the basis of a true work of art; a painting of a panorama of London has just as great a claim to artistic merit as one depicting a quite imaginary vista.

(b) Thomson's Seasons is denied the status of art for no other reason than that it portrays scenes in the real world, rather than an invented realm of the poet's own imagining like that of The Castle of Indolence.

It is true that The Seasons is consciously a eulogy of Nature unadorned, and that Thomson awards the palm firmly to the beauties of the real world, against which the fictional devices of the imagination pall; and Monboddo's verdict seems influenced by this. But it is obvious that this latter criterion completely contradicts the former, implying as it does that to qualify as art a poem cannot
merely contain the poet's heightened vision of real, or life-like, beauties, but must retreat into an inner world private to the poet. The implications of this line of thought would be startling if rigidly drawn out, and would tend towards an aesthetic concerned exclusively with Blakeian visions; but for the most part Monboddo supports a more orthodox view of poetic imitation which condones the representation not only of characters and events purportedly located in the natural world, but even of suitably transformed historical happenings.

Monboddo is quite aware of the conflict between this view of the poet as a creator of idealizations, and Aristotle's precept, implied by his demand for probability, that the real world is, no matter how obscurely, the final standard to which the material of poetry must be faithful; as Monboddo acknowledges, the poetic fable "must be . . . beyond Nature, yet it must be also Natural" (MP 232, p. 10(4)). He sees this tension, however, as a resolvable one: combining the idealized with the life-like is conceived to be a practical problem to be tackled by the poet, not a wrong-headed attempt to implant in one work of art two conceptually incompatible types of entities.

I propose now to return from this digression to raise anew the point made earlier: that a further dimension is added to Monboddo's aesthetics by his view that the artist imitates not only sensible but also intelligible objects. Monboddo reaches this conclusion only in MP 243, which therefore represents a change of heart from the concept of
the poet as a mere retailer of sense impressions which runs through Antient Metaphysics.

In Antient Metaphysics I, Monboddo states categorically that the perceptive faculties of man are distinguishable into the perception of particular objects (by the sense and imagination) and the perception of generals (by the intellect). The function of the poet is confined to the former of these, as has been explained above; yet all the nobler activities of man involve the operation of the latter. This is Monboddo's view in 1779; by 1789, when MP 243 was written, a renewed attention to Aristotle's utterances on the universality of poetry in the Poetics had impelled Monboddo to a reconsideration of the degree to which poetry participates in the intellectual world. Hence his remark that the objects of poetic imitation may be either "things perceived by the Sense or things perceived by the Intellect" (MP 243, p. 2). Monboddo goes on to amplify on this remark later in the MS: he wishes to extend his discussion of art to take in not only "the Beauty of outward forms, such as we perceive by our Senses" but also those loftier beauties "which are perceived by our Intellect, I mean the Beauties of Mind, of Sentiment, Manners and Characters" (MP 243, p. 7).

As a first step in the evolution of Monboddo's aesthetic from an empirical to a transcendental one, I would point to a paragraph on ideal beauty subjoined as a footnote to Antient Metaphysics I, and therefore representing Monboddo's thought after the main body of his text was set in type; Monboddo has been outlining the mental operation
by which the intellect takes cognisance of the perceptions of sense and, by abstraction, makes them objects of the intellect, or ideas. This operation Monboddo then proceeds, in his footnote, to identify with the practice of the artist in imparting ideal beauty to his creations; despite the fact that there is a world of difference between the transcendentalism of this footnote and the concept of poetic creation as the rearrangement of sensible particulars which Monboddo introduces earlier in the same volume. The ideal beauty sought by the artist, says the footnote, is "no other than ideas of beauty, taken from forms actually existing, but corrected and improved by the Intellect; so that they become something transcendant" (AN, I, 117, n.). It would appear that in this footnote Monboddo is contradicting the empirical theory of art which runs through Antient Metaphysics I (and to which, indeed, Monboddo returns in Volume II, unmindful of the transcendentalism of the Volume I note).

The beauties of intellect to which Monboddo refers in MP 243 would appear, from the examples Monboddo provides, to be, in short, the attributes of the man (or woman, as Lady Douglas should remind us) of sentiment and feeling. Poetry, says Monboddo, "comprehends the operation of our chief faculty, I mean Intellect" (MP 243, p. 55); and to this end can encompass not only action but also argumentation and logical reasoning; as witness the reasoned speeches in Homer and Milton. The consequences of this point are important: both the parallel between painting
and literature which underpins so much of Monboddo's and his contemporaries' theorizing, and, more significantly, the whole notion of art as imitation are pushed to breaking point. As soon as a writer introduces talk of the beauties of a piece of reasoning, questions arise: of what is this reasoning an imitation? It is at least intelligible to talk of narrative poetry as depicting (note the etymology) an event in a way analogous to that in which an artist paints a picture; but to what product of the pictorial artist does a section of poetic argumentation correspond? Poetry, as understood by Monboddo to denote primarily epic and tragedy, yokes together two conceptually distinct modes of composition: enactment ("Exit Macbeth") and statement ("Life's but a walking shadow . . ."). It makes sense (whether it be wrong-headed or not is irrelevant) to maintain that poetic narrative can only approximate to the vividness of artistic representation; but in the case of statement the shoe is on the other foot, and the onus is on the artist to produce a pictorial analogue of a statement which the poet can enunciate with little difficulty. While the poet, for instance, can simply write "Alas! I am undone!", the artist must embroil his figure in all the activity of a game of charades to convey even such a simple notion. (It is food for thought to consider how far the aspects of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century figurative art which seem most alien to us now - the brows furrowed by passion, the dejected gaze, the fist clenched in moral resolve - are attributable to the artist's
struggle to convey information which would be more effectively relegated to a caption or thought-balloon.)

Something of the same sort occurred to Monboddo, and found expression in his remarks that the play Douglas was much more effective in dramatic form than it would be in a series of paintings (see p. 319 below). This did not deter him, however, from advocating that the artist should represent in his paintings (even those of animals!) manners, characters and passions such as are the business of the dealer in words rather than images. He continues to press the parallel between painting and poetry despite these anomalies which arise; and extends this tendency to music as well. The chief subject of musical imitation, too, is manners, sentiments and passions, and the musician's task is to approximate to the tones which nature has assigned to these human phenomena.

Behind several themes of Monboddo on the subject of poetic imitation we can see the influence of James Harris's Discourse on Music, Painting and Poetry, one of Harris's Three Treatises, first published in 1744. Monboddo notes in the printed works his familiarity with this volume; and the second treatise is noticeably similar in aim and method to Monboddo's Of Poetry (MP 243). Both tracts draw upon Aristotle's Poetics to furnish a basis for comparing the relative merits of the various fine arts. Harris concludes that there are two categories of objects which poetry can imitate in a markedly superior fashion to painting: actions of a prolonged duration; and those
which "lay open the internal Constitution of Man, and give us an insight into . . . Characters, Manners, Passions, and Sentiments." Here, then, we see the source of Monboddo's stress on the capacity of poetry for depicting a succession of events, as illustrated by Douglas, and for conveying intellectual beauties.

One effect of Monboddo's assent to the tradition that "ut pictura poesis" is that the full extent of his Platonism is not always apparent. As long as emphasis is laid on the empirical ideal as the artist's desideratum, the implication is that the primary task of the artist is just to tidy up the careless work of nature in the real world by adding a more regular curve here, a smoother line there. The pursuit of the Platonic transcendental ideal, however, implies an orientation away from the empirical world rather than an attempt to eliminate its discrepancies. For proof of such a transcendent aspect in Monboddo's literary theory we have a page of unadulterated Platonism in MP 243, p. 5. All the main elements in the traditional account are there: a former exalted state, with continuous contemplation of ἡ ἐκκεντρική; present aesthetic awareness as a reminiscence of former, this hypothesis being the only explanation of our supra-natural idea of beauty; the congruity between the Platonic account and the Bible. This Platonism occurs, too, in a Pocket Book discussion of ideas (PB 8, pp. 39-42), where Monboddo sees the child's

1 Works (1801), I, 50.
early reaction to beauty as intimating a state of pre-existence. The artist's power to represent beauties not derived from the world of sense is also paraded as a proof of pre-existence; the act of artistic creation is here interpreted rather as a laying claim to previously-possessed "Ideas of which there are no Archetypes in the naturall World, & which therfor the Objects of Sense could not have furnish'd us with, so that we must have been conversant wt. them in our former State" (PB 8, p. 41).

A more extensive enunciation of the same sentiments is to be found in PB 11, in a setting which gives some insight into Monboddo's rather eccentric thought-processes. This essay begins as a critique of John Caspar Lavater's Essai sur la Physiognomie (1783); a topic from which Monboddo is quickly diverted when he turns his attention to confuting a minor detail of Lavater's speculations which comes into conflict with Monboddo's own aesthetic opinions.

Lavater, Monboddo notes, betrays a materialist bias in his observation that ancient art is more beautiful than modern not because of a greater capacity for ideal creation, but because the empirical models available to the ancient artist were themselves finer than their modern counterparts (PB 11, pp. 14-16; c.f. Lavater, II, 322). This obliges Monboddo to sidetrack into an elaborate defence of his own Platonism, with all its aesthetic, religious and philosophical ramifications, which extends to some fifty pages before Monboddo wrests his attention back to Lavater's
work (PB 11, pp. 9-56). This essay bears marked resemblances to MP 243, and indeed seems to have served as an early draft of it.

The role of the artist is of the utmost importance in terms of this Platonist hypothesis, since it is he who directs mankind to the source of all that is valuable in life; and although Monboddo's account of poetry in *Antient Metaphysics* dwells more on the Aristotelian view of the poet as imitator, his theory of beauty, which can for the most part be considered independently of his theory of poetry, does justice to the exalted position of the artist which is implied by this introduction of Platonism. To corroborate this claim, and to provide some background to this doctrine of aesthetic awareness as reminiscence, I would cite two passages in the printed works in which Monboddo presents the view that the contemplation of beauty is the most exalted of human aspirations, and gives meaning and value to all activities subordinate to it.

In *Antient Metaphysics* II, in the same chapter from which I have quoted Monboddo's opinion that beauty is the ultimate cause of pleasure, it is made plain that this statement applies not just in terms of literature, but to all aspects of life. For one thing, ethics is subsumed under aesthetics: the human sense of honour and virtue depends, in Monboddo's view, on the fact that we perceive beauty in a morally good action. This is explained more fully in a previous chapter: when I perceive a virtuous action I am aware of a congruity, an
appropriateness, between the action and the system (encompassing self, mankind, God and Nature) within which the action is performed (AM,II, 118-119). This congruity is analogous with, for example, the relationship between figure and its surroundings in a well-designed picture. Virtue is consequently based on beauty, which has such "an universal influence in human life" that "every action and affection, which are, properly speaking, human, proceed from that source" (AM,II, 124). The chapter closes with the proposition that the highest beauty discernible is the beauty of the system of the universe, and that all intellectual activity is to be seen as preparation for an ultimate perception of such beauty in "the Beatific Vision of Philosophy" (AM,II, 132); a sentiment consonant with the Platonic doctrine of MP 243.

The second passage to which I refer links Monboddo's theory of beauty with his theory of ideas more fully than elsewhere. In Origin and Progress I, in the course of denying Lockian mental philosophy in every detail, Monboddo draws a distinction between perfect ideas, which are those clear and distinct general ideas which are adequately differentiated from the sensible particulars on which they are based; and imperfect, which are not. Among these perfect ideas is the idea of beauty, says Monboddo, and goes on to quote a sizable section of Plato's Symposium which formulates the theory that the pursuit of beauty involves a dialectical progress from the perception of beauty in individual corporeal forms, via the increasingly
intellectual beauties of species, minds, characters, manners, constitutions and science, to the general, eternal and supra-sensual idea of beauty (O&P, I, 95-97). The tone throughout is generalized in the extreme; as befits such a topic, Monboddo might counter: one of the properties of perfect ideas is that they are at a remove from the realm of natural, readily discussable objects. Monboddo himself observes that "Plato, we see, has not attempted to define the beautiful in this passage" (O&P, I, 99). Monboddo's zeal for definition, however, takes him beyond a mere transcription of Plato's high-flown generalities, and leads him to complement his classical sources by referring to a line of thought inherited from Shaftesbury and Hutcheson, resulting in the formulation that beauty consists in system.

It will be recalled that Monboddo contrasts intelligible beauties with the lesser type "such as we perceive by our Senses" (MP 243, p. 7). This exemplifies a looser manner of speaking than Monboddo usually permits himself, implying as it does that beauty, in its less exalted manifestations, is in fact an object of sense, perceptible in a sensuous or quasi-sensuous manner. It would be a mistake to think of this remark as typical of Monboddo's theory of beauty, the whole drift of which is away from the notion of an aesthetic sense which bypasses the rational faculty, registering aesthetic appreciation or disapproval without a concomitant cognitive act of the mind.

There is, admittedly, evidence, in the form of "Of Taste," that Monboddo originally believed it was possible
to perceive beauty in simple objects in a manner more akin to the sensitive than to the intellectual; but he quickly sheds the doctrine. A cancelled draft of "Of Taste" divides into two distinct groups the qualities in objects which raise in a beholder the idea of beauty: "some of them do simply & absolutely in themselves, without Relation to any Thing else give us the Idea of Beauty; Others only conjunctly and in Combination with other Things" (BF MSS 6, 38). This distinction occasions another: the ideas of beauty are divided into two categories. One group contains the ideas of beauty raised by single forms, among which Monboddo counts symmetrical geometric figures, single musical notes and sounds, single actions or sentiments, and single theorems or propositions of science. The influence of Shaftesbury is evident: Monboddo's list of plane geometric figures embodying this simple idea of beauty includes "the Globe, the Cone or the Cilander" (p. 39), and echoes a question asked by Theocles in The Moralists, in a discussion of our instinctive liking for regularity: "Why is the Sphere or Globe, the Cylinder and Obelisk prefer'd?"

The other type of beauty, a compound one, is discernible in larger-scale works: "a regular Building" (p. 39), an extended musical refrain, the depiction of a whole personality rather than a chance utterance, or a whole system of science. Beauties of the former type, "lying open to the naturall Facultys & untaught Apprehensions of

1 Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times (1711) II, 414.
Men" (p. 39), require a minimal application of the rational faculty, are perceived by the young and the uneducated, and are perceived in similar fashion by all men. The discernment of the latter type of beauty, however, requires an intellect attuned to the complexities involved, and takes various forms: these beauties "are very differently perceived by different Men, and by some not at all" (p. 39). Clearly Monboddo is drawn at this stage to an Addisonian account of beauty, differentiating between a simple, immediate beauty and a secondary type the apprehension of which is consequent on the play of the intellect over the elements constituting the work. The besetting problem of eighteenth-century aesthetics, characterized by Monboddo as "the Connection betwixt the rationall Faculty & Taste" (p. 39) is thus partially settled: these higher, secondary, beauties are completely rational; the lower, immediate, beauties, though not originating in sense (that way materialism lies) "are much more connected with it" (p. 39), and with this vagueness we must rest content.

The two types of perception associated with these two types of beauty may be described as the perception of simple objects, and of compound ones. By the final draft of "Of Taste," however, this distinction has undergone important modification. In the final version, the operation of the mind upon an object is still classified under one of two heads, but with a difference: either the object is conceived of "as one single individuall Object standing
by itself and unconnected with any Thing else", or "in relation to other objects, or as consisting of parts, which have a certain Relation to one another or to the whole" (p. 47). Monboddo now maintains that the former mode of perception is not, strictly speaking, a perception of beauty at all: "no Idea of Beauty is produced," says Monboddo, when a man views objects "simply as one without analysing them into Parts or comparing them with any other Object" (p. 47). Thus Monboddo takes a step away from the inner sense theorists: no longer is beauty attributable to a quality in objects capable of impressing itself infallibly on even an untrained beholder. Instead, the onus is now on the beholder to perceive an object either as an indivisible, non-aesthetic whole or as an internally-related, and therefore potentially aesthetic, system.

Yet Monboddo could not bring himself to apply this strict rationalism with such complete consistency as to deny children any aesthetic awareness. Returning again to his "Globes, Cones & Cylanders" (p. 52), Monboddo writes "yet in these simple as they are there are those Characteristicks of Beauty" (p. 52). Monboddo's justification of this apparent contradiction of his previous denial of beauty to simple forms seems to be that although a child naturally is not conscious of perceiving an object as a simple form or as a complex one, yet he derives from his perception a pleasure, albeit a diminished and vague one, comparable to that attendant on full-blooded aesthetic perception.
Monboddo's mature view, then, can be taken as that enunciated in *Antient Metaphysics*, that "There is no Beauty in one single thing, considered by itself" (*AM*, II, 106). If beauty is to be won back from the category of the sensuous, the sole province, in Monboddo's eyes, of the modern empiricism he detested so much, it is necessary to demonstrate that the mental operation which takes cognisance of beauty belongs to the rational faculty. This reasoning faculty, believes Monboddo, has as its proper objects ideas, and in particular the relations between them. Hence in proceeding to say that beauty "must consist in Relation" (*AM*, II, 106) Monboddo is taking an important step towards establishing the pedigree of the aesthetic faculty as being of intellectual origin.

Monboddo's aesthetics can be described in general terms as being Shaftesburian; but purged of the ambiguities associated with the Shaftesburian concept of a moral sense, and therefore approximating more to the scanty theory of beauty propounded by Monboddo's mentor Aristotle.

Before expanding on this, I will sketch in the exposition of Monboddo's account of the nature of beauty. Having decided that beauty consists in relation, Monboddo proceeds to make the more specific claim that the relation in which beauty is discernible is the connection between objects forming a system, "so that wherever the Mind perceives a System in things, it has the Idea of Beauty" (*AM*, II, 107). Here, as in his theory of poetic imitation, Monboddo is indebted to his friend Harris's early *Three Treatises* in
corroborating his own findings among the philosophy of
the ancients: asserting that every art "should have some
plan or system" (O&P, II, 487), Monboddo directs his reader
to "Mr Harris's excellent treatise of Art" (O&P, II, 488, n.).
The Dialogue Concerning Art to which Monboddo makes refer-
ence does indeed establish a conception of art comparable
to Monboddo's own: the artist is to be directed by "a
System of various and well-approved Precepts" (Works, I, 15).
It is true that the system Harris, and Monboddo in his turn,
are considering in this specific instance is the system
which the artist follows in the composition of his work,
rather than the system to be perceived in the art-work
itself, but the two are akin: by an awareness of system in
the finished product one infers the systematic activity
of the artist, just as one infers from the beauty of the
natural world to the power and benevolence of a Creator.
The perception of beauty, then, is a perception that the
elements of the object contemplated contribute to a whole,
and participate in its completeness. Various formulations
of the theory are offered by Monboddo; sometimes the per-
ception with which he is concerned is referred to as per-
ception of "the one in the many" (AM, II, 107). The common
theme, however, is that the creator of beauty exerts a
unifying force on his materials, and that the appreciation
of literary effort is the awareness of a unity in the
resulting art-work. The comparison with Hutcheson's for-
mula of unity amidst variety is an obvious one.

A less than obvious application of this doctrine is
seen in Monboddo's claim that it can be turned to the support of Platonic transcendentalism. Monboddo presents the thesis that "we cannot have an idea of any one individual thing . . . without perceiving the one in the many" (AM,II, 107), since the idea (conceived of as a wholly intellectual entity, not as a sense impression) is constructed by a process of abstraction from a number of particular sense impressions. Monboddo's conclusion is that "Every idea, therefore, is a System by itself; and, according to my definition of Beauty, is Beautiful" (AM,II, 108). This obviously prepares the way for the professedly Platonic doctrine of MP 243, in which the contemplation of ideas is posited as the prime activity of the philosopher seeking beauty.

It should be pointed out that this theory of the beauty of single ideas is in no way in conflict with Monboddo's denial of the presence of beauty in individual things: beauty is consistently regarded as a property of individual ideas, the end-product of a process of abstraction, and not of individual objects. Monboddo to this extent sidesteps the question which occasioned so much eighteenth-century aesthetic speculation: whether awareness of beauty exercises the rational, or the sensitive, faculty of the mind. The paradox giving rise to the question is that aesthetic judgment often appears, on the one hand, to be objective, rational, and capable of being supported by reasoned argument; while, on the other hand, one's response to art is often instinctive and not
susceptible either to logical explanation or to erasure by reasoned argument. Looked at from another aspect, aesthetic judgments are paradoxical in harnessing both a subjective record of favourable or unfavourable reaction to the work in question, and a statement, ostensibly objective, about qualities which the beholder thereby attributes to the art-work. Such considerations led many critics to introduce a dichotomy between rational and sensuous beauty; for a discussion of this point, see R. L. Brett's The Third Earl of Shaftesbury: A Study in Eighteenth-Century Literary Theory (London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1951), pp. 130-144. In the case of Addison, this takes the form of a distinction between an immediately discernible beauty, the effect of "several Modifications of Matter which the Mind, without any previous Consideration, pronounces at first sight Beautiful" (Spectator No. 412; ed. Bond, III, 542), and a second type, with a lesser impact on the imagination, which we apprehend to consist in, for instance, the judicious arrangement or colouring of a painting. Hutcheson conceives the distinction to be between an absolute beauty perceived in objects considered apart from any referent, and a comparative or relative beauty dependent on the justness of the resemblance between an object and a referent it imitates (Hutcheson, pp. 13-14). The two sets of distinctions, Addison's and Hutcheson's, are not, of course, directly comparable; but in both instances the former branch of each dichotomy has a greater affinity with the sensitive faculty than the latter. Monboddo, however, extends the
province of the intellect to the entire realm of beauty. Whether immediate or considered, whether simple or complex, all aesthetic perception requires an intellectual recognition of system. For Monboddo, the difference between a simple delight in a figurative felicity in a poem, and a complex awareness of the organic oneness of a plot lies not in a generic dissimilarity between the two instances, but in the complexity of the system discerned in each. The maxim as formulated in Antient Metaphysics II is "the greater the System in any of these Arts [i.e. the fine arts of music, painting, sculpture and poetry], the greater the Beauty," with the proviso that the system must be such as can be "comprehended and taken in at one view" (AM, II, 112; an obvious allusion to Aristotle's remark in the Poetics that we cannot perceive beauty in an extremely large or small animal, to which specific reference is made in Antient Metaphysics, V, 121). Varieties of aesthetic response are conceived of as being in accordance with the mental attributes of the percipient, so that "He, of little understanding, will take in but a small part of a System" (AM, II, 112). This principle is applied in a manner reminiscent of Monboddo's account of the progress of taste in the individual, from childhood to maturity, as contained in "Of Taste" (see p. 45 above): a lowly critic will be drawn to the characters, or perhaps a simile, in a poem, while a more perceptive critic will devote his attention to the organic unity of a plot. A detailed working-out of this theory is not provided, and vagueness
abounds: one wonders, for instance, how the appreciation of "a Description, or some such splendid patch" (AM, II, 112) depends on its exhibiting system, and indeed, the extension of the notion of beauty as system to the minutiae of literary criticism seems frankly erroneous.

The affinities between Monboddo's theory of beauty and Shaftesbury's will by now be apparent. Monboddo's critical writings abound with references to, and praise and censure of, Shaftesbury's work, and it is particularly clear that he held The Moralists in high esteem. A comparison will show that the main features of Monboddo's aesthetics are adapted from the cosmology of The Moralists as defined by Theocles. The key passage is that in which Shaftesbury, like Monboddo, endeavours to establish a rational basis for quasi-sensuous aesthetic perception. Citing the difference between chaos and order to infer the existence of a divine architect, Theocles states "Now as this Difference is immediately perceiv'd by a plain Internal Sensation, so there is withal in Reason this account of it; That whatever Things have Order, the same have Unity of Design, and concur in one, as Parts of one WHOLE, or are, in themselves, intire Systems" (Characteristicks, II, 285). From the same source comes the notion that the universe itself is the grand paradigm of system, and consequently that the discernment of system in parvo is an apprenticeship for contemplation of this ultimate system, the cosmos (II, 286). Monboddo labelled the ancient philosophy the "Philosophy of Mind," and would
consequently be pleased to see. Shaftesbury maintain that the necessary consequence of contemplating the oneness of the universe is that "we must of consequence acknowledge a Universal MIND" (II, 290). To a large extent this harmony of opinion between the two writers is attributable to influences common to both, Plato being the pre-eminent example. Philocles talks in undeniably Platonic terms of the dialectic by which the aspiring soul moves from the single beauties of external forms to the beauty of the universe; and Monboddo would have been reading Shaftesbury already equipped with a close acquaintance with Plato's original expositions of the theory. Monboddo would have been drawn to Shaftesbury because the latter's philosophy was attuned to the classical philosophy to which he himself was devoted; and in reading Shaftesbury Monboddo's classical philosophical principles took on something of the cast of Shaftesbury's own mind: some of the arguments and examples in which Monboddo clothes his classicism adhere closely to those by which Shaftesbury expresses his own highly personalized Platonism. Shaftesbury's uncompromisingly anti-materialist assertion that "there is no Principle of Beauty in Body. None at all" (II, 404) provides the basis for Monboddo's later expositions of the same line of thought. Similarly, Monboddo's hierarchy of beauties in MP 243, according to which poetry exhibiting the beauties of sentiments, character and action is preferred to that exhibiting the lesser delights of outward forms, relates to Part III, Section II of The Moralists. Here, Theocles urges Philocles
into agreement that "those Fabricks of Architecture, Sculpture, and the rest of that sort" are less rational and exalted than those contained in "your Sentiments, your Resolutions, Principles, Determinations, Actions" (II, 409). Monboddo goes so far as to draw attention to this facet of Shaftesbury's influence, praising his having directed his ethics at those capable of discerning the beauty of "Characters, Sentiments, and Manners," who thus show greater taste than "those who admire Beauty and Grace only in outward forms" (AM, II, 117, n.). The only fault Monboddo finds in Shaftesbury's aesthetics is his failure to systematize his opinions with the same painstaking thoroughness to which Monboddo himself aspired. Despite his continuous eulogy of the beauty of the universe via the mouthpiece of Theocles, and despite his constant praise of the universal system, says Monboddo, Shaftesbury fails to make it explicit that these two subjects of his paeans are in fact to be identified: "he has not told us what Beauty is" (MP 272, Of the Rhapsody of Lord Shaftesbury, p. 26). Yet only a modicum of consideration, continues Monboddo, would have sufficed to make the connection between the two: "For as he speaks So much of Harmony Numbers & Proportion, a very little reflection would have convinced him that System which cannot be without Numbers & Proportions is Beauty" (p. 26). At the same time, however, it is clear that Monboddo attributed great importance to Shaftesbury's aesthetics, holding him to be "the first among the Moderns who appears to have known that Beauty
was the Object of Intellect, & of Intellect only & that
the Contemplation & Admiration of Beauty was the only
good of the Intellectuall" (p. 31).

In the light of these remarks we can turn to another
critic's dichotomy between sensuous and intellectual
beauty, and its faults when viewed in terms of Monboddo's
theory. Reference has been made to Kames' distinction
between intrinsic and relative beauty (see p. 47 above).
This latter beauty demands an awareness in the perceiver
of the intended end or function of the object under con¬
sideration, and originates in Hume's analysis of the
beauty of utility, in which he postulates a perceiver's
sympathetic participation in the real or imagined benefits
accruing to the agent affected by the object's utility; to
the principle of utility, says Hume, "is owing the beauty,
which we find in every thing that is useful." 1 But this
awareness of utility is not to be confused with Monboddo's
awareness of system, although both include a rational
element in the perception of beauty. Monboddo's concept
of aesthetic perception as a disinterested contemplation
of system as a microcosmic imitation of God's creative
power reinforces the view of art as elevated and supra¬
mundane; Hume's concept of perception of beauty as a
sympathetic appreciation of utility tends to erode any
generic distinction between artistic matters and the
affairs of common life (we find a fertile field beautiful,
says Hume, simply because we join in the happiness of the
farmer who cultivates it to his advantage.)

1 A Treatise of Human Nature, ed. L.A. Selby-Bigge
Despite Monboddo's debt to Shaftesbury, he should be seen as a contributor towards Monboddo's theory rather than as a principal source. The fact is that Monboddo, overtly and covertly, models himself on Aristotle, not Shaftesbury. Quoting from Aristotle's remarks on the extent of beauty in the Poetics, Monboddo adds "From what Aristotle says here, it is evident that he conceived Beauty as I do, not to consist in the perception of a single thing, but of several things connected together; . . . This is Aristotle's idea of Beauty, which I have adopted" (AM, V, 121). The implication is that Shaftesbury was a perceptive modern whose ideas proved congenial to Monboddo, but that any serious philosophy of art must have recourse to Aristotle. Certainly the manner in which Monboddo conducts his argument is decidedly Aristotelian rather than rhapsodic: Monboddo eschews the exclamatory fervour of Theocles in favour of the systematic rigour of Aristotle. This is most markedly so in the longest sustained discussion of beauty which Monboddo produced, "Of Taste," which is modelled on the Aristotelian method of examining commonly-held opinions on beauty with a view to reaching the truth.

I have postponed a close examination of "Of Taste" until now because, although pre-dating Antient Metaphysics, the MS is most fruitfully viewed as evolving the theory of beauty which I have endeavoured to present in its mature form by reference to the printed works. The hand, an early scribe's, points to a date of composition in the 1750's or early 1760's, but additions in the hand of Monboddo himself
and Kirkpatrick Williamson show that Monboddo deemed the MS worthy of revision after the latter entered his employment in 1773.

In embarking on an analysis of the concept of taste Monboddo was performing a task which was practically de rigueur for any aspiring aesthetician of the time; and indeed Scotland boasted a climate particularly congenial to writings on the topic. These ranged from John Armstrong’s poem *Taste* (1753), a reformulation of the standard gibes against those whose financial resources outstripped their capacity to employ their wealth in an artistically decorous manner, to Hume’s weightier attempts to examine the nature of taste in *Of the Delicacy of Taste and Passion* (1741) and *Of the Standard of Taste* (1757). And it was the Edinburgh Society which honoured Gerard’s *Essay on Taste* (1759) with the award of a prize. Writers on taste used the term as a hold-all into which they might pack whatever desirable qualities were implied by their aesthetic convictions, importing into their analyses their own notions of the attributes of the man of taste; and just as Hume paints him in Gallic tints, so Monboddo depicts him as a committed Aristotelian, albeit one receptive to emotional qualities as well.

As the title indicates, "Of Taste" draws on the accepted notion of a split between the capacity to appreciate works of art, and the greater capacity to create them. To the qualities of the man of taste the poet super-adds the inspired wildness of poetic licence; but
connoisseur and creator alike must possess the faculty of aesthetic judgment. Monboddo's title might suggest that the level of discourse will be that of sentimental dilettantism; but questions of taste are, for Monboddo, resolvable only in terms of philosophy, and an attempt is made to carry out investigations with the rigour of Aristotelian thoroughness.

Monboddo accordingly begins with a résumé of common opinions. On certain matters there is agreement, says Monboddo: no one denies that by taste we perceive beauty or deformity, and judge of works of art and nature; or that tastes vary, yet a standard of taste exists. Disagreement arises, continues Monboddo, when critics attempt a definition of beauty, the object of taste: "Some give no other Account of it except that it is a Matter of mere Feeling like the Objects of the Bodily Senses, Others that go a little deeper say that it consists in Uniformity & Variety, Others that it is the same or of a like Nature with Grandeur & Novelty. It is also disputed how far Taste is connected with Art and Science, Or whether it be not the pure Gift of Nature, & lastly whether Taste & Genius be not the same or wherein they differ" (BF MSS, 6, 36). The views which Monboddo thus takes as his rough data are too common, and too widely diffused throughout the critical speculation of the time, to be positively attributable to individual writers; although the mention of uniformity and variety can be taken as a direct reference to Hutcheson. From references elsewhere, however,
we can infer Monboddo's familiarity with Shaftesbury, Addison and Hume; and it is probable that he would be acquainted too with Gerard and Burke. It is this background, then, against which Monboddo sets his own account of taste and beauty.

Monboddo proceeds by taking for granted two propositions: the perception of beauty is accompanied by pleasure, and is not a mere perception of sense. The latter of these is a notable piece of question-begging which Monboddo tries to buttress by further reference to his theory of ideas, contrasting mere sense-perceptions of physical forms with abstract ideas of beauty; but Monboddo's case is unlikely to win over any converts from empiricism. Monboddo concedes that the materials on which the mind operates in aesthetic perception are provided by the senses, but warns against confounding sensory and aesthetic pleasure. Here, too, Monboddo tackles the problem presented to his theory by the apparently immediate and non-intellectual beauties of simple sense-impressions. "Wherever therefore any pleasure arises immediately from any Perception of Sense, we must not call that Beauty, altho' in some Cases, it may be confounded with it" (p. 46), says Monboddo: the sense-impression is conceived of as the vehicle of the beauty, not as constituting it. An ingenious argument supports this claim: although "it is commonly said that light or any vivid Colour is beautifull, because it gives us pleasure" (p. 46), this is erroneous; a proof of which is that "if the Light or Colour becomes exceeding strong, it gives
us the Feeling of Pain, but no Idea of Deformity, which would be the Case, if the Pleasure it gave us before had arisen from Beauty" (p. 46).

Monboddo then proceeds to the denial of simple beauty, as discussed above (see pp. 68-71 above). A corollary of this claim that beauty cannot be predicated of a single form is that beauty is deemed relational, and thus, in one respect, subjective. Beauty, says Monboddo, is perceived by apprehending the co-operation of the elements in a system, and therefore belongs to "that Category or Class of Ideas that they call Relation" (BF MSS, 6, 47).

Here we see, in prototype, the view later reappearing in Antient Metaphysics, that beauty consists in relation (AM, II, 106). A feature of relation, Monboddo continues, is that "it exists not in the Objects themselves but in the Mind that considers & compares them" (p. 47). Relations are therefore not "Qualities of Objects," but "Judgements of the Mind comparing two Objects" (p. 47).

Here, then, we have Monboddo's early attempt to account for both the subjective and individual, and objective and universal, dimensions of aesthetic judgment. In apprehending, let us say, that a sub-plot contributes to a catastrophe, we base our judgment on objective features of the work in question; our decision is therefore not arbitrary or irrational. But it is, to a greater or lesser extent, dependent on the attitude and mental capacity of the beholder whether or not he judges such a relation to exist between the plot and sub-plot. If no judgmental
act takes place, no perception of beauty will occur. Hence the wide variety of tastes, and the apparent lack of a standard of taste, is allowed for.

Having traced beauty to relation, Monboddo feels obliged to specify the type of relation involved. He examines the entire range of relations between objects (cause and effect, for example, and faculty and object), concluding by a process of elimination that the candidates can be narrowed to three: diversity, identity and similarity. Mere diversity is an insufficient basis for beauty, since a unifying force must bind together the scattered elements of a composition before it can be pronounced beautiful. It is certainly true, Monboddo explains, that "Variety yields a Pleasure, which Pleasure, mixt with that of Beauty, heightens the Enjoyment very much" (p. 49); and indeed variety is the main literary virtue which Monboddo attributes to classical literature in general and to such moderns as Milton. But the pleasures of beauty and variety are different, says Monboddo, and should be carefully distinguished.

A similar attention to fine philosophical discrimination leads Monboddo to deny the beauty of imitation as such, although his poetical theory is indisputably imitative. The relation under discussion, then, is not identity. The pleasure arising from the apprehension of similarity between an artist's production and its natural referent is more akin to the pleasure accompanying the acquisition of knowledge, believes Monboddo, than to aesthetic pleasure.
Monboddo thus expressly repudiates the comparative beauty discussed by Hutcheson. Already one can discern, in "Of Taste," the origins of the doctrine in MP 243 that the artist must avoid too faithful a reproduction of natural detail, favouring rather a heightened portrayal of his subject: "if there be nothing else in the Subject imitated that we can commend, besides its likeness to the Original, there we have no Perception of Beauty" (p. 49).

This leaves, as the only type of relation in which beauty can consist, that referred to variously by Monboddo as similarity, similitude and resemblance. Monboddo's views on imitation indicate that the similarity thus described is not that between an art-work and its referent, but between elements in a composition. The most eminent degree of this similarity, and that producing the greatest beauty, is that which "connects and unites Things seemingly the most different and even opposite, and that is, Tendency to promote one End or accomplish one purpose" (p. 50); or, in the later terminology of Antient Metaphysics, a tendency to form a system.

Considerable sleight of hand is required to apply the criterion of participation in a system to all branches of artistic endeavour; and "Of Taste" gives some hints as to how Monboddo planned to effect this. Whenever the relation of similitude is seen, says Monboddo, the mind "has Some idea of Aptness and Congruity & consequently of Beauty" (p. 50). When viewed in these terms, Monboddo's comments begin to make sense of the notion that the beauty
of characters, sentiments and passion is to be analysed in the same way as pictorial or descriptive beauty. The actions and pronouncements of a poetic character may be described as "apt" or "congruous" if they are in harmony with his situation, for example, or his station in life, or an ideal of virtuous conduct. The application of Monboddo's apparently objective criterion of beauty, therefore, presupposes an entire world view: that nature comprises a hierarchy generating its own norms of conduct, its own duties and obligations. An implication of this view is that all good art is moral art; that is, art which depicts characters acting in accordance with the demands of nature's ethical code. By teasing out the strands of Monboddo's notion of "aptness and congruity" as the hallmark of beauty, then, I have tried to approach from another direction the phenomenon exemplified in Monboddo that morality in the age of the man of feeling was conceived of as not only analogous to, but dependent on, aesthetics; as Monboddo says in *Antient Metaphysics*, the virtuous is pursued because of the beauty it embodies. (The caveat should be inserted here that although subsuming virtue under beauty Monboddo nevertheless warns against a total identification of the beautiful and the good. There are many goods, says Monboddo (by which he means those things intrinsically conducive to the total happiness and well-being of man), which are not beautiful, such as health.) Such a view of morality and aesthetics results in a very one-dimensional theory of art, with interesting
side-effects. For one thing, satire and, in general, the depiction of any characters acting in an inappropriate and unseemly manner are debarred from the realms of true art. This, however, is easily enough compensated for by hedging off such representations, allotting them their own category of the ridiculous. A second result, however, is to abnegate the writer's capacity for formulating any criticism of a world-order as such. The classical view of literature to which Monboddo subscribes presupposes an acceptance of nemesis, or kharma: the good prosper, the bad are punished. This is not to say that the good are never punished; but, it is understood, there is a reason for their punishment. Any suggestion in an artwork that this sense of justice is missing is seen by Monboddo as a simple ignorance of the rules of poetry, rather than as a possibly valid depiction of the human condition. Monboddo, indeed, notes with disquiet the modern tendency to combine the incompatible world-views of tragedy and comedy. Describing "the good Success of Virtuous Characters or a happy Conclusion of all turmoils & troubles" as the proper business of comedy, Monboddo observes that they "yet may be well received even in Tragedy by the unlearned Judge" ("Of Taste," p. 57).

There is an ever-present tension in Monboddo's criticism between the methodical, rational love of decorum which he drew from his classical masters, and the susceptibility to the emotional and the awesome which we associate with his age. Monboddo's concession to the
culty of the sublime lies in his deigning to give some account of the part played in our enjoyment of art by qualities such as grandeur and novelty which are, on Monboddo's premisses, non-aesthetic; his classicism lies in his refusing to acknowledge them as beauties in any true sense of the word. Having already pointed out the discrepancies in Hutcheson's assignment of beauty to variety and imitation, Monboddo continues "Of Taste" by driving a wedge between the pleasures of beauty and of grandeur, novelty and admiration, as well as differentiating beauty from the ridiculous and the good in the manner outlined above.

The burden of Monboddo's argument is that while grandeur, novelty and irregularity are vital components in our response to artistically pleasing objects, the basis of their appeal is quite distinct from that of beauty, defined, with the aid of Aristotle and Shaftesbury, as system. Aristotle, indeed, is invoked to prove the point: grandeur contributes to beauty only when serving the purpose of bringing the object of contemplation into the median range in which Aristotle asserts the beautiful to be discernible. The pleasure of novelty is traced by Monboddo to the same origin as that of imitation: "Learning & Knowledge, which by Nature is pleasant to us" (p. 51). And the pleasure of admiration, which Monboddo notes can extend to what he splendidly terms "that profound Reverence & Veneration which we call religious Awe or sacred Horror" (p. 51), is also deemed foreign to beauty.
Monboddo next examines beauty in terms of the categories of objects in which it is found: works of art; works of nature; characters, sentiments and manners; and theorems and systems of science. It is in the treatment of the second of these that we witness the battle between classical beauty and modern sublimity over Monboddo's aesthetic soul. "In the Works of Nature," says Monboddo, "we admire Regularity and Proportion as the Level of the Green, the smooth Slope and regular Figure of the Hill, the River Winding in regular Curves, the Trees fringing the Top of the Bank or breaking the Evenness of the Plain by Shades here & there at regular Distances" (pp. 52-53).

So far Monboddo is painting a landscape in which an ancient Greek would feel quite at home. But the non-aesthetic delights which also figure in a rural panorama are also acknowledged, in what is for Monboddo the most purple of purple passages: "there is the Variety of Hill & Dale and Plain and Wood & Water There are Trees & Plants of various Shapes & Sizes placed in all the Variety of Attitudes and Distances imaginable, and there are Flowrs enamelling the Ground in wild Profusion, Next Grandeur predominates in the Works of Nature; This is what Strikes us in lofty Mountains, wide extended Plains, the vast Ocean, the wonderfull Canopy of Heaven: Then there are deep Caverns & Grottos, dark and solemn Groves, believed of old to be the Habitations of Gods & Demons, and yet inspiring with religious Awe & Veneration" (p. 53). Monboddo's sensibilities, in fact, are keenly attuned to
the artless beauties of the day: "Too great Regularity in laying out Gardens and adorning Villas hath been sufficiently ridiculed and exploded" (p. 53). But he believes the modern penchant for the irregular to have been taken further than classical good taste sanctions: "I think we have gone to the other Extream when we have banished altogether from such Works the Beautys of Art" (p. 53). Variety must, as ever, be tempered by uniformity: "would that rurall Wildeness," asks Monboddo "which is now so much affected be the less pleasant to the Eye, not to speak of Conveniency, for having intermixed with it streight Avenues, some square Fields, regular Lines of Trees? Might there not be some Groves or Clumps answering one to another, or would the House be the worse situated for being embraced by a Semicircle of Wood hanging over it, instead of being placed as it now is in a great Lawn broke here & there by Trees or Tufts of Trees scattered as it were by Chance?" (pp. 53-54).

A similar doubt in Monboddo's mind concerning the relative merits of classical and romantic tendencies can be seen in his opinions concerning the cast of mind appropriate to the poet. He acknowledges a discrepancy between the popular notion of the poet as an inspired figure, his mind distracted from worldly matters by a furor poeticus, and his own principle that the highest realms of artistic ability are laid open only to those whose intellect has been disciplined to a severe philosophical regime. In accommodating to his theory "the
Want of Sense & Understanding that is imputed to Artists" (p. 58) Monboddo concedes that a close attention to his art may diminish an artist's contact with the mundane, but insists "surely it will not be said that they want Understanding or Knowledge in their own Art" (p. 58). Monboddo thus retains his view that the artist's attitude to the beautiful must be methodical and rational. But in painting a character of the man of genius, as opposed to the man of taste who admires beauty "soberly and discreetly" (p. 59), Monboddo presents a view of genius which suggests that the poetic temperament not only rejects the ordinary world but approaches the beautiful with a less than rational fervour: "Beauty is to the Genius a Mistress to who he devotes himself entirely . . . hence comes that Enthusiasm approaching sometimes near to Madness which is so observable in Men of Genius, together with that Ignorance of common Life and sometimes such a Degree of Folly and Wrongness of Head as makes them very contemptible in the Eyes of those who have no Taste for their Art" (p. 59). Clearly Monboddo's ideal artist, designing organic artworks of great complexity while in the thrall of virtual insanity, is a figure of remarkably opposed qualities.

In "Of Taste," then, we see the evolution of the theory of art which finally appears in Antient Metaphysics. The rest of the MS allies virtue to beauty in the manner discussed earlier, before tailing off, in typical Monboddo fashion, in an extraneous speculation on the degree of moral feeling among savage races. Two other MSS show that the
matter in "Of Taste" was subjected to reworking on various occasions before surfacing in Antient Metaphysics. MP 7, entitled Of Beauty, dated 1772, and endorsed "To be printed," covers the same ground as "Of Taste" and reaches roughly similar conclusions. There is, however, some embellishment: Monboddo now recognizes a symbolic function of single qualities of aesthetic objects which influences his earlier opinion that beauty cannot be predicated of, for example, a single colour. Monboddo now believes that "a single Colour may be said properly enough to be Beautifully namely when it is considered as the Mark or Indication of something Beautiful" (MP 7, p. 4). Thus a blush is beautiful because it indicates a beautiful disposition of mind; and a complexion is beautiful because it attests to the health of its possessor. Thus Monboddo tries to eradicate one troublesome feature of his aesthetic (its inability to admit the possibility of a plain colour's being literally beautiful), but at the cost of eroding the basis on which his theory of beauty as system is based: once one accords to single, non-relational qualities the capacity to evoke in a beholder the response appropriate to a rational, truly beautiful, object, the need for a perception of system in each act of aesthetic judgment becomes redundant.

An item entitled "Homerus Historicus" (BF MSS, 11, 48-80, 299-303) shows that Monboddo's mind was ranging to the literary application of an imitative aesthetic as early as the 1760's. This MS delineates in detail the
historical origins of Homer's poetry; and concludes with
Monboddo's answer to a question presenting itself in the
course of Monboddo's main argument: if Homer merely
represents factual incidents, wherein consists the merit
by virtue of which he is deemed a poet? Monboddo's
answer is that it lies in the rearrangement of the events
of the poem so "as most to delight & move the mind of the
Spectator or Reader" (p. 74). In other words, the ideal
to which the poet here aspires is defined with reference
not to the metaphysical nature of the ideas he presents,
but to the practice of ancient artists in selecting ele¬
ments of their works from a number of individual models;
and adds that "of the best Modern Pictures, that have been
painted in Italy, the particular figures are taken either
from Real Life, or from those antient Statues" (p. 75).

In keeping, then, with his age's desire for optimum
mental impact in literature, Monboddo stipulates force
of emotional effect as the main desideratum to be aimed
at by the artist in his imitation. He even lists the two
main ways in which Homer manages to do this, to "surprise
& agitate the Reader" (p. 75). The first method is com¬
pression: Homer "crowds together the several events"
(p. 75) so that the reader does not "tire or become
languid" (p. 76). The second method depends on judicious
selection of the events thus juxtaposed so as to surprise
the reader continually; in which Homer has succeeded so
well that "almost all the Events of his Poem, are so many
Peripateias PERIPATEIAE, or sudden changes of Fortune" (p. 76).
The artist, says Monboddo, imparts aesthetic merit to his material by exercising a unifying force on the scattered elements of real life. One means to this end, as we have just seen, is to concentrate the emotional impact of the events, circumscribing the frame of reference in which they are presented or effecting unexpected plot developments. Monboddo also points to Homer's skill in unifying the Iliad by not simply foreshortening a single period of several days in the Trojan war but by introducing a wealth of allusion to events predating it. Herein, says Monboddo, consists the most significant difference between the linear historical method, which presents all facts in chronological order of importance, and the poetical, which selects only relevant events and groups them organically round a central hub of the plot.

MP 6 is no more than an index to "Of Taste," but, being in Kirkpatrick Williamson's hand, suggests that Monboddo still subscribed to the views contained therein during the 1770's or later.

These writings form the basis of Monboddo's aesthetic theory. One feature which I note in passing is its old-fashioned quality; his theory has strong affinities with the thought of the later 1600's, although singular in displaying a curiously "de-gallicized" neoclassicism. By this I mean that although Monboddo's literary theory and criticism hark back to the rigidly neoclassical principles current during the Restoration period, they do so not as a result of his close attention to the French
critics of the seventeenth century, but by virtue of Monboddo's independent reading of Aristotle (and Horace) in the original. Monboddo's almost universal disdain for Gallic criticism therefore serves to set in perspective the undeniable parallels between Monboddo and John Dennis, the writer who, of all Restoration and early eighteenth-century critics, shows the most striking similarities to Monboddo. Dennis, like Monboddo, champions "the rules" while not always withholding praise from those whose works successfully disregard them; like Monboddo, Dennis posits an ethical base for literature, and acknowledges the indispensable role played by the sublime and the pathetic in art. In their particular critical verdicts, too, a similarity of thought is even more marked: both criticize Shakespeare's fables, enthuse over Milton and denigrate Pope; both dislike rhyme in large-scale works (for a masterly account of Dennis's literary theory, see Edward Niles Hooker's Introduction to his edition of Dennis's criticism¹). Whereas Dennis, however, reaches his verdicts with the works of Boileau, Rapin and Le Bossu at hand, Monboddo eschews French intermediaries between Aristotle and himself. For this reason I believe it is a mistake to view Monboddo simply as a Restoration critic born too late, and similarities in thought between Monboddo and Dennis are to be seen as

curious coincidences rather than evidence pointing to
Dennis as an influence on Monboddo.

A close reading of the *Poetics*, as we have seen, provided Monboddo with the respect for formal unity which underlies such praise of Homer. But an equally important strand in Monboddo's criticism of poetry concerns itself not with formal but with material considerations; not with large-scale wholeness of design, but with niceties of auditory effect and grammatical construction. To cast some light on the factors determining this aspect of Monboddo's literary theory, I will discuss various influences which imparted to his fairly representative Aristotelianism the almost fanatical classicism and concern with philological and elocutionary minutiae which are characteristically his: the works of the minor classical critic Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and of James Harris. Before doing so, however, I would point to a more general influence on Monboddo.

The Select Society of Edinburgh was a highly-esteemed literary coterie, membership of which was a coveted feather in the cap of any would-be man of taste in the Edinburgh of the 1750's, at a time when both full-time writers and off-duty professional people sought intellectual stimulation and social intercourse through the debate of literary and philosophical issues in a wealth of small clubs. The minutes of the Select Society, which numbered David Hume among its members, have survived, and show that Monboddo played a principal role in its
activities and organisation. Monboddo's name is eighth in the list of members drawn up on the institution of the Society in 1754, and we find him chairing the proceedings on 17 July 1754, when it was debated "Whether it be more difficult for a Poet to excell in Tragedy or Comedy?" (p. 20). On 6 December 1754 Monboddo was elected to the committees charged with regulating the procedures and finances of the Society, and the questions to be considered at its meetings; and was regularly re-elected to these and other committees throughout the life of the Society. On 25 January 1757 Monboddo was elected one of six Presidents on whom, as the Minutes record, "the conducting the Debates would be chiefly incumbent" (p. 98), and was one of the most frequent chairmen of the meetings.

A glance at the topics discussed by the Select Society suggests that it was here that Monboddo's mind was first attuned to literary pursuits; and indeed many of the issues dealt with by the Society's speakers are identical with those figuring in Monboddo's works. Among other questions concerned with political, legal and economic matters, we find a host of queries relating to the arts. On 27 November 1754, for instance, the question was tabled "Whether have the moderns done well in laying aside the use of a Chorus in Tragedy?"; the connection with NP 307, Of the Chorus of the Antient Tragedy, is apparent. And on 15 January 1755 a typical Monboddo theme, "Whether do we excell the ancients, or the ancients us, in knowledge and Arts?" (p. 43) was introduced.
Another question proposed on 12 March 1755 turned on a point highly germane to Monboddo's later writings:

"Whether the decay of the language of a People be not a mark of the decay of Arts and Sciences among that people?" (p. 53). Other questions logged at this time suggest either that Monboddo's presence on the committee accepting questions for future discussion gave him scope to introduce his own interests, or that the topics proposed by his fellow-members had a profound influence on the form Monboddo's thought took at a later stage, when he set about formulating his own theories of language and literature: "What part of the poetical faculty is it most difficult to excel in? Whether the diction, Sentiments, characters or composition? . . . Whether Milton be not a better poet than Virgil?" (p. 53). The question "whether doth Poetry, painting or Music produce the strongest effects on the imagination?" generated sufficient interest in debate to be carried over from January to February of 1756. A final pair of examples of topics close to Monboddo's heart: "whether a fine Taste is the gift of Nature or the Result of Experience, and may be acquired?" (p. 122); "Whether the Imitations in painting are not superior to those in poetry?" (p. 123).

Not all the questions recorded as potential subjects were actually debated, but the lists of accepted topics which appear in the minutes do give an indication of the kind of material which was in people's minds, as well as highlighting just how widespread was the desire to display
one's taste by the public disputation of cultural matters. Although Monboddo records in a letter to Harris that his attention turned to the genetic study of language and literature as a result of his researches in France, those nights spent wrestling with the problems of aesthetics must have done much to lay the groundwork for Monboddo's later writings.

If it was the Select Society which instilled in Monboddo an interest in literature, it was Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the Greek rhetorician and historian, who provided Monboddo with the apparatus for channeling his broad literary preferences into close critical analysis. Dionysius' influence is discernible throughout Origin and Progress; in particular, Books II and III of Volume II, including Dissertation III appended to it, and Book IV of Volume IV, are greatly indebted to him. In Origin and Progress II (p. 238, n.) Monboddo lists as Dionysius' foremost critical works those on Thucydides and Demosthenes, and Περὶ συνθέσεως τὸνοματω. It is this last named which Monboddo subjects to closer analysis in Origin and Progress V, and which forms the basis of much of what Monboddo has to say on the beauties to be sought in the arrangement of sounds in prose and verse. Monboddo acknowledges the narrow focus of Dionysius' treatise, but contends that Dionysius demonstrably proves the important role played by such minor auditory qualities in contributing

1 26 March 1766; Knight, p. 49.
to a pleasing overall effect (O&P,III, 46). So, too, Monboddo himself apologizes for entering into such minute detail concerning the individual sounds making up a language, while nevertheless insisting that such microscopic analysis is a prerequisite for an informed assessment of the more large-scale qualities of literature.

Monboddo acknowledges his debt to Dionysius in Origin and Progress V, stating "I have been more instructed by him in everything relating to stile and composition than by all the other authors I have read put together" (O&P,V, 440). It is from the ἀναλογοματικὴ of Dionysius that Monboddo derived his information concerning the melodic nature of Greek; Monboddo's whole prosody, with its central distinction between a supposedly musical classical accent and a non-melodic modern accent, rests on Dionysius' claims. In his critical methods, too, Monboddo draws on Dionysius, availing himself of the ancient critic's tripartite division of style into austere, middle and florid, as well as imitating Dionysius' practice of close practical criticism in a manner which would satisfy the most rigorous of Cambridge critics.

The one modern writer who appears to have influenced Monboddo in any way at all comparable to that of the ancients is James Harris, whose admiration for Aristotle is on a par with Monboddo's own. Monboddo even acknowledges in Origin and Progress that it was Harris who first opened his eyes to many of the Alexandrian commentators on Aristotle (O&P,II, 53 - 56, n.). Harris's Hermes: or a
Philosophical Inquiry Concerning Universal Grammar (1751) provided Monboddo with the methodology for examining language which lies behind the whole of Origin and Progress: Monboddo's practice of analyzing the individual components of language before proceeding to study the manner in which the units operate together in the language system owed just as much to Harris as to Dionysius, and is plainly set out in the opening lines of Hermes; as is Monboddo's distinction between the matter and the form of language (Works, I, 215 - 216). From Harris, too, Monboddo derived the notion of the linguistic excellence of Greek on account of its variety of inflections and its lack of auxiliaries; Harris, like Monboddo, places Greek, Latin and English in a descending scale on this basis (I, 297 - 98, n.). And Harris's claim in Hermes that "thus is MIND ultimately the Cause of all" (I, 380) lies behind all Monboddo's attempts at scientific theorizing, as does his attempt to popularize the Aristotelian categories in Philosophical Arrangements (1775). From the literary point of view, however, Harris's Philological Inquiries (1780) is of greater interest, showing that Harris was turning from the grammatical pursuits of Hermes to the more literary concerns of his Inquiries just at the time when Monboddo was progressing from the linguistic and grammatical portions of Origin and Progress to those sections dealing with the literary arts. At the same time, both realize that the aesthetic judgments to which they are turning their attention are to be built on the groundwork of their earlier linguistic studies; as Harris expresses it, in terms which Monboddo
would heartily endorse, "Exquisite Productions both in PROSE and VERSE induced men... to seek the Cause; and such Inquiries, often repeated, gave birth to PHILOLOGY" (Works, II, 276).

The two authors' conception of the history of literature, and of its nature, are similar in many respects; but it is not enough, as it is in the case of Hermes and Origin and Progress I and II, to point to a straightforward use of Harris's methods by Monboddo. By the 1780's the flow of ideas is taking place in both directions. In particular, Harris's account of the rhythm of ancient and modern language evidences a close reading of Origin and Progress II; and in his assessment of English as a suitable medium for poetry Harris, like Monboddo, faults the preponderance of monosyllables in English (Works, I, 340).

The exact extent of Harris's debt to Monboddo with respect to prosody is unclear. Harris writes to Monboddo, in anticipation of Origin and Progress II, "As to what yr. Lords. says about Rhythms & Accents, I shall be happy to peruse it, because I know the Subject to be curious, & not much thought upon, with reference to ye English language. I have slightly touched the Subject in a little Treatise upon the rise & progress of Criticism, which I shall subjoin to my larger Peice in the same Volume."¹ This essay, however, was not printed, as Harris intends here, with Philosophical Arrangements, but became part of Harris's Philological Inquiries. Whereas Harris could not have availed himself of the prosodic theory of Origin.

¹ 23 March 1774; MP Box 22, fol. 4/32, pp. [3] - [4].
and Progress II in writing the Philosophical Arrangements - he writes to Monboddo that he is too busy supervising the proof sheets of the Arrangements to read Monboddo's second volume — the same stricture did not apply by the time Harris's essay on criticism appeared in 1780; Harris therefore had ample time to incorporate in his Inquiries any material in Origin and Progress II which might have proved germane to Harris's own work on prosody.

Having shown that Monboddo was capable of building up and sustaining a literary friendship which proved amicable and profitable to both parties, I must balance the account against another: that of the gradually deteriorating relationship between Monboddo and Dr. Johnson.

The details of the visit paid by Johnson to Monboddo's home territory near Laurencekirk, in a meeting engineered by Boswell, are recorded in full in the Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides (Hill-Powell, V, 74 - 83). On this occasion both men appeared to derive pleasure from the clash of temperaments which, no matter how different, nevertheless established a certain common ground. Apart from a passing reference to Johnson's Dictionary in Origin and Progress III, we find no other mention of Johnson by Monboddo until a letter of 11 April 1777 in which Monboddo, prompted by Boswell, delivers a rather stereotyped judgment on the passage in Johnson's Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland concerning his landing on Iona.

1 15 April 177; MP Box 22, fol. 4/34, p. [1].
2 Yale, IX, 148.
Johnson's writing, says Monboddo, "may be given as an example of the sublime in writing, for it elevates the mind and excites those sentiments that make the tear start to the eye, which I take to be the true test of the sublime" (quoted in *Boswell in Extremes*, ed. Weis and Pottle, p. 168, n.). Although uninspired as literary criticism, the letter is significant in marking the last recorded occasion on which Monboddo had a good word to say for Dr. Johnson. Indeed, only a month later we find Monboddo using the opportunity of a letter to Boswell (28 May) to scorn Johnson's lack of classical learning, as well as giving some of the worst advice ever proffered to an author in advising Boswell against writing on so inappropriate a subject as Johnson: "But no life of Dr. Johnson. No more memoirs of parish clerks" (*Boswell in Extremes*, p. 181, n.). Similar imprecations were delivered to others; in a letter of 17 February 1784 to John Young, Professor of Greek at Glasgow, Monboddo vents his spleen against Johnson in the very year of his death: "I wish you would chuse a better Subject for your pen than Dr Johnson" (MP Box 22, 8/104). Monboddo even stoops to referring to his adversary as "that Beast Dr Johnson," a lapse in decorum which Knight feels constrained to censor (Knight, p. 264).

A further meeting in London did nothing to repair the breach (see Johnson to Mrs. Thrale, 1 May 1780, Letter 663, *Hill*, II, 149), and by 1782 Monboddo was openly insulting Johnson in letters to his friends. In a letter
to Sir George Baker the topic is Milton; "whom Dr Johnson has said, as I am told, (for I do not lose my time in reading such works) he never reads with pleasure, and puts up upon the Shelf, with much more satisfaction than he takes him down."¹ Later that year, the topic is brought up again: "I doubt very few of this Age are such great Men as to comprehend fully the Beauties of Homer. Doctor Johnson certainly has not Genius enough to comprehend even the Beauties of Milton, who I think is the only poet in English that can be compared with Homer" (Monboddo to Baker, 2 October 1782; MP Box 22, fol. 7/87, p. 3).

In the Life of Johnson, Boswell records the unhappy state of affairs which had come to pass between the Doctor and Monboddo by 1784, noting that subsequent to their meeting in Scotland "his lordship had resumed and cherished a violent prejudice against my illustrious friend" (Hill-Powell, IV, 273, n. 1), although Johnson for his part did not rise to the bait offered him. The sad tail-end of the matter is to be found in Volume IV - VI of Origin and Progress, where Monboddo, freed from all restraint by Johnson's death, indulges in bitter invective aimed against Johnson's learning and character which detracts from the stature not of his enemy but of Monboddo himself.

It is not clear why Monboddo's attitude to Johnson became soured in this way. Perhaps the outcome is partly

¹ 20 August 1782; MP Box 22, fol. 7/82, p. 7.
attributable to the goading in which Boswell indulged freely with a view to producing good "copy": Boswell records in the *Life* that on one occasion he related to Monboddo Johnson's remark that "Monboddo does not know that he is talking nonsense" (Hill-Powell, II, 74, n.), which cannot have helped matters; but it is clear from Boswell's account that even at this stage it was only in the face of virulent anti-Johnson sentiments from Monboddo that he was driven so to act. The principal factor contributing to Monboddo's dislike for Johnson may in fact be a purely academic one: that Monboddo was so fanatically convinced of the total supremacy of Homer and Milton that Johnson's relative unfamiliarity with the former, and his audacity in finding fault with the latter, turned Johnson into a personification of modern barbarity in Monboddo's eyes. This is the more to be expected if, as Letter 7/82 above suggests, Monboddo was forming his notion of Johnson's critical principles at second-hand, subject to the distortions of his own pejorative view of the Doctor, rather than giving him a fair hearing or reading; the twisted version of Johnson's remarks on the perusal of *Paradise Lost* being a duty rather than a pleasure show how warped an idea of Johnson Monboddo was developing. On the other hand, the garrulous strength of Johnson's personality is an indisputable factor in precipitating the animosity between the two, as the following remarks from *Origin* and *Progress* V show: "Dr Johnson was the most invidious and malignant man I have ever known, who praised
no author or book that other people praised, and in
private conversation was ready to cavil at and contra-
dict every thing that was said, and could not with any
patience hear any other person draw the attention of the
company for ever so short a time" (O&P, V, 271). If
Monboddo could only have isolated his personal reaction
to Johnson from his evaluation of him as a scholar, and
resisted the temptation to counter Johnson's conversational
obtuseness with pretentious denigration of the greater
man's intellectual accomplishments, it would be easier
for the modern reader to admit the partial validity of
these Volume V comments on Johnson's belligerent techniques
of disputation.

It is through his frequently strife-ridden relation-
ships with individuals such as Dr. Johnson that a picture
of Monboddo as crotchety and peevish has grown up. In
this chapter I have tried to show that the theoretical
base on which Monboddo constructed his literary prin-
ciples, and which is thus responsible for the polemics
into which these principles led him, was the closely-
reasoned product of the careful study of classical and
modern sources.
Chapter 2
Monboddo on Prosody

None of the MSS intended for Origin and Progress display more evidence of having been painstakingly revised and rewritten than those concerned with metrical and prosodic matters. That Monboddo should consider a theory of prosody an essential part of a work on poetry is to be expected, bearing in mind the renewed interest in such matters from the mid-eighteenth century onwards. Two traditions blend in Monboddo's prosodic thought: the classical tradition, as represented pre-eminently by the work of Dionysius of Halicarnassus; and the contemporary tradition, whose cogitations played no small part in freeing later eighteenth-century English poetry from the rigidity of earlier poetic theory. Before examining Monboddo's interpretation and utilization of classical commentators, it is helpful to gain some historical perspective on the controversies in which Monboddo participates by taking a closer look at the state of prosodic theory by the time Monboddo started to write on such topics.

It is helpful, and, one would hope, not misleading, to set up Edward Bysshe's The Art of English Poetry (1702) as a manifesto of the less imaginative poets and poetasters of the following age. Merely to cite the table of contents allows the aridity of Bysshe's conception of poetry to make itself felt: a set of cursory rules for versifying; a list of rhymes; a collection of suitably poetic thoughts culled from the best English poets and pressed dry between
Bysshe's leaves. Nowhere is this downgrading of the poetic art more evident than in Bysshe's first chapter, "Of the Structure of English Verses": for Bysshe, English verse consists of a set syllabic pattern, with no exceptions to this rigidity: "The Structure of our Verses, whether Blank, or in Rhyme, consists in a certain Number of Syllables; and not in Feet compos'd of long and short Syllables, as the Verses of the Greeks and Romans" (p. 1). Past attempts to establish a quantitative analysis of English syllables have failed to take cognizance of the distinct qualities of English on the one hand and the classics on the other (p. 2). These essays in pseudo-classical versifying are dismissed by Bysshe as a historical curiosity. Bysshe's resulting "ars poetica" is consequently simple in the extreme: no heed is to be paid to any such vexed notion as the quantity of an English syllable. All verse-forms are defined by the number of syllables they contain; the preservation of this number apart, the two factors to be considered by the would-be poet are the due allocation of accent and pause. While furnishing copious instructions as to the distribution of these accents and pauses throughout English decasyllabic verse, Bysshe is less than forthcoming as to exactly what is being distributed in the former instance: accent, we are told, "is an Elevation of the Voice on a certain Syllable of a Word" (p. 4). Whether this elevation of the voice is a raising of the musical pitch of the supposed speaker's voice; or simply an increase in volume; or even
a lengthening of the time taken to pronounce the syllable, we are not told. That such a one-dimensional view of poetry should go unchallenged is not to be expected; and indeed Bysshe's text-book serves as a starting-point from which all the prosodic texts here considered are to be seen as deviating. Worthy of mention in that it stirs up the hornet's nest of accent versus quantity which is the main prosodic issue contested by Monboddo and his fellow debaters is Charles Gildon's *The Complete Art of Poetry* (1718), which takes up arms against Bysshe in straightforward but incontrovertible terms. In the course of a discussion of English numbers, attention is drawn to those who deny the very existence of numbers in English: Bysshe's "Art of English Poetry, which has sold a great many Impressions, shews you how to make harmonious Verses, without Numbers, or Quantities, which he positively denies to be in the English Tongue" (I, 293). Bysshe's enunciations are here attributed to either a misinterpretation of Roscommon or to his having imported into an assessment of English verse the comments on French verse of "the Messieurs of Port-Royal, in their Rules of French Poetry" (I, 293). The necessary implication, it is claimed, of Bysshe's view that considerations of syllable length do not enter into English versification, is that any ten consecutive syllables may be paraded as verse. This contention in itself is unfair to Bysshe, who could presumably counter that his caveat that accent and pause are to be attended to ensures that unadorned prose does not aspire
to the condition of poetry. Gildon's strictures do, however, have the effect of focussing in on the true point of discussion: either Bysshe is smuggling in a reference to quantity in English verse under the title of accent, or he is at any rate omitting to define his terms; as Gildon puts it, "He shou'd . . . have let us know what he means by the Word Accents, when he makes it a Term of Art, and lays such a stress upon it" (I, 294).

Gildon then proceeds both to equate accent, in its original classical signification, with musical pitch, and to claim that this aspect of verse is no longer designated by the term. What is thus designated is not explained; Gildon is content to look forward to a future state of perfection of the prosodic art, when the volume, pitch and length of syllables will be adequately differentiated.

We have seen, then, that the rebuttal of Bysshe's claims that English verse can be compared with French in terms of its prosody tends to draw one into defensive assertions as to exactly what differentiates the two systems of verse. In tracing this debate from the early decades of the century to Monboddo's time, I will concentrate on three texts with which we know Monboddo was familiar, and which can be seen to have shaped his own thinking on the subject. The first of these is John Mason's An Essay on the Power of Numbers (1749), which hastens in medias res by presupposing the radical difference between English accent and quantity which Monboddo is later so careful to emphasise. Without explaining quite
what he means by accent, Mason observes that "Custom and Accent often make these kind of Syllables short which are naturally long" (p. 7). We can infer that Mason, wishing to differentiate between accent and quantity, therefore holds accent to be either pitch or stress; his pronouncements on this point we will examine in due course. At this juncture it is worth noticing that Mason subscribes to a fallacy later assented to by Monboddo: the notion that the Latin principle that a vowel, when followed by two consonants, is thereby lengthened can be transplanted to an alien prosody without losing its currency. Scanning "Th' Infernal Serpent; he it was, whose Guile" (P.L.I, 34) as an orthodox iambic pentameter leads Mason to claim that the syllables in, nal, pent and whose are all "naturally long," but all "short by Accent" (p. 7); a conclusion which could only be reached by improper application of Latin quantification. That Monboddo belonged to the same school of quantifiers is witnessed by his similar scansion of Paradise Lost I, 1, "where the Syllable dience in the word disobedience, which is certainly a long Syllable, if there be any in English, is not accented while the Syllable Be which is very much Shorter is accented (MP 240, p. 60). Monboddo, however, does not prevaricate as to the nature of this accent which overrules the "natural" quantity of syllables; with Mason matters are different.

Unlike Monboddo, Mason does not simply equate English accent with stress. He describes as short "Every Syllable terminated by a single Consonant, and on which there lies
neither Accent nor Emphasis" (Mason, p.8; my underlining). Mason's quandary with respect to accent is partly disguised by his terminology: among the ancients, we are told, "the Accent denoted the Sound of the Voice, and the Quantity the Length of the Time" (pp. 9 - 10); the failure of "Sound" to refer definitely either to pitch or volume is transparent. At first sight a later ground for distinguishing between accent and emphasis appears to be in the offing: "For common Use and Custom . . . will never fail to determine the Accent, and the Sense of the Period when understood, will always point out the Emphasis; and where the Accent or Emphasis is thus directed to fall, that Syllable (be its natural Quantity what it will) is in that Place considered as long" (p. 11). Any hopes that this distinction will lead to a satisfactory account, however, are illusory; we are not told exactly what it is that use and custom so unfailingly label as accent, or how, if at all, it differs from emphasis. We can only assume that Mason assents to the opinions of Pemberton quoted by him in this connection that "whereas the antient Accent is represented to be only a Variation in the Tone of the Voice . . . ours is constantly attended with an Emphasis, which implies greater Length in the Syllable" (p. 11, n.). In other words, there is a constant conjunction between pitch, stress and quantity in English, such that a syllable which is accented is also emphasized, and therefore lengthened. It would appear, in fact, that Mason's argument here is circular: common
usage is set up as one standard which determines whether
the length of a syllable is to be dictated by accent rather
than by quantity, despite the fact that it is the theor-
etical basis of common usage which is here in question,
Mason is obviously confused as to the relationship between
accent, stress and quantity, and elevates his uncertainty
to the status of one endemic in the language: "And that it
is impossible any such Distinction between the Accents and
Quantities can be observed in reading English, whether
Poetry or Prose, any one may presently be convinced by
making the Experiment" (p. 10). We can well imagine that
it was part of Monboddo's purpose in *Origin and Progress* VII
to clear up the confusion to be found in Mason's work.
Take, for example, a passage in the sequel to this essay
of Mason's, *An Essay on the Power and Harmony of Prosaic
Numbers* (1749). On p. 15 we find mention of the drum as
"an Instrument which in a wonderful Manner shews the Force
and Power of Poetic Numbers", a comparison taken up by
Monboddo and hammered home repeatedly throughout his
prosodic tracts. Any nuances of pitch modulation and
variation in length of note are lost to the apparently
tone-deaf Mason, who feels that the mind, in reacting to
the tattoo of a drum, "is affected as much as it is by
an Instrument that runs all the Notes of the Gamut" (p. 15).
Monboddo even allots a footnote to this very passage,
commenting on the inconsistency between this tympanic
interpretation of English verse, and Mason's views in his
erlier essay that "our English verse is made by short and
long syllables, though there be no such thing as short and long in the beating of a drum; and though he himself confesses, that what principally fixes the quantity in English numbers, is the accent" (O&P,II, 401,n.). Despite the faults which Monboddo finds in Mason's treatises, however, we can rest assured that Monboddo would be of one mind with Mason in his assertions that "there is a very wide Difference between the Latin and English Prosody" (Essay on the Power of Numbers, p. 10), and that English "is a Language of a very different Genius" from either the Latin or the Greek (p. 10). On this latter point, indeed, Monboddo is more in agreement with Mason than with the author of the next prosodic work, chronologically speaking, which internal evidence shows Monboddo to have read. This is John Foster's An Essay on the Different Nature of Accent and Quantity (1762; references to 3rd ed., 1820), which Monboddo deemed "full of excellent grammatical learning" (O&P,II, 275) and employed on several occasions by way of corroboration. Monboddo can be said to have made use of Foster's "grammatical learning" while dissenting from his opinions as to the comparative merits of English and the classics. For instance, Monboddo delegates to Foster the task of proving that musical pitch is a characteristic of language at all: "Mr Foster . . . has made the matter so perfectly clear, that I will not say a word upon the subject" (O&P, II, 275). Foster did his clarifying in the first chapter of his Essay, a work written with the design of refuting
the proposition of one Henry Gally, in *A Dissertation against Pronouncing the Greek Language according to Accents* (1754; reprinted in 3rd ed. of Foster's *Essay*) that the written accents in Greek only conducted to lead the modern reader astray in his pronunciation, and should therefore be ignored. Not so, countered Foster: the accents serve as a guide to musical pitch, and therefore denote a legitimate aspect of language distinct from quantity. Here, however, Monboddo and Foster part company. Whereas Foster holds that melodic pitch is a necessary quality of language, of whatever age and condition, Monboddo's classicism impels him to observe that it is missing from modern pronunciation. Foster's very defence of musical pitch reveals the gulf between Monboddo and him: Foster holds that "There must in short be a comparative highness and lowness of sound, except the voice has the use of only a single note, like a drum or drone-base" (*Essay*, p. 6). Monboddo evidently approved of the metaphor but not of the sentiments; for him, it was exactly this drum-beat monotony which disfigured our language. Again, in Chapter II Foster ridicules the view that "The northern nations . . . have utterly lost the Χρόνος, retain no quantity at all, have nothing but the Τόνος, the place, tone, or accent left" (p. 14); a fair summary of Monboddo's own position, albeit that Monboddo holds that not only has quantity dropped out of the picture but that the remaining accent has been debased from one of pitch to one of emphasis. In this connection, we can also trace the influence of
Foster on Monboddo's opinion that we read the ancient verse on an accentual rather than quantitative basis. This point will, however, be raised anew later; as will the effect on Monboddo of similar sentiments in John Herries' The Elements of Speech (1773), the final prosodic work to be mentioned here. Monboddo found "several good observations" (O&P, II, 402) in Herries' work, drawing freely from it when expostulating on the crude modern pronunciation of Latin; yet in Herries as in Foster Monboddo was faced with one who held the moderns to be at least potentially on a level with the ancients. "What reason is there," asks Herries, "for asserting that we are incapable of arriving at the same perfection in speaking as the Antients?" (Elements, p. 3). Despite this, we find in Herries' book certain themes which Monboddo found congenial, and which reappear in the Origin and Progress. Herries' stress on the sheer complexity of the physical task of articulating words is adopted by Monboddo in Origin and Progress I; as is its corollary, that language is not natural to man. Of immediate relevance to our present concerns is the fact that Herries too insists on a distinction between accent and quantity, talking of "the absurd notion . . . that there was no difference between the accent and the quantity, in the English language" (Elements, p. 123). However, such polemics are oddly at variance with the defeatist stance adopted by Herries throughout much of his work. He denigrates all attempts to "reduce the quantity of our syllables to the standard of the Antients" (p. 123), on the grounds that
we have no first-hand experience of the ancients' pronunciation. The ancients did not accent every long syllable; nor did their pronunciation correspond with ours at every point. Herries forthwith ends any attempt to rationalize ancient prosody, advocating his readers too to "give up all pretensions to this species of critical knowledge" (p. 124). Nor are these the only issues on which Herries abstains: he sees it as no part of his task to assess the affinity between ancient and modern accent, or to investigate the notion that accent is completely missing from modern language. Yet both these topics form the hub of Monboddo's prosody; and it is not fanciful to see Monboddo's prosodic MSS as filling in the blanks in Herries' work. It is unfair to censure Herries for omitting such matters, since his purposes are avowedly practical: "to reduce to practice that particular species of harmony which belongs to speech" (p. 171). Herries is writing a manual of elocution, Monboddo a compendium of classical and modern linguistic arts, and his interests lie in the direction of encyclopaedic completeness rather than succinctness. Hence his desire to explore the ramifications of all aspects of ancient and modern poetic practice.

It is in the light of these attempts to plumb the depths of English prosody that we come to Monboddo's own contributions to the debate. As observed above, it is in Origin and Progress II that we are introduced to Monboddo's prosodic doctrines; and since the theory of prosody contained
in the Monboddo Papers is based on, and often refers back to, the principles enunciated in *Origin and Progress II* it is as well to outline the presentation given in that volume.

In the first chapter of *Origin and Progress II*, Book II, Monboddo, having completed his analysis of the grammatical part of language, turns to consider its more concrete aspects, in an "analysis of language, considered as sound" (*O&P*, II, 227). The heads under which these aspects are ranged are articulation, prosody and quantity. Monboddo uses "prosody" in its original sense, corresponding to the Greek πρόσωπον, to denote the variations in musical pitch employed in language, and not in its wider meaning, according to which it can comprehend the whole study of versification. He thus makes the distinction, in his second and third divisions, between the pitch and length of syllables which, as we have seen, was too often ignored or ill-explained by his predecessors. Monboddo too is aware of this; in particular, he censures "the common Latin grammars" for labelling quantity as prosody. Even "the learned Vossius's grammar" conflates the two (*O&P*, II, 271, n.). It is here that Monboddo cites Foster's Essay to corroborate his ideas on the melody of language (see pp. 116-118 above); it is evident that he paid close attention to the essay, and was influenced by it. However, we have no reason to doubt Monboddo's claim that Foster's essay served to corroborate Monboddo's own opinions about accent, rather than to provide a line of argument which
Monboddo merely plagiarized. Monboddo shows no reluctance to document his sources, (indeed, his copious citations of sources frequently leave the printed page with a mere two lines of main text propped up by a dense scree of footnote), and it is most probable that what Monboddo says is true: that Foster's work "did not fall into my hands till I had begun to write upon this subject, and had formed the opinion which I was glad to find so well supported by Mr Foster" (O&P, II, 275). Monboddo tries to account for the reasons which might have led some moderns to deny that pitch is a characteristic of language: the confusion of accent with quantity; the lack of any living language possessed of musical pitch; and our own inability to pronounce in the manner of the ancients (the last of these anticipating Monboddo's claim, expounded in the Volume VII MSS, that the classics are nowadays read in the unmusical manner in which we read our own language). He then goes on to show how language was thus made musical, basing his account on classical texts; but before embarking on this topic he draws several distinctions which further delineate the matter here discussed. It will be recalled that Herries dealt on a unilateral level with the imposition of musical tones on syllables, words, cadences and sentences (Elements, p. 193). This method of procedure has the effect of cancelling any distinction between prosody (conceived of as the study of the formation and arrangement of syllabic elements in verse) and the wider study of elocution. Monboddo's concern here is to insist on this
distinction, in the interests of an Aristotelian accuracy. So it is that Monboddo stresses that the "syllabic tone" which he is here concerned with is not "the general tone of a language" (O&P, II, 276). This "national tone . . . affects the whole tenor of the speech, not words only, and much less syllables" (O&P, II, 277), and therefore does not enter into Monboddo's present subject, the analysis of the elements of which language is composed. Neither, for similar reasons, is syllabic tone to be identified with "the tones of passion or sentiment" (O&P, II, 277). And the third distinction here drawn by Monboddo is simply a reiteration of his warning not to confuse syllabic tone, qua accent, with quantity. The topic thus defined, Monboddo goes on to parade a passage from Dionysius of Halicarnassus' ποιήσεως ὁμοιωματικός as demonstrating the nature of classical accent: the interval employed in the pronunciation of ancient Greek is approximately a fifth; and, as we are reminded continually throughout the drafts for Volume VII, this melody of speech is differentiated from that of music by its being συμμετρικος rather than διαστηματικος. In other words, notes of different pitch in prose coalesce, whereas those in music are kept distinct from each other. It is, says Monboddo, solely because we are not accustomed to accentual discourse that the idea of the application of accents is a startling one; among the Chinese, for instance, accentuation is an essential factor not only in the sound, but in the sense, of their language. In the light of this account of accent, Monboddo criticizes
the error of another Vossius, Isaac Vossius, in the De Poematum Cantu (1673), in claiming that the accent must always be laid on the long syllable of a word. As Monboddo points out, what is to be done in the case of a Latin disyllable with a short first syllable? The accent must be placed on one of the syllables; it cannot, in accordance with Latin practice, be placed on the last syllable; therefore,pace Vossius, it must be placed on the short first syllable.

Thus far Monboddo is in almost complete accord with Foster, and indeed makes use of several of Foster's observations in establishing the melodic nature of Greek and Latin. But he is not prepared to acquiesce with Foster in crediting the English language with this particular grace of discourse: Foster's notion that English is marked by melodic accents stems "from a partiality, very excusable, to his country, and its language" (O&P,II, 298). The fact of the matter, says Monboddo, is that there are no variations in tone in English. Once again Monboddo makes it clear that he is talking about the smaller segments of language, not the more extended: he would not deny that there are modulations of the voice throughout an entire sentence. It is precisely these national and emotional tones which he had been so particular to distinguish from syllabic tones earlier (O&P,II, 276-277). But as to the musical pitch bestowed on particular syllables by the ancient Greeks and Romans, Monboddo is convinced that we have none of it. There is, however, a
practical objection to this theory, drawn from normal linguistic usage: the word "accent" is in fact used in English; are we to conclude that any talk of English accent is nonsensical? Not so, says Monboddo, and in explaining why formulates the description of English verse which has become most associated with him: "we have, no doubt, accents in English, and syllabical accents too: but they are of a quite different kind from the antient accents; for there is no change of the tone in them; but the voice is only raised more, so as to be louder upon one syllable than another" (O&P, II, 299). This objective, observational statement is pressed to the service of two main subjective and evaluative conclusions: in the first place, this stress emphasis is held to be the sole variable in the sound of English; Monboddo calls on musicians to attest to the fact that there is no "difference of tone betwixt the accented and unaccented syllables of any word" (O&P, II, 299-300). The necessary consequence, in Monboddo's eyes, is that the modern replacement of accent proper by mere variation in loudness testifies not only to the dissimilarity between ancient and modern language, but also to the inferiority of the new to the old. A whole dimension of the sound of language is lost with the demise of melodic accents.

This is the first critical judgment that Monboddo derives from his study of the sound of English: that English is a poor successor to Greek and Latin. But, secondly, he refers to the nature of English accents in
preferring English to "other languages of Europe, particularly the French" (O&P,II, 300), which he sees as being quite devoid of any accents. English, therefore, although faring badly in any comparison with the ancients, is still pre-eminent among the languages of the present day.

Monboddo's next excursion into the complex realms of prosody brings us nearer to an account of extended discourse rather than of its elements in isolation. By way of prologue, however, Monboddo provides a heady, metaphysical account of no less than five types of rhythm (the exact distinctions of which need not concern us here), concluding that only one of these (the rhythm of long and short syllables) is relevant to "the grammatical art" (O&P,II, 317). There then follows a conventional account of the role of this rhythm of long and short in forming classical verse; and of the rules determining the length or shortness of a syllable. Of more relevance for present purposes is Monboddo's consideration of English in the light of these observations. With respect to the rhythmic quantities of the modern languages, Monboddo sees himself as taking a middle course between those who, like Foster, would read into English all the systematization of long and short syllables which glorifies the classics; and those who, like M. L'Abbe Gedoyn,\(^1\) deny that modern languages make any division of syllables into long and

\(^{1}\) "Si les Anciens ont esté plus savants que les Modernes, & comment on peut apprécier le mérite des uns & des autres," Histoire de L'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, 12(1740), 80-106.
short. Against Gedoyn, Monboddo points to diphthongs in English which are incontrovertibly long; but, against Foster, Monboddo believes that most English syllables are of indeterminate length. Applying these conclusions to English verse, Monboddo combines what can be salvaged from both Foster and Gedoyn, to back up his own conception of English versification: English is insufficiently systematic in its principles of quantitative scansion to furnish a purely quantitative system of verse; on the other hand, it is not to be characterized, as Gedoyn would hold, as decasyllabic rhyme. Instead, Monboddo harks back to his notion of English stress-accent as a fundamental of English versification. The details are elaborated on in Book III of *Origin and Progress* II. Here, Monboddo progresses from the analysis to the composition of language; once again, a step nearer to a critique of literature rather than of language. After discussing in brief the melodic delights imparted to Greek by its accents, Monboddo does what he can to provide the same service for English; the difference being that the accents to be discussed are, in English, those of stress rather than of musical pitch. Although Monboddo has previously stated that only one species of rhythm (the rhythm of long and short syllables) is susceptible of analysis by the grammarian, he has recourse to another two of the types of rhythm distinguished earlier in explaining English verse; which he accordingly holds to be composed of the rhythms of loud and soft sounds; and of the rhythm
of the pauses occurring between these sounds. From these accents are composed feet which correspond to the iambic, trochaic and anapaestic feet of the ancients.

As stated in a previous chapter, Monboddo promises to elaborate on his Volume II prosodic theories in a later portion of the work (see pp. 14-15 above); and his final judgments on the rationale of versifying are contained largely in MP 235.

It is paradoxical that Monboddo believes, as one would expect, that the subject of a literary work is more important than the style in which it is presented; yet bestows far more attention on examining the style of verse than on its content. This stylistic bias on Monboddo's part means that the topic of prosody looms much larger in, and occupies a proportionally larger part of, the overall treatment of poetry in Origin and Progress than in a comparable work like Kames's Elements of Criticism or Blair's Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres. Another factor which affects the tenor of Monboddo's prosody is his enthusiasm for the ancients; whereas most authors would naturally consider an elucidation of present-day prosodic practice to be of primary importance, and would examine classical verse mainly in so far as it influenced that of the present, Monboddo allots pride of place to Greek and Latin; modern versification is examined only as a deteriorated form of the ancient. So it is that the first species of rhythm treated in Monboddo's Volume VII MS Of Rhythm (MP 235) is that of "the antient Verse" (p. 1). The
influence of verse on the listener is related to Monboddo's aesthetic theory as expounded in Antient Metaphysics II: pleasure is the result of beholding system rather than chaos. In the case of verse, this system consists in the ratio of the parts of the verse to each other. The aesthetic experience is a pleasurable one because "we are form'd by Nature to delight in every thing that is Orderly & regular & tending to form a System, which is the Object & the only Object that Intellect contemplates." (MP 235, p. 16). The verse-elements forming these ratios are syllables, and it is the relation between the quantities, or lengths, of these syllables which constitutes the rhythm of the verse. In a typically gnomic utterance, Monboddo concludes that "The Subject therefor of Rhythme is Motion." (p. 2). Thankfully, we are spared an incursion into the metaphysical dimension of motion, which is more appropriate to the tone of Antient Metaphysics (where the subject of motion is analysed at great length and to no avail) than to a work of literary theory. However, Monboddo does go so far as to explain, in a section of MP 237 incorporated in MP 235, that rhythm is merely a subsection of the more comprehensive category of number, one of the forming principles of the universe; he cites the Pythagorean maxim that ἄρθρος ἐς πλευρ' ἐπιλέχε (MP 237, p. 2). Monboddo's concern with the numerology of the Pythagorean school can be discerned in the importance he attaches to the convention that the proportion of a long to a short vowel is 2:1; without such arithmetical
precision "there would be no Art or Science in the Case" (MP 235, p. 16). On numerology, MP 30, Of Arithmetick or the Science of Number, shows Monboddo wrestling with the problem of how literally to interpret this maxim: "If there could be any doubt that Numbers are the formal Cause of all Things in Nature, that is the Works of God, there can be no doubt with respect to the Works of Art invented and practiced by Men: for they are neither usefull nor beautifull if they are not formed by Numbers" (MP 30, p. 48(4)). The excellence of a single work of plastic art depends on the ratios of its parts to each other; and the complexity of ordering these proportions aright is plainly magnified when a composite group is produced (p. 48(4)). Monboddo here confines his discussion to the plastic arts, but it is easy to see how he would apply these principles to the literary arts too. His final conclusion is that the role of numbers in the microcosm of human artifice implies an important significance for numbers in the divine macrocosm. Indeed, this common numerical bond between the works of man and God serves also to establish the subservience of the one to the other: "As to the Works of Art, it is evident that the Beauties of that kind must be infinitely inferior . . . both in Number and degree to those of the Works of God. The Study of them nevertheless may Serve to form a taste in us, and to raise our Minds to the Study of the Beauties of Nature" (MP 30, p. 66). The conclusion may be Wordsworthian, but the premises are derived from a body
of thought of a very different character. Similar arithmetical considerations account for the elevated status accorded music by the ancients and accordingly by Monboddo himself; the art of music "leads us to the Study of those Numbers which form the System of the Universe" (p. 67). Only pragmatic considerations deter Monboddo from delving into even more abstruse areas: "To explain what higher Genus Number belongs to would be going farther into the first Philosophy than our Subject requires" (MP 237, p. 2).

Here, however, Monboddo confines himself to the empirical aspects of rhythm "as an Object of Sense & not of Science" (MP 235, p. 2). This approach yields a division of the subject, in terms of the sense affected by each type of rhythm, into the rhythms of dancing, of music, of discourse and as perceived by touch. (This last species Monboddo admits has no name, but believes may be of importance "particularly in Medicine" (MP 237, p. 2); I imagine Monboddo is thinking of body rhythms as indicating the regular or faulty functioning of the organism.) The third of these, the rhythm of discourse, is set apart as Monboddo's subject in this tract. At the outset, we are reminded of the importance to Monboddo of separating rhythm and prosody. This is, of course, a variant on the quantity/accent polarization: the rhythm of the classical languages consists of the alternation of long and short syllables; the prosody, of high and low musical pitch. Monboddo obviously sees himself as propounding a radical doctrine in suggesting that variety of melodic pitch
could be a characteristic of language; the evolutionary precedence of music to language is insisted on by way of
defence. So, too, in *Origin and Progress* I Monboddo
notes his belief that "all the antient and original
languages, without exception, have a great deal of accent
or tone in them" (*O&P*, I, 314). Singing is natural, and
comes easily to man; language is highly artificial, and
linguistic skills are hard won; therefore it is to be
expected that primitive man would be further advanced in
his melodic than in his other linguistic achievements.
Further evidence that music is anterior to language is
found in the fact that the southern and eastern nations,
where civilization originated, are more musical than the
northern. Monboddo sees this deficiency in the northern
nations as being due to largely climatological factors:
northern weather "has not only Shrivel'd & Contracted
their Bodies, but has more or less impaired all their
Senses" (*MP* 235, p. 13). Monboddo sees the Chinese
language as living proof that melody can be annexed to
language. He speculates that the Chinese first acquired
the capacity for making musical notes, then added these
tones to language at a later evolutionary stage. Again,
Dionysius is cited as testifying that the conjunction of
melody with language was a feature of the Greek language;
and the North American Iroquois are displayed as another
people combining tone and articulation. Finally, and as
if in desperation, Monboddo presents his oddest exponents
of articulate and musical language: the cuckoo and the
cockatoo; if mere birds can produce measured and tuneful
calls, why not the ancient Greeks!

Monboddo appears at his most eccentric when casting too wide a net for evidence to back up his claims. But beneath the absurd lengths to which Monboddo will go to gather corroboration for his thesis that language was originally melodic lies a commendable awareness of historical perspective: that too simple an inference from present-day behaviour to that of the dim past is dangerous. We find in Monboddo a deep sense of isolation from the past, and of attendant loss. The scanty idea of ancient statuary that we possess is derived from a few remnants fortunately preserved to us; what notion would we have of their accomplishments in this sphere if these relics had not been saved? And yet some would dogmatize on the nature of ancient language on the basis of even less data. Monboddo's attention may well have been turned to the relics of ancient statuary as a result of reading Spence's Polymetis (1742), with which references in MP 53, Observations on Various points of Philosophy, & Theology (1796), show him to be familiar. We see him, in a section of the MS dated 1776, cite Polymetis to defend against the ridicule of his acquaintances his assertion that the Georgics were not true didactic poems (MP 53, pp. 8-9), and to prove the melodic nature of ancient verse (p. 14), as well as referring the reader to an account of ancient monuments (p. 8). Also figuring in Monboddo's reading into classical antiquities are Winckelmann's Geschichte der Kunst des Altherthums (1764), published in a French
translation in 1766 (See MP 53, p. 9); and Montfaucon's
L'Antiquite Expliquee et Representee en Figures, first
appearing in 1719 (MP 53, p. 8). These interests demon-
strate Monboddo's intention to treat language on a par
with, and as one of, the fine arts; hence his assessment
of the relative abilities of the arts to be transmitted
unscathed through the centuries. It has been shown that
Monboddo believes present versifiers to be labouring
under the disadvantage of having no ancient models to
imitate, and to be in this respect worse off than expon-
ents of the plastic arts. But prosody apart, Monboddo
shows in MP 53 (actually a collection of revisions for
a new edition of Origin and Progress) that he believes
the modern author to be more in touch with his illustrious
forbears than his counterpart in the field of painting or
statuary. This whole passage is of interest: "As I have
compared the Writing Art wt. other antient Arts & parti-
cularly Painting & Sculpture it is proper to Observe that
those who would form a good Stile, have this Advantage
over the other Artists, that they can imitate the very
best modells of the kind that Antiquity has produced,
whereas our Painters & Sculptors must necessarily form
their Taste & Practise upon Such works of Art as were only
Copies of the great antient Master pieces. For these
works are all the Produce of that Age of the Art which
Winckleman calls the Age of Imitation" (MP 53, pp. 6-7).
This sense of loss is accentuated by the very artifice of
this melodic phenomenon of language: "in a degenerate
Nation among the first Arts that are lost is the Melody of Language" (MP 235, p. 12). Thus modern Greek has no accent or rhythm; and the Sanscrit language, which Monboddo held to be superior even to the Greek, is preserved only among the Brahmins. Like Herries, Monboddo regrets that we are cut off from any real awareness of the sound of Greek, or even Latin, spoken in the period of its finest flowering by those most skilled in its pronunciation. Accounts of Demosthenes' rhetorical powers have convinced Monboddo that there was a beauty in his performances "such as No Man now living can have any Idee of" (MP 235, p. 14). Our loss in this respect, says Monboddo, is all the greater in that the art of rhetoric was the most popular, and most assiduously pursued, of all arts among the ancients, and could therefore be presumed to have been pre-eminent among them.

Drawing his first chapter of MP 235 to a close, Monboddo repeats his definition of rhythm as consisting in the ratio of long and short syllables to each other. Both verse and prose are susceptible to composition in numbers, and in Chapter 2 Monboddo confines himself to the former of these. The numerical basis of rhythm is reaffirmed, as is the nature of the poetic experience. The conventional rules of quantity are sketched in, including that fixing the proportion of a long to a short vowel at 2:1. Of more interest is the fact that Monboddo prefers a division of a verse into feet rather than into mere syllables. The former division is "more
proper" in that "Syllables . . . are only a Division of the Articulation or Spelling of the Verse", whereas a division into feet separates the true divisions of verse: "The Ratios of which it is composed" (p. 19). Paul Fussell has made the point that the major innovation in prosody throughout the eighteenth century was the replacement of a conception of verse as primarily syllabic by one which stressed instead its division into feet, analogous to musical bars, which split the verse into units of equal rhythmic value rather than units which contained an equal number of syllables. Fussell's observation applies mainly, of course, to the prosodic analysis of English verse, but it is interesting to note that Monboddo evinces the same anti-syllabic tendency in discussing ancient verse. Monboddo was not at all original in preferring a foot-division to a syllabic one in classical verse; indeed, it is to be wished that he had remembered this distinction when he came to discuss English verse, instead of remarking that it is "a certain number of syllables" (O&P II, 385), along with accentual rhythms, which makes English verse. However, even a half-formed realization that verse is essentially rhythmic rather than syllabic is better than none at all, and at least Monboddo can, equipped with his notion of a rhythmically-formed ancient hexameter line,

make some attempt to account for certain poetic effects. For instance, he observes that "One foot may consist of more Syllables than another & yet be of the same time" (MP 235, p. 19). This enables him to account for the apparent speed of a predominantly dactylic line, and hence its suitability for describing swift motion. Virgil's "Quadripedante putrem sonitu quatit ungula campum" (Aeneid VIII. 596) is an appropriate description of a horse's gallop; and Homer's "πεπείθετη πεδονός κυλιείξεις ἀνανίς" (Odyssey XI. 598) is well suited to depicting the swift descent of a stone, especially in contrast to the preceding spondaic line describing the previous ascent of the stone. That these lines have such an effect Monboddo assumes to be evident; he sees his own role as being to explain why. Resorting to his definition of rhythm as motion, Monboddo tells us that "in the Dactyle ther is more motion in the same time" (p. 20), since three syllables must be fitted into the time allotted to a spondee. This "explanation" may seem rather scholastic until we realize that Monboddo subsequently gives a specifically human, indeed physiological, interpretation to the kind of "motion" involved here: "the Action of the Organs in the pronunciation of every Syllable is a Motion" (p. 20). The movement which Monboddo holds to be quicker in the dactyl than in the spondee is not motion in the abstract, but literally the movement of the vocal organs; as we might expect in the theorizing of one who made such capital out of the difficulty of articulation. We might
compare with this passage a similar elocutionary account of a poetic phenomenon in the work referred to above by Herries, another writer concerned with the difficulties of pronunciation. Correct attention paid to the due marking of poetic accents in the pronunciation of syllables, we are told, means that "they will relieve at once the organ of the speaker and the ear of the hearer" (Elements, p. 171). Here, then, is an example of the elocutionary bias to be observed in Monboddo's poetics: the creative process, and the aesthetic experience by which the recipient is made aware of the products of that process, are conceived of as part of a causal chain which includes as the link between artist and audience, the physical utterance of the literary work in question. Verse for Monboddo exists not as a series of printed lines, but as a dynamic entity which must be performed, or enacted, in order that its acoustic qualities may be fully savoured. The importation into poetic theory of the terms and values of elocution is symptomatic of an age which paid such attention to the phenomenological aspects of aesthetics and to the affective aspects of literature in general; the same tendency is prominent in the works of Thomas Sheridan, to be examined later; in the meantime, I simply take the opportunity to demonstrate the elocutionary slant Monboddo gives to the discussion of a poetic figure.

Defining his subject more strictly, Monboddo turns to a closer analysis of ancient rhythm, choosing as his model the classical hexameter. He deals first with the feet used
in the hexameter (the dactyl and spondee), praising the conventional ending of the verse in a dactyl followed by a spondee. The basis for this praise lies in two touchstones of Monboddo's criticism of verse: the principle enlarged on above that rhythm is motion, and the demand for variety tempered by order. The -- v v / -- concluding rhythm of the hexameter "makes a very agreeable Variety" (p. 22) to Monboddo's mind, this variety being prevented from overflowing into rambling disorder by the concluding spondee, which "gives a firm Base to the Verse, & Stops as it were the rapid flow of the Dactyle with which it is very well contrasted" (p. 22). So finely contrived is this balance of motion and control in a verse that a spondaic line, replacing the penultimate dactyle by another spondee, is condemned as "[flowing] very unpleasantly" (p. 22). Where this internal rhythmic variety is lacking, Monboddo suggests a possible defence of such unorthodox verses by appealing to variety on a larger scale: they are "used sometimes by Poeticall Licence or perhaps for the Sake of Variety" (pp. 22-23).

Since rhythm is held to depend on the ratio of the lengths of syllables, the means used to define these ratios are naturally of great importance. Monboddo therefore proceeds to enumerate the pauses employed in the hexameter, which he sees as being essential to the discrimination of rhythm, echoing Cicero's illustration (in De Oratore III. 186) that we can perceive a rhythm in a series of falling drops of water, but not in a headlong torrent; a
precipitate flow of syllables is to be ordered by the regular intervention of pauses. It may be noted that Herries, too, has recourse to this passage; with the difference that he twists Cicero's words to apply to the intervals between acute accents; where, "if each syllable was pronounced in the same tone, the sound would be unvaried like that of an uninterrupted stream of water" (Elements, p. 172).

Monboddo finds pauses separating syllables, words, feet and verses, as well as the caesural pause. Monboddo conducts his examination as if the first four of these types of pauses were all of a kind; a closer analysis might have suggested that whereas the first, third and fourth are indeed qualitatively similar in that they mark the metrical divisions of a text, the second (pauses between words) is at odds with the rest, frequently causing a syncopative tension between the metrical rhythm of a passage and its distribution of emphases as dictated by its sense. That Monboddo was nevertheless aware of some manifestations of this syncopation is made evident by his attempts to account for the remaining pause to which he draws attention, the caesural break. A note in MP 235 directs the reader to MP 237, an earlier draft of Monboddo's opinions on rhythm, in order to pursue Monboddo's ideas on the caesura; and it is to this MS that reference must be made in tracing Monboddo's own changing opinions regarding the classical caesura. At first, Monboddo frankly admits ignorance: "But what the reason is of this
So constant Pause at the Caesura . . . I know not" (MP 237, p. 9). A series of papers apart appended to this MS, however, contain Monboddo's final triumphant conclusions: Monboddo has "asked the Question of Severall Men of Letters but I have found none hitherto that has So much as attempted to answer the Question" (p. 28(11)(1)). One unfortunate object of Monboddo's requests gains only his withering scorn for denying that the caesural pause exists. Monboddo is proud of his unravelling of the problem that has beaten so many erudite minds; but it must be admitted that his solution is rather obvious, and consists of showing the caesura to be formed from the coincidence of two types of pause: that between syllables, and that between words. When these two pauses, each in their own right of minor significance, coalesce in the middle of a foot, the resulting pause is of sufficient magnitude to affect our reading of the verse.

An alien observer, perusing the repeated praise of variety and condemnation of "tedious uniformity" in the theorizing of this period, could forgivably attribute to its writers a quite neurotic propensity to boredom. A single regular iambic pentameter or even dactylic hexameter would be anathema to Monboddo. The saving grace of variety can, however, be introduced by ringing the changes in the position of the caesura. So Virgil has proceeded by deferring the caesura from, for example, the third to the fourth foot.

Such is Monboddo's picture of the beauties of ancient
versification. But, as explained above, Monboddo believes that we behold these beauties through the dark glass of modern degeneracy. Our own barbaric verse, diversified only by the alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables, blinds us to the melodic and quantitative variety of the ancient. The proof of this point is the subject of Chapter 3.

With respect to the quantitative verse of Greece and Rome, one apprehends its rhythmic qualities by measuring the time taken in pronouncing each syllable and perceiving the ratios between these times. Such, at least, is Monboddo's ideal of how such verse should be read, and indeed of how it was read by the ancients themselves. Monboddo's thesis in Chapter 3, however, is that we nowadays perceive no rhythm in the ancient verse other than the rhythm formed by comparing the intervals between emphatically stressed syllables; the rhythm, in fact, which we find in our own verse. We are asked to believe that the modern reader does not perceive differences in the lengths of vowels when reading Latin and Greek; this, too, even though Monboddo devotes so many pages to eulogizing this very aspect of the classical languages. It is difficult to believe that the eighteenth century could have been so blind to the inherent rhythm of the verse from which the Augustan age derived its Augustanism. Yet any suspicions that Monboddo is out on a limb as far as this contention goes are allayed when we find that other writers saw fit to comment on their contemporaries'
distortion of ancient rhythm. Herries, for instance, makes the point not that classical quantity is ignored in favour of modern stress, but that these ancient quantities are distorted by the superimposition of false quantities, a practice into which the modern reader is led by treating the classical text in the way he would one of his own language. The first line of the Aeneid provides a convenient example: Herries holds that despite the authentic scansion of "Arma, virumque cano, Troja- qui primus ab ore," "agreeable to the analogy of the English, every judicious reader will pronounce the syllables vi and ca in the words virum and cano, long, which is contrary to the rule of antient prosody" (Elements, p. 125). Foster is more precise on the type of error commonly made in the English speaker's mispronunciation of Latin: "he pronounceth as long, every short penultima of all dis- syllables, and every short antepenultima of all polysyllables that have their penultima short too" (Essay, p. 191). Descending to particulars, this refers to the perpetration of readings like domus with a long ə, and imperium with a long ə. Foster explains that the vowel upon which this wrong quantity is placed corresponds to that on which the Romans placed their (melodic) accent (p. 194). It is a short step from saying that the English pronunciation lengthens the syllable which is the seat of the accent, to saying that this syllable is emphasized by a stress; and it is this step which Monboddo takes. Foster had, in fact, come very close to anticipating Monboddo, in
voicing the belief that it is because the English reader
naturally accents a Latin word on the same syllable as a
Roman himself would ("accent" being used in the original,
musical, sense) that this syllable tends to be lengthened
as well, it being a common tendency of the English reader
to err by lengthening an acute syllable. Monboddo, of
course, could not subscribe to this view, since he denied
the very presence of melodic accents in English; but he
saw fit to retain the substance of Foster's account,
merely submitting his own concept of English stress-accent
for Foster's twofold notion of pitch-plus-quantity. How¬
ever, Monboddo is not content with a bare assertion that
"we read it [i.e. ancient verse] by what we call Accent"
(MP 235, p. 35): his passion for methodical and exhaustive
systematization urges him to elucidate the principles upon
which we act in thus reading classical verse. Hence
arises the question "how are those Accents to be laid
upon the Several Syllables?" (p. 35). A chapter in Origin
and Progress II (Book II, Chapter 6) shows how Monboddo's
interest in this topic grew directly from his reading of
Foster. Monboddo notes Foster's observation that we do
not honour the rhythmic quantities of Latin, but feels
"the subject deserves to have something more said upon
it" (O&P,II, 329). This Monboddo goes on to do, giving
an attenuated version of the scheme of pronunciation which
we find in MP 235. In the Volume II passage we find out
why Monboddo thought Foster's account inadequate. He
understands Foster to have denied that we apply our modern
accents to the seat of the ancient accents (O&P,II, 339);
this despite Foster's plain statement that "It seems the
accent is readily carried by an English voice to the same syllables which the Romans acuted" (Essay, p. 194). Monboddo's point seems valid, however, because Foster, although saying we apply an acute accent to, and in addition lengthen, the syllable originally accented in the Latin, does not go so far as to say that we consciously adopt the principle of following ancient accent in our prosody. It must be remembered that Monboddo is trying to formulate a science of prosody; and one of the features of a science in Monboddo's eyes is that its principles must not be mere empirical generalizations about the practices people actually follow, but must possess a rationale of their own. Monboddo postulates an intentional element in the practice of the prosodist. He seeks a knowledge over and above mere facts such as that the English reader accents the penultimate of a polysyllable; he wants to know his reason for so doing. This explains why he finds no positive prosodic analysis in Foster: Foster "confesses [the ancient accent] is attended to by very few in practice, and rejected by many even in theory" (O&P, II, 330); it is therefore impossible to postulate the following of ancient accent as a guiding principle in English pronunciation. In this chapter, too, Monboddo also has recourse to Eclogues I.1 as a text to demonstrate the barbarities of modern pronunciation, and to comment, as to the first syllable, that "by pronouncing the syllable so strongly, we do in effect double the consonant, and pronounce it as if it were written Tittyre" (O&P, II, 331). The remainder of this chapter is devoted
to a tortuous and enigmatic attempt to establish the loose relation between quantity and modern accent, the gist of which is that the only case where a Latin quantity and a modern accent necessarily coincide is that of a long penultimate of a polysyllable. Although this conclusion is perfectly valid in terms of Monboddo's prosodic assumptions, it is barely comprehensible in its Volume II presentation; and the later MSS on the subject can be seen as an attempt to spell out in less condensed fashion the principles here outlined. Certainly Monboddo had intentions as early as 177¼ of expatiating on the subject. "A system of antient prosody (I use the word in the common acceptation) might be given," said Monboddo, "according to which we actually read their poetry, very different indeed from the antient prosody, but more agreeable to that of our own language. But such an inquiry would lead me too far from my present purpose" (O&P, II, 336). It was to Volume VII that this task was deferred. One possible explanation of modern practice in scansion, that we scan classical verse according to the paradigm of the English heroic verse, is immediately rejected by Monboddo; although modern classical pronunciation is bastardized in Monboddo's eyes, he is not prepared to admit that we have Anglicized it to the extent of imposing on it the regular alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables which Monboddo associates with "our English Hexameter [i.e. pentameter] Verse" (MP 235, p. 36). Also rejected is the suggestion that we
merely accent the long syllables in the original, and leave unstressed the short. It is no coincidence that Monboddo demonstrates English pronunciation of Latin with reference to the opening line of Virgil's *Eclogues* (O&P,II,332); this is precisely the verse used by Herries for a related purpose. In the *Elements*, Herries depicts the manner in which we would read *Eclogues* I.1 if we were under the impression that the Romans were in the habit of accenting each long syllable: "Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi" (p. 124); and it is probable that Monboddo adopted this example as demonstrating the sound of the line if an English reader were systematically to accent the long syllables. A less condensed version of Monboddo's remarks in this passage is to be found in MP 240, one of the papers on rhythm from which Monboddo drew in preparing the Volume VII text: "If we laid the Accent always upon the long Syllable then we should have nothing more to do, but to Study diligently the Quantity of the Syllables, in order to read the Antient Verse properly but that is far from being the case: for proof of which we need go no farther than the first line of Virgills first Eclogue,

Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi.

Where we have three long Syllables that are not accented, viz tu, lae and sub, And two that are short viz pa re, and yet are accented" (MP 240, p. 47).

If Monboddo has given an accurate representation of how the eighteenth-century scholar would pronounce this
verse, we must infer that the custom was to treat a Latin text as if it were an English one, paying no heed to metrical niceties like quantity and foot-divisions. Such a conclusion is a difficult one to make, but one which is supported by what Herries says. I think it likely, in view of Herries' hazy notion of quantity, that when he says "every judicious reader will pronounce the syllables vi and ca in the words virum and cano, long" (Elements, p. 125) he is in fact confusing quantity with stress, and means that the English reader stresses the first syllables of these disyllables in the same manner that he would, more often than not, stress the first syllable of an English disyllable. Monboddo's purpose in contrasting a quantitative and an accentual reading of this line is in the first instance to prove that we do not read such verse merely substituting accent for quantity; and, by way of corollary, to point out that "Quantity & Accent are quite distinct & that by making a Syllable louder we do not make it longer" (MP 235, p. 36). It is apparent that there was considerable debate in Monboddo's age as to whether the accenting a syllable necessarily prolonged the quantity of the vowel in question. Foster, for instance, "Notwithstanding the reluctance of Vossius, Henninius, and thousands after them, to admit the acute as compatible with a short time" (Essay, p. 181), undertakes to alter their opinion by simple recourse to the short notes of a musical instrument. Monboddo, as we have seen, is anxious to stress the mutual independence
of accent and quantity. Indeed, says Monboddo, so little truth is there in the platitude that accenting a syllable lengthens it, that the reverse is often the case. The relevance of the examples adduced by Monboddo in substantiation of this point is dubious. Oat, he says, is a long syllable, whereas the first syllable of Oatmeal, being emphasized, is thereby shortened. Similarly, the long syllable Vine is abbreviated to Vin in Vintage and Vinyard.

Monboddo's survey is less than exhaustive. For one thing it is unclear whether Monboddo means to say that there is actually a phonetic change in the vowel in question, as opposed to a change merely in quantity (from \( o \) as in road to \( o \) as in rod, in the first example). In the second place, Monboddo fails to prove that any vowel-change which does take place in the derivative in each case is due to accentuation rather than to a gradually evolved alteration of pronunciation to comply with the dictates of ease of articulation. However, a mere choice of bad examples does not necessarily render a proposition invalid. Monboddo's remarks on accent and quantity here seem quite fair, and reinforce his point that we are not to rely on a facile one-to-one relationship between the two.

So much for the negative side of the coin. Monboddo's positive account of modern classical pronunciation falls into two sections. He first demarcates the areas where the position of an English stress coincides with that of a long
syllable in the original, then spells out the cases where the two do not agree. This division is significant, and shows that Monboddo's eyes were open to the different demands made by the two languages in question: the language of the original verse, and the language of the reader. Into his former category fall the instances where, unless the modern reader paid deference to the rhythmic patterns of the Latin or Greek original, all pretence of having transmitted the spirit of the original would have to be dropped. For instance, Monboddo insists that the characteristic \(-v\ v\ /\ -\) close of the hexameter must survive the translation from a quantitative to an accentual mode of pronunciation. This is to be achieved by accenting the initial syllable of the penultimate and ultimate feet, thereby preserving some semblance of the hexameter rhythm.

The other area in which Monboddo sees a need for the modern accent to be tied in with the classical quantity is even more fundamentally concerned with doing justice to the original text: this is where the quantity helps in construing the text by clarifying matters of accidence. It is important that we know whether \(_{eadem}\) be nominative or ablative; the Latin quantity removes any ambiguity; therefore it is important that the modern reader should not reintroduce this ambiguity by arbitrarily pronouncing the \(a\) of \(_{eadem}\) as stressed or unstressed.

The second class Monboddo discusses is that where the nature of British pronunciation necessitates a deviation from the pattern of quantities in the original. Monboddo's
first category lists resemblances between ancient and modern scansion which must be maintained if the rhythmic spirit of the original is to be preserved; his second, dissimilarities which must exist if the rhythmic "feel" of English is to be introduced. Hence Monboddo's general rule that no two adjacent syllables must be accented when reading Latin, just as no two are normally accented in English verse. This is due to the emphatic nature of our accent: in order that a syllable may be emphasized, it must be perceptibly louder than those adjacent to it. Where a syllable is next to another loud one, it cannot be said to have any prominence over it, and is therefore not emphasized in any way. Secondly, Monboddo observes that of three adjacent syllables the English speaker must stress one; this being due to no intrinsic feature of the language, but mere custom. Combining the rules contained in both Monboddo's categories, then, we can work out a fairly precise system for accenting Latin in the modern manner.

But it will be remembered that evolving this system is only half the task which Monboddo set himself. The remaining problem amounts to this: why should a body of verse thus debased in the pronunciation nevertheless be pleasing to the modern reader? Relevant portions of MP 238, later taken into MP 235, show that on this issue, too, Monboddo was at no loss for an answer. Here, too, Monboddo's thought processes were set in motion by Foster's Essay, where we find the subject raised thus: "how
wonderfully does it likewise shew the excellent harmony of the Greek and Latin composition, particularly in their verse, that it should still be agreeable to our ear; still be able to recommend itself so powerfully to us, and, under all its present losses and disadvantages, be superior to that of any modern language?" (Essay, p. 195). In Volume II, Monboddo had occasion to remark that it is "true, what Mr Foster observes, that not withstanding the injustice we do Greek and Latin poetry, in the pronunciation, it still pleases even our ear more than any modern poetry. It is a matter of some curiosity to know how this happens" (O&F, II, 335-36). Curious enough for Monboddo to return to the problem in MP 238, pp. 23-24, where he again deems the basis of aesthetic pleasure, both in the ancient and modern pronunciation, to lie in the hallowed principles of uniformity and variety. There is, of course, less of both commodities to be had in the case of the modern pronunciation. Monboddo attributes this lack to our not observing the foot-divisions of the original scansion; and this adds further weight to the supposition that, if Monboddo has accurately characterized his contemporaries' pronunciation of Latin verse, nearly all the metrical rhythm of the original would appear to have gone by the board. The Latin is read just as if it were English prose, with the proviso that a compensatory - v v / - - is tacked on to revive some approximation to the style of the hexameter. The uniformity which is relished in the ancient
pronunciation is that of the intervals between the stressed syllables. In the case of the modern mode of delivery, the variety is introduced by the insertion of either one or two unstressed syllables between each emphatic one. Monboddo does not spell out in this particular passage the nature of the variety found in the ancient method of pronunciation; we must simply recall his earlier eulogy of the classics' melody, quantity and pauses.

Monboddo tells us so much about modern English prosody when dealing with modern Latin pronunciation that very little of his picture of it needs shading in by the time he comes to consider it in its own right in Of English Verse (MP 241). He does, admittedly, go into more detail as to why English verse should be based on emphasis rather than quantity. For one thing, English long syllables are too few in relation to the short, and of indeterminate length; and the ratio of the long to the short is not the rigidly maintained 2 to 1 which Monboddo finds between the long and short quantities of Latin syllables. Monboddo repeats the genetic account of modern accent found in MP 235: modern accents came to replace the old musical accents. The loss of the ancient musical features of language led to the eclipse of rhythm too; Monboddo believes that to this extent at least melody and rhythm are interdependent. Language thus deprived of melody and rhythm would display a monotony too rigid for the human speech organs to maintain; hence a modicum of
variety was reintroduced via the only method to which a post-classical nation could aspire: stress accent. Here as ever Monboddo ranges round for a present-day specimen to substantiate his theories, and finds one in the modern Greek language, which has deteriorated from the level of Attic Greek to its present position on a par with English.

Chapter 1 of MP 241 set English rhythm against classical, and found it to be of base metal; Chapter 2 proceeds to formulate the rules followed in making English verse. As Monboddo acknowledges, this has largely been done already in Volume II, where Monboddo had defended the inclusion of a guide to English metrics in a treatise on grammar rather than on poetry by explaining that verse is a stylistic device and consequently incidental, rather than essential, to poetry. Having dealt in some detail in Volume II with the feet used in English verse, he only needs in Volume VII to summarize his findings there: the feet indigenous to English verse are the iamb, the trochee and the anapaest, combined in verses of varying lengths. Monboddo proceeds to do for English the service he has already performed for the classics: to highlight the beauties inherent in the language, and to illustrate their use. This is naturally for Monboddo a task of much smaller scope in the case of English than of the classics. Monboddo notes that "the use of Rhyme has introduced a great difference in our Poetry" (p. 10), although probably attributing a disproportionately large importance to the distinction between blank and rhymed verse simply because, to Monboddo,
the presence or absence of rhyme was the main criterion for separating good from bad verse. Classical verse of the first order was unrhymed; therefore English verse which *is* rhymed cannot be of the first rank; the matter is as simple as that. Monboddo's overwhelming concern with stylistics blinds him to any finer (and more judicious) frame of reference for comparing contemporary verse with classical. The humour inherent in Pope's reworking of Horace - with respect, for instance, to the selection of topical modern parallels - would, one feels, have largely escaped Monboddo; it is sufficient to damn Pope that he uses rhyming couplets.

Priority is given, then, to blank verse. According to Monboddo, two features are peculiar to blank verse, serving to establish it not only as distinct from, but as superior to, the rhymed variety. These are a pause "which the Sense requires" (p. 17), that is which clarifies the grammatical structure of the verse; and a capacity for running a large number of verses together to construct a sustained and coherent "period." Monboddo draws a distinction between the caesura found in blank verse and the pause which he observes when discussing rhyming verse in Chapter 3. The blank verse pause can be adapted to conform to the demands of the verse's grammar, since its *raison d'être* is to distinguish the various members of the speech. The caesura in rhymed verse, however, Monboddo views in a very different light, as a necessary evil accompanying the unpliable and end-stopped couplet. We must at least applaud Monboddo's
ingenuity in proving a priori that rhymed verse in couplets must, of necessity, be boring. The drift of his argument runs as follows: if one is determined to insert rhymes into one's verse, one must bring the rhymed words to the reader's attention; otherwise they might as well have been omitted. This is effected by introducing a pause at the end of each verse. But such a pause would interfere with the grammatical construction of a sentence, unless it coincided with the divisions between its grammatical sections. Therefore a sentence construction must be chosen such that its clauses are separated by the pause at the close of each verse. Hence Monboddo's conclusion that "this Composition in Rhyming Verse is all in Sentences or Members of Sentences of a determinate Number of Syllables" (p. 22). Of course, this is an awesome distortion of the true scope of couplet verse; but more is to come. The presence of the pause at the close of each verse induces the reader to insert a lesser pause "about the Middle of each Line" (p. 24), which not only cuts across the syntatic structure of the words, but imparts a constant and never-varied monotony to the verse. It is obvious that such a jaundiced view of couplet verse could only be arrived at by one who has an unshakable conviction of its demerits in the first place. Monboddo has imbued from his wide range of classical reading a taste which posits as the ideal of versification a sonorous and elongated flow of verse, in which the rhythmic pattern is perceived by considering the overall accumulative effect
of a sentence which may run to a considerable length. He accepts this as an objective criterion applicable to other languages. But these criteria are properly applicable only to the classical languages, and cannot be transferred to a radically different language such as English. Had Monboddo realized this, he might have seen too that the rhymed couplet form generates its own system of values, in accordance with which poets like Pope must be judged. Far from being constricted by the mould of the heroic couplet, Pope turns the limitations of the form to his advantage by producing a tension and interplay between the rhythmic and grammatical content of his verse.

However, to concentrate on what Monboddo did not do, and to discuss the insights he did not have, is to lose sight of him as a man of his time, and one too whose prosodic writings, if published, would have demanded attention as part of the history of prosody. As it is, his opinions never saw the light of day, at least in printed form; and any influence they had on the study of prosody must have been in their Volume II dress, or by word of mouth. I have examined above four works on prosody whose influence on Monboddo is acknowledged by him, and indisputable; I wish now to place Monboddo in context by indicating parallels, and similarities in thought, between Monboddo and other contemporary prosodists. The interchange of thought is by no means one way; the perhaps surprising truth is that while Monboddo
was ridiculed as a naive eccentric for his anthropological hobby-horses, he was looked on as a serious participant in the arena of poetic theory and criticism. It is abundantly clear that the critical comparison of ancient and modern accent was, in the later years of the century, not the mark of a reactionary pedant, but a matter of popular and spirited debate. It is not sufficient to view Monboddo's prosodic doctrines as a bywater into which he was led in his efforts to establish the ancients' supremacy in even the most esoteric branches of the arts. The fact of the matter is that the most widely disseminated critical works of the period dealt with this very topic.

Thomas Sheridan, father of the playwright, established a reputation by his extremely popular series of lectures on elocution, in which he discussed such topics as the nature of accent and quantity, both ancient and modern, and compared languages, new and old, from the elocutionist's standpoint. His audience evinced a desire for refinement of pronunciation for which he catered with great success; and this desire was markedly present in the Edinburgh of Monboddo's time, whose inhabitants, despite their yearnings for an authentic Gaelic Homer, showed no willingness to betray any hint of linguistic affinity with such a bard. The best English was English English, and "Scoticisms" were to be eradicated. Hence it is that we find the Select Society, of which, as I have noted, Monboddo was a prominent member, inviting
Thomas Sheridan to lecture to them on the subject of elocution; and there are several themes in Sheridan's Course of Lectures on Elocution (1762) which had a formative effect on Monboddo's own views. Sheridan, as Monboddo does later, points out a difference between ancient and modern accent: "The term with us has no reference to inflexions of the voice, or musical notes, but only means a peculiar manner of distinguishing one syllable of a word from the rest" (p. 41). Sheridan, unlike Monboddo, does admit quantity as a significant feature of English speech, alongside the emphasis which Monboddo held to be its sole attribute. But one can see how Monboddo's notion of the drum-beat of English speech merely draws out to extreme length the distinction between ancient and modern accent made by Sheridan.

Sheridan also discredits the common notion that a stressed syllable is thereby a long one; this seems to lie behind Monboddo's repeated assertions that, on the contrary, the practice of emphasizing a syllable frequently has the opposite effect of shortening it. He also shows himself to be, like Monboddo, an ardent Graecist, in two Dissertations appended to the Lectures. The title of the first is "On the State of Language in OLD GREECE and the Means by which it was brought to Perfection" (p. 137), and we can imagine the enthusiasm with which Monboddo assented to its fundamental proposition that "Of all the countries in the world, Greece seems to have been, constitutionally, the best formed,
to bring the human language to perfection" (p. 138). In the second dissertation, "On the State of Language in other Countries, but more particularly in our own, and its Consequences" (p. 155), this praise of Greece expands into a detailed analysis of what Sheridan sees as the universal superiority of the Greeks over the English in linguistic and artistic matters. The artful composition of the Greeks, calculated to "afford the greatest variety of numbers" (pp. 165 - 66), is set against the "uniformity, which in any long work becomes insupportable to the ear" (p. 166) of the English, in complete accordance with Monboddo's own methods. Sheridan does however differ from Monboddo in conceding that although actually inferior English is potentially as rich a language as the classical tongues, and that, suitably handled, "it might rival or even excel the noble languages of Greece and Rome" (p. 192). Such optimism is quite alien to Monboddo, who sees the debasement of modern language as symptomatic of the irreversible decline of mankind since Athens flourished.

Kames accords an equally important role to prosodic analysis, devoting a large part of his Elements of Criticism (1762) to the subject, and coming to more sanguine conclusions concerning the status of English vis-a-vis the classics. His views are quite contrary to Monboddo's: he attributes melodic accents to English, and authentic quantity. He explains blithely that "the doctrine of accenting English heroic verse, is extremely simple ... accenting is confined to the long syllables"
Given Kames's refusal to allow any essential difference between ancient and modern prosody, his conclusion that English verses "rival the most perfect species known in Greece or Rome" (II, 435) is not startling. He even cites *The Rape of the Lock* as the pinnacle of English versification (II, 362); one wonders how much of Monboddo's criticism of Pope is to be seen as a vigorous rebuttal of such claims. On the other hand, Kames shares to a certain extent Monboddo's distrust of rhymed verse, holding it to be a fit ornament only of the lighter poetic forms and subjects (II, 451 - 56). He praises English blank verse, like Monboddo, because it imitates the variety of the classical; and, in terms which echo Monboddo's own, talks of the "tedious uniformity" (II, 444) of French verse.

(Monboddo's frequent talk of the "tedious uniformity" which he finds in all types of couplet verse seems prompted by a lingering recollection of Isaac Watts' preface to *Horae Lyricae* (2nd ed., 1709; ref. to 6th ed.). Watts' early championing of the beauties of blank verse against rhyme is not only in complete accord with Monboddo's but also appears to have provided Monboddo, not to mention Kames, with the actual phrase he uses in his own diatribes. Watts, like Monboddo, condemns the auditory effect of rhymes, declaring "The Reader is tir'd with the tedious Uniformity, or charm'd to sleep with the unmanly Softness of the Numbers, and the perpetual Chime of even Cadences" (p. xxviii).)
The idea of modern rhythm as no more than a debased form of the ancient became firmly entrenched in the writings of the Scottish literati; and it seems that Monboddo’s doctrines, as propounded in *Origin and Progress II*, were the most significant item extracted from the work by his colleagues. Hugh Blair, in his *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* (1783), several times numbers Monboddo among his sources on grammatical points, and evidently adopted Monboddo’s theory of prosody as well. He follows Monboddo’s account of the melody of the Greeks’ and Romans’ speech, declaring "Our modern pronunciation must have appeared to them a lifeless monotony."¹ Blair even acknowledges the justness of Monboddo’s prosodic teachings in a footnote (*Lectures*,II, 327, n.); as does Beattie in "An Essay on Poetry and Music, as they Affect the Mind", who adopts his explanation of rhythm.²

In a letter to Monboddo of 1774, Sir John Pringle calls in question Monboddo’s equating English to a drumbeat, and voices his intention of uniting Monboddo with an acquaintance: *τὸν ἡμῶν μουσικότατον*; Joshua Steele, who believes firmly in the melodic variety of English. Pringle concludes by inviting Monboddo to his home "that I may bring Mr Steele & you together, upon the melody of ancient & modern languages" (23 June 1774; MP Box 22, fol. 4/35, p. [4]).

The end result of Pringle's manipulations was the publication of a work by Steele, *An Essay Towards Establishing the Melody and Measure of Speech* (1775), in which Steele takes Monboddo to task over his caricature of English as a language devoid of quantity and rhythm. The course of the debate between the two prosodists has been charted by David Abercrombie; suffice it to say that Monboddo's uncompromising stance is effectively undermined by Steele, who evolves in the process a commendably scientific method of musical notation in an attempt to provide a comprehensive system of linguistic transcription. That Steele's is something of a pioneer work in this field is indisputable; but its effectiveness in arguing Monboddo out of an allegiance to his usual prosodic hobby-horse is more questionable. Steele, in his preface, clearly thinks that Monboddo "was candid enough to give up many of the musical opinions which he had published" (Steele, p. vii); but a closer examination suggests that Steele's corrective observations were not taken to heart. Had they been heeded, we would expect to see a reformulated prosodic scheme being presented by Monboddo in the MSS for *Origin and Progress VII*; as it is, Monboddo's prosodic theory of the 1780's is substantially the same as that attacked by Steele in 1775.

Steele's introduction confirms the role played by John Pringle in the matter: his treatise came about as a

---

direct result of Pringle's express request that he controvert Monboddo's criticism of English prosody in Origin and Progress II. Two letters which Steele wrote to Pringle establishing the melodic element in English were communicated to Monboddo, and elicited from the latter a set of "Observations and Queries," published in Steele's work, in which Monboddo concedes that a minimal amount of tonal variation is admittedly discernible in English, but professes himself unconvinced that such fluctuations form a significant factor in the scheme of English prosody, which he believes takes into consideration only the variety of loud and soft (Steele, p. 58). Steele's further attempts to convince Monboddo again fall on deaf ears: Monboddo's "Second Set of Observations and Queries" reiterate that English accents are both arbitrarily applied and barely perceptible, and therefore "never can be reduced to rules of art, as the Greek were, or made part of the grammar of our language" (Steele, p. 104).

This unresolved difference of opinion between Steele and Monboddo is attributable in part to a difference in purpose. Steele is working towards a complete, descriptive, system of speech transcription, which must take into account every relevant variable. Monboddo, on the other hand, is concerned to evolve a prescriptive system - the rules of English prosody - and only brings under his aegis those variables which he believes to be of the essence of prosody. Thus, for instance, Steele stipulates
a difference between the regular rhythmic pattern of speech, corresponding to musical bar divisions, and the degree of loudness or softness superimposed on it; Monboddo is adamant that such a distinction is irrelevant to prosodic analysis, since classical prosody takes no account of variations in volume.

There is some evidence, however, that Steele's tract went some way towards opening Monboddo's mind to the existence of rhythm as distinct from variation in volume level. Throughout his correspondence with Steele, Monboddo sticks to the opinion that Steele's distinction between the two is at worst imaginary and at best nugatory. "Now as I am no musician," he says, "I am not able to make the distinction betwixt light and heavy, and loud and soft" (Steele, p. 60). All the force of Steele's demonstrations that such a distinction is indeed a significant one gives rise only to a grudging admission from Monboddo that talk of "bars" in verse is indeed intelligible, but inconsequential: "I have spoken all my life in musical bars, without knowing that I did so, like the bourgeois gentilhomme you mention in Moliere" (Steele, p. 177).

Steele's reply is an exasperated claim that the ancients even had a critical vocabulary designed to treat this rhythmic phenomenon: "Your 1-p cannot think that the Greeks meant THESIS to signify loudness; or ARSIS, softness" (Steele, p. 183). Hence the acknowledgment by Monboddo, in a footnote to Origin and Progress III, that English does indeed display rhythmic qualities, and that
Steele's tract convinces him that "a great deal more, in this respect, may be made of the English language than I thought was possible" (O&P III, 409, n.); he nevertheless maintains that this rhythm is still inferior to that of the classics.

Such remarks do seem to have implanted in Monboddo a lingering curiosity as to the precise meaning of these terms, to be rekindled when planning the volume on poetry. We find, at any rate, in a letter of 1785 from Monboddo's former clerk, John Hunter, now elevated to a Professorship thanks to Monboddo's good offices, a reply to a request from his former employer that Hunter explicate for him the nature of accent, quantity, arsis and thesis. Hunter replies, in line with Steele's own thinking, that arsis and thesis signify the metrical equivalent of bar-divisions, serving only to point the time structure of the verse. At the same time, however, Hunter stresses the conjectural nature of his suggestions, which he realizes to be at variance with those of "the very acute & learned Dr. Bentley" in his edition of Terence (1726). He quotes a passage demonstrating Bentley's confused equation of arsis and thesis with accent and quantity. Monboddo declined to accept his friend's advice on the matter, but did make use of the passage of Bentley, quoted by Hunter, for his own purposes: a leaf inserted into MP 235 (p. 42(1)) duplicates the lines, and criticizes

\[^1\] 25 July 1785; MP Box 22, fol. 8/109.
the confusion of terms they contain; a confusion, it should be said, of which Hunter himself makes no mention.

Steele's admirable attempts at objective prosodic analysis failed to lead Monboddo away from his own deeply-held beliefs on the subject; a footnote in Antient Metaphysics shows Monboddo doggedly reiterating the customary assertions as late as 1799, the year of his death (AM, VI, 232, n.); but Monboddo's correspondence with Steele, along with the similarities I have highlighted between Monboddo's studies of accent and those of his contemporaries, serve to demonstrate the substantial role Monboddo played in the development of prosody in the later eighteenth century.
Chapter 4
Monboddo's Poetical Criticism

The purpose of this chapter is to gather together Monboddo's critical comments on each of the English poets upon whom he saw fit to write; and to form from this collected criticism a picture of how Monboddo conceived of the development of post-Renaissance English literature, and the discernible phases into which his literary preferences led him to divide it. To this end I have identified four separate eras of literature:
(a) The Elizabethan and Jacobean age, which Monboddo saw as predominantly rude, and still tainted by the barbarity of the Middle Ages;
(b) The age of Milton, the acme of English letters;
(c) The Augustan age, dominated by Pope's highly culpable verse and Swift's and Fielding's admirable novels;
(d) The age of Monboddo's contemporaries, distinguished by its poets' efforts to establish an alternative poetic to the urbane couplets of the school of Pope.

By way of background, I begin by setting this criticism of modern poetry against Monboddo's writings on the ancients. This is because although the scope of this thesis is limited to the former, it is important to realize that Monboddo himself saw his criticism of English poets as subordinate to his writings on classical poetry in general, and Homer in particular. An extensive analysis of Homer's literary art was to form the greater part of Origin and Progress's treatment of
poetry, as a letter to Sir George Baker shows: "if I ever shall carry on my work upon Language, and write upon Poetry, which ought to be the Subject of a fourth Volume, I will certainly make Homer my text, who, I think, is the Standard of all kinds of writing"
(2 October 1782; MP Box 22, fol. 7/87, p.[2]). Thus while it is Monboddo's treatment of Milton, Dryden and others which is of principal interest to the scholar of English, it is important, both in order to understand the classical basis of Monboddo's criticism and to gain some perspective on how Monboddo visualized the whole development of European literature from classical times to the present day, to bear in mind the scope and extent of his classical studies.

Monboddo on Homer

From the start, Monboddo's interest in Homer as a poet was intimately connected with his philological studies into the development of the Greek language. A major factor in opening Monboddo's eyes to the poetic qualities of Homer was Eustathius' commentary, notes from which Monboddo recorded in Volume 11 of the Bound Folio MSS and incorporated in various tracts on the Greek language in the same volume. The varieties of vocabulary and expression to which Eustathius draws

1 Ευσταθίου δραγοτριγλίκον θεσσαλων θεάντου παρεκβολον εις την Όμηρον Ηλιδα και Όδυσσείαν (1542-1550).
attention had a double significance for Monboddo: on the one hand, they served as linguistic data by which Monboddo could substantiate the claim, figuring prominently in *Origin and Progress*, that Greek was theoretically the most varied, systematic and mellifluous of languages; and on the other they fuelled Monboddo's admiration for the writer who made the finest use of these materials: Homer.

This dual response to Eustathius is reflected in the titles of the Volume 11 tracts: we find not only a philological "Of the Origin & Formation of the Greek Language . . ." (pp. 1-29), but also a tract entitled "Homerus Historicus" (pp. 48-80, 299-303) which first postulates a firm historical base for the *Iliad*, then examines the devices by which Homer arranges his historical material into a poetic whole. The MS dates from the 1760's, but contains annotations in the hand of Kirkpatrick Williamson, Monboddo's later scribe, as well as of Monboddo in his later years; the topic is evidently one in which Monboddo retained an interest, and indeed a note in Williamson's hand indicates that the essay is "To be Printed;" it never was. Homer's use of history is further discussed in a later tract, dating from the 1780's, contained in one of the Pocket Books and also, curiously, endorsed "To be printed" (PB 33, pp. 40-75). Monboddo here focusses on the foreshortening by which Homer imparts a unity to the events he describes, and the discussion is extended to cover the *Odyssey* as well as the *Iliad*. In
this notebook, too, Monboddo goes on to extend his discussion of Homer beyond the historical content of the poems to deal with the stylistic aspects covered more fully in the MSS intended for the *Origin and Progress* poetry volume, and which form the bulk of the Homeric tracts in the Monboddo Papers. Monboddo praises the grammatical integrity of Homer's Greek, asserting it to be a fully coherent predecessor of the various Greek dialects rather than being itself a "Babylonish Dialect" (Monboddo himself uses the phrase, PB 33, p. 56) compounded of regional and poetic usages. Homer's versification is also praised, and preferred to the modern. Finally, Monboddo sets Homer's works against their cultural background in a manner reminiscent of Blackwell and Wood, viewing them as the product of a sophisticated and knowledgeable civilization rather than isolated efflorescences of literary genius in a barbaric age. An earlier Pocket Book, 29, attributes the presence of superfluous particles in Homeric Greek to the poet's attention to euphony (PB 29, pp. 123-25, 7-8).

The subject of poetic unity arises again in Pocket Book 34, in a tract "Upon the Odyssey" endorsed "To be printed" (presumably in *Origin and Progress* VII), in which Monboddo compares the *Odyssey* with the *Iliad* and decides that the former not only unites a wider variety of incidents than the *Iliad*, but organizes them round a more morally pleasing centre: the excellence of Ulysses rather than the anger of Achilles (PB 34, pp. 117-67). The
discovery of Ulysses by his nurse, Monboddo says, was recommended by him to Joshua Reynolds as a suitable subject for a picture; "And if he had lived, he certainly would have executed it" (PB 34, p. 124; c.f. PB 33, pp. 70-71. This provides some background to the triumphant footnote in Origin and Progress IV that Monboddo is "glad that so eminent a painter as Sir John Reynolds has chosen it [i.e. the discovery of Ulysses] for the subject of a picture, which he is to paint for the Russian Prince Potemkin" (O&P IV, 404, n.).) Monboddo also notes the less adorned, less splendid style of the Odyssey, more suited to the personal Saga of Ulysses than to the lofty theme of the Iliad. This tract is, in fact, a reworking of an earlier, 1760's, item in the Monboddo Papers, MP 123, Observations upon the Odyssey, which makes the same basic points. Also dating from the 1760's is MP 124, an untitled comparison of the Odyssey and the Aeneid, to the advantage of the former, which attributes the superiority of Homer's poem to the too great magnitude of the Aeneid's plot, and to the over-ornate style to which Virgil resorts.

The most substantial MS on Homer, however, is that catalogued under MP 132 and MP 230, two MSS which are in fact part of the same tract. The basis of this MS is an item Observations on the Language of Homer (1777), which was later incorporated in Of the Language and Stile of Homer" (MP 230; continued in MP 132). This latter represents the maturity of Monboddo's thought on Homer,
as a passage in the Introduction makes clear: "As he has been my particular Study for many years, I have been collecting Observations upon his language and Stile, which I have now put into some order, and here give to the public for the benefit of the Young Greek Scholars to whom I think they may be usefull" (MP 230, Introduction, p. [x]). These items together constitute a detailed examination of Homer's diction, vocabulary and style which complements the discussions of the content and historical basis of his poems mentioned above. *Of the Language and Stile of Homer* is obviously intended, in the first instance, for Origin and Progress IV. Various references to Volume III, made as if referring internally, make this clear. However, Monboddo decided to devote Volume IV to a generalized account of Greek and other languages, rather than to a specific treatment of Homer; this he postponed to a later volume. The result is that he extracted from this MS such items as were of relevance to the comparison of ancient and modern languages which figures in *Origin and Progress* IV, and divested them of the poetic context in which this MS frames them. The residue of *Of the Language and Stile of Homer* was not, however, abandoned; instead, Monboddo continued to add to it, references to *Origin and Progress* III giving way to references to Volume IV, showing that additions were made after the publication of the latter. Monboddo's intention must have been to use the MS as the basis of his criticism of Homer in *Origin and Progress* VII; he also used portions
of Book 2, Ch. 2 in *Origin and Progress* VI, in a chapter on Homer's rhetorical qualities (Book 4, Ch. 1).

Chapter 1 of this principal MS compares Greek favourably with modern languages as a medium for communication; Chapter 2 applies the observations of Chapter 1 to prove that Homer's grammatical usages are regular and systematic rather than capricious poeticisms. Chapter 3 traces the varieties of Greek verbs to five duads of vowels, and is in fact a recapitulation of the "Dissertation on the formation of the Greek Language" in *Origin and Progress* II. Chapter 4 concentrates on Homer's nouns.

Book 2 of the MS, "Of the Stile of Homer," makes much of a distinction made by Monboddo between "figures of construction" and "figures of the sense or meaning," and in fact used by Monboddo in *Origin and Progress* III. Hence Ch. 1 of Book 2, after illustrating Homer's poetical manipulation of single words, comments on those figurative usages which may be construed as simply variations in expression, and Ch. 2 those which manifestly alter the content of what is said. The latter of these in particular has a wide denotation for Monboddo, taking in his expatiations on Homer's dialogue, characters, similes and metaphors. Here, too, Monboddo's conviction that Eurycleea's discovery of Ulysses would make a fine picture enters; no mention is made of his entreaties to Reynolds, but we are told instead that Monboddo has a sketch of the scene "by a Painter of a great deal of
Genius, tho' not very well known" (MP 132, p. 161).

Chapter 3 makes the astute observation that Homer's style, which some commentators have been misled into describing as ornate, due to its dissimilarity to Attic Greek, is in fact simple and unadorned. He also defends the often lengthy repetitions of identical sentences in the poems, on the grounds that they add to the probability of the narrative.

Chapter 4 (misnumbered 3 in the MS) again compares Homer's style with Virgil's, charging the latter poet with writing in an over-elaborate, less exact style than Homer which testifies to the degeneracy of mankind since Grecian times. The MS closes with a comparison of Homer's style with that of the Old Testament, finding in them a similar attention to dialogue and to circumstantial narrative. Monboddo points out the occurrence in both of substantial repetitions, and "a pathos given to the Story which no plain Narrative could give it" (MP 132, p. 224). A concluding note directs the reader to a continuation of the topic in PB 20, which is lost.

With this MS are to be considered MP 229, 231 and 233, which, although distinct from Of the Language and Stile of Homer, treat of the same general topic, and may have been intended to be integrated into it for publication in Origin and Progress VII.

MP 229, Of the Language of Homer, is dated by a reference to "the 3d & 4th Volumes of the Origine of Language" (p. [1]) to the post 1787 period. It proposes
the same schema for analysing Homer's language - single words, their grammatical permutations, and their combination and arrangement - as is followed in Of the Language and Stile of Homer, and adheres to this to give a condensed version of MP 132 and 230, before inexplicably tailing off in yet another account of the beauties of spoken Greek, and the changes to be made in British education in order to foster a renewed attention to the study of rhetoric and elocution.

MP 231, though brief, also sheds light on Monboddo's authorial practice. Its four pages form an Introduction to a Dissertation on the Stile of Homer, dated 1787. A cancelled chapter heading suggests that the MS was planned for Origin and Progress. "In this Dissertation," says Monboddo, "I propose to collect and digest Observations upon the Stile of Homer which I have had lying by me for several years in loose detached papers. It is for this purpose chiefly as I have said elsewhere, that I print in order that what I have written and think worth preserving may not be lost even to myself" (MP 231, pp.[2]-3).

The place of this MS in Origin and Progress is vouchsafed by a reference to Origin and Progress as "that Work," later amended to "this Work" (p. 4). As to the writings this MS is intended to accompany, however, only conjectures may be made. MP 231 might be a rewritten introduction to MP 230; it might herald a separate rewritten version of MP 230 which has not survived. At any rate, MP 233, Of the Copiousness and Variety of the Language
of Homer, endorsed "(To be added to the discourse upon the Stile of Homer)" (p. 1), is intended to complement it. The usual contention as to the integrity of Homer's Greek is evident, but is accompanied here by a conjectural account of the origin of Greek in the language of Egypt and in Sanscrit. (These ideas Monboddo later channelled into *Antient Metaphysics* IV, published in 1795.)

Enough will have been said to illustrate how Monboddo's interest in Homer developed from a specific concern with Homer as the paradigm of Greek linguistic excellence, to a wider-ranging attention to Homer as a poet. The very fact that Monboddo, in a separately-written introduction to MP 230, alters the title from *Of the Language of Homer* to *Of the Language and Stile of Homer* bears this out. Once the more strictly linguistic aspects of Homer had been allotted to *Origin and Progress* IV, the way was clear for Monboddo to treat the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* not as mere depositories of Greek linguistic varieties, but as poetic artefacts to be examined with respect not just to the grammatical sophistication of the language, but also to the poet's conscious manipulation of the resources at his command, and his success, viewed in Aristotelian terms, in combining the incidents he depicts into an organic entity. Monboddo is notable for combining the linguistic abilities of the textual scholar with the broader outlook of those writers, such as Blackwell and Wood, whose interest in Homeric epic took the form of an
(often conjectural) estimate of the social, political and personal factors entering into the nature of its composition.

It will be evident to anyone scanning the Monboddo Papers that no poet other than Homer receives anything like a comparable amount of space or attention. It is no exaggeration to say that, for Monboddo, poetry was Homer. It is important to bear this in mind in considering the exposition of Monboddo's modern criticism which follows; Monboddo's views on Milton or Shakespeare may be interesting to the English scholar, but were seen by Monboddo as mere addenda to those on Homer, the main subject in the work on poetry. Even the rest of classical literature takes a decidedly secondary place, although Monboddo admittedly turns his attention to Greek tragedy in MP 307, and confides in a letter that his reading extends to Euripides and Sophocles (Monboddo to Welbore Ellis, 28 June 1783; MP Box 22, fol. 8/97, pp. 2-3). And there is noteworthy material in MP 158, Of the Poetry of Plato, in which Monboddo shows, and claims, originality in examining the Platonic dialogues in terms of their poetic features rather than their philosophical theses. The Euthydemus in particular is praised for its poetic features in MP 38, Of the Dialectic of Plato, pp. 13-14.

Latin literature, although held to be much superior to modern, suffers badly in comparison with Greek; the linguistic premises on which this view is based are those of Origin and Progress IV. In consequence, Virgil only
merits mention in the Monboddo Papers either as a foil to Homer's superior gifts, or when a Virgilian passage is cited to demonstrate that a mere modern has at least sought to imitate a Latin. The kindest compliment Monboddo can pay Virgil is to praise his manipulation of the caesural pause.

Horace's Satires and Epistles Monboddo believes to be not true poetry, and would prefer them in prose; an ungracious verdict, considering the widespread use Monboddo makes of Horace's Ars Poetica in formulating his own theory of poetry, and his frequent employment of Horatian quotation. An over-zealous application of Aristotelian poetics causes him to reject those which have no identifiable "plot." The Odes draw some approval.

There are references to other classical poets, such as Lucretius, but these are of little substance. Not only is modern literature subservient to classical, but all classical authors are subservient to Homer.

Monboddo on the Middle Ages

Monboddo sees the history of the period from the demise of Augustan Rome to the Renaissance as an unmitigated record of abandoned classical standards and Gothic barbarity. His favourite text to demonstrate this is the Chiliades of Tzetzes, which show the process by which classical quantitative metre came to be replaced by modern accentual metre. Monboddo's constructive criticism of the literature of the period is almost non-existent;
the sole reference to Chaucer, for instance, that I can find in the Monboddo Papers is a remark that if it were not for the steadying role played by the Authorized Version and "debates in publick Assemblies," "the Language of the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth & James, wou'd have been now as much a dead Language, only understood by learned Antiquarians, as the Language of Chaucer is" (MP 150, p. 4). In his low estimate of the period Monboddo is not deviating from the standard view of his age; although, if anything, he is old-fashioned in putting forward a caricature of medieval literature which is in essence a legacy from the seventeenth century, at a time when more historically-minded critics were coming to appreciate the brilliance discernible in the Dark Ages.

Monboddo on Modern English Poetry

(a) The Transition to Modern Poetry

The twentieth century reader most probably tends to regard the Elizabethan and Jacobean age as the finest hour of English literature, if only for the presence of Shakespeare. Not so Monboddo, who viewed this era rather as a preparatory phase in which poets had to cast off the shackles of the medieval age's sole and contemptible contribution to poetic technique: rhyme, sustained throughout a poem, and not used as an occasional device.

Some attempt is made to explain away English rhymed verse by setting it in its historical perspective. Spenser, for instance, is seen as a poet of undoubted
talents who adopted rhyme because of its ascendancy in Italy, the arbiter of literary fashion at the time. A good deal of head-shaking is indulged in by Monboddo, who laments the extraordinary pains to which the elaborate scheme of the Spenserian stanza puts the writer, just as he deplores the prevalence of rhyme in Milton's early verse (MP 232, pp. 39-42; MP 241, pp. 29-30; see, too, O&P,II 399-400). At the same time, Monboddo applauds Spenser's addition of an Alexandrine line, the advantages of which he also appreciated in Thomson's Castle of Indolence.

Monboddo sees the blank verse poets of the time as having done no more than accomplish the groundwork which Milton was to improve upon, and as having produced much clumsy and crude verse in the process. Monboddo's acquaintance with the period was mostly gained at second hand from Thomas Warton's History of English Poetry (1774-81), from which he took his examples of the heavily-rhymed verse popular in the Tudor era, and the first early attempts to counter it. Reference is made in MP 232 to verses, quoted in Warton's History, by More and by Thomas Tusser which contain rhymes at each half-line as well as at the conclusion of each verse; they are cited simply as lamentable curiosities of versification (MP 232, p. 40,n.).

Monboddo also found in Warton's pages a diatribe against the barbarity of rhyme, written by Roger Ascham, a scholar for whom Monboddo had previously voiced his
admiration for having instilled in the royal family, through his role as preceptor to Elizabeth, a love of classical learning which Monboddo himself found much harder to impart to his own contemporaries (MP 232, p. 50; O&P, III, 389-91). Passing from theorist to practitioner, we find Monboddo also praising Surrey's blank-verse Aeneid translations, which he also learned of from Warton.

Among other poets of this period, Shakespeare, Jonson and Massinger are lumped together as dabblers in "Prosaic Verse" (MP 232, p. 18) who never quite achieved a proper grasp of the principles of blank verse. However, Monboddo does look beyond Shakespeare's versification to a consideration of his formal and emotional qualities, and in so doing displays a combination of neoclassical and sentimental literary values which warrants a closer inspection.

Shakespeare

Two quotations will serve to indicate the poles between which Monboddo's verdicts on Shakespeare oscillate:

And I must think it very unfortunate for the English Taste of Poetry that Shakespear has been set up as a Standard (Monboddo to James Harris, 28 September 1769; MP Box 22, fol. 2/12, p. 6).

I am Sorry if what I have Said of the Nature of Poetry should Seem to Detract any thing from the Reputation of our Admired Shakespear. (MP 159, p. 12)
It is in Monboddo's Shakespeare criticism that we see most clearly the clash between the blind Aristotelianism of which he was at times capable, and the love of the sublime which was more typical of Monboddo's age and by which he too was capable of being affected. MP 159, Illustratns. of Aristotle's Analyticks, purporting to establish a valid code of critical principles derived from Aristotle, makes much of Aristotle's demand that the incidents depicted in poetry must be invented rather than historical. A strict adherence to the demand that the poet is an inventor of incidents, Monboddo realizes, implies a radical revaluation of the contemporary poetical hierarchy: "some [poets] it degrades to a very low Rank who are now very high in Poetick Fame" (MP 159,p. 12).

Among those demoted to the ranks are "Historicall Play Writers," a category into which Shakespeare is forced in the most arid neoclassical vein: "I can never allow that his Historicall Plays deserve the Name of Tragedies, & yet almost all his Tragedies are of that kind. As he had neither study'd the Rules of Art nor form'd himself upon good Modells, he imagin'd that to write a Play was no more than to put a piece of History into Dialogue & his Misfortune was that he not only copied in this manner Pieces of reall History but Fictitious Tales more improbable & Absurd than any History ever was" (p. 12). Monboddo's classical armoury is brought into play: he feels sure that Herodotus' histories, interspersed with dialogue, were in this respect "better Dramaticall Pieces
than many of Shakespear's" (p. 13).

Monboddo enlarges on the factual, historical basis of Shakespeare's tragedies in the letter to James Harris from which my initial quotation is taken. The lack of a fable in Shakespeare's tragedies, declares Monboddo, relegates them to the category of \( \eta \theta \epsilon \alpha \tau \omega \alpha \rho \alpha \), the loosely-constructed Greek pageants, from which they are differentiated only by the fact that Shakespeare "attempts a Fable but does not succeed" (MP Box 22, fol. 2/12, p. 5). Whenever Monboddo unearths an artistic fault in Shakespeare, he attributes it to the poet's lack of learning, which usually turns out to be identical with a failure to observe the principles which the neoclassical age drew from, or rather read into, Aristotle's Poetics: "If Shakespear had formed himself, as I have said all young Poets ought to do, upon the Study of Aristotles Rules & had joined the Practice of the great Antient Masters, from which those Rules were drawn, we should have seen him at least aim at what is most perfect in Tragedy namely a Discovery" (p. 6).

Monboddo does, however, attribute to Shakespeare's role as natural poet par excellence his skill in the imitation of characters. In this respect, if in no other, Monboddo is ready to admit that Shakespeare is "inferior to none antient or modern" (MP 159, p. 22). Monboddo quite shrewdly points to the affinities between the playwright's skill at giving convincing dramatic life to his characters, and the craft of dramatic performance itself:
"this Faculty depends less upon Art & Learning & more
upon Naturall Genius than any other Talent of a Poet
being of a kin to the Player's Talent For as a Player
must Assume the Character So much as to become in Some
Sort the very Person whom he represents, before he can
properly Act the Part, So in like manner must a Poet
doe in writing the Part. Now this Faculty of assuming
Characters & as it were Metamorphosing one's Self, is
I think a Gift of Nature that can be but little Assisted
by Art or Learning, being truly a Species of Mimickry
but of the higher kind" (p. 22). Whereas other less
hide-bound critics could excuse, and even condone,
Shakespeare's disregard for classical precedent by dubbing
him a poet of nature rather than art, Monboddo's insist-
ence on a poet's adherence to a classical literary regime
regularly leads him to view Shakespeare's "natural"
qualities as unpardonable flaws, not as the products of
social and psychological factors which must be borne in
mind in reaching a considered verdict on his art.

From a censure of Shakespeare's fables, Monboddo
passes to an aspect of the plays which he deems still
less excusable: "I forbear to mention his monstrous
Mixtures of Tragedy & Comedy or rather Farce in the same
Piece" (MP 159, p. 13); any dissenting voice talking
nonsense about exhibiting the real state of sublunary
nature would receive short shrift from Monboddo, who
believed that "This too was the Vice of his Times which
he had not learning to correct" (p. 13). A footnote in
Origin and Progress III indicates that Monboddo's much-vaunted love of variety in art does not extend to a variety of comic and tragic in the same work. "The taste of all barbarous nations," he asserts, "delights much more in variety than in simplicity and uniformity" (O&P, III, 194, n.). Monboddo instances the asymmetry of Gothic architecture to demonstrate the barbarous taste of a non-classical age; a barbarity from which Monboddo believes literature in general, and Shakespeare in particular, caught the taint. "Before Shakespeare's time, there was a tragedy called Cambyses, which bore in its title to be a most lamentable tragedy, full of excellent mirth; and in Shakespeare's own tragedies, there is not wanting mirth sufficient, but not always excellent, whether it were his own taste, or only compliance with the barbarous taste of his time" (O&P, III, 194, n.).

This is the neoclassical side of the coin; but Monboddo betrays a greater sympathy with Shakespeare's art than his avowed principles strictly warrant. "I am Sorry," he adds, "if what I have Said of the Nature of Poetry should Seem to Detract any thing from the Reputation of our Admired Shakespear. Him I mention particularly as an Author who I think was possessed of a true Poeticall Genius, which is more than I can Say of Some other much celebrated Poets among us" (MP 159, p. 12).

The discrepancy between this commendatory afterthought and the critique of Shakespeare into which it is inserted is too apparent to require further comment. But we can
imagine that Monboddo as a keen playgoer would have responded to the personages of Shakespeare’s plays regardless of whether they acted in theoretically defensible works. His absurd verdict that *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is Shakespeare’s best work can thus be seen as Monboddo’s attempt to praise his author in the only way his ostensible principles permit: by selecting a play which is a success, albeit a limited one, in neoclassical terms, rather than by admitting that a completely reconsidered basis of criticism is required: "But before I quitt the Subject I must do Justice to so great a Genius by Observing that even in Point of Invention he was not deficient as appears from some of his Comedys particularly the Merry Wives of Windsor" (p. 13).

Similar remarks enter into MP 232, the MS intended for an *Origin and Progress* IV on poetry. Monboddo voices his awareness of the affective strengths of Shakespearian composition, mentioning the "many Splendid Patches, or purple Clouts" (MP 232, p. 14) to be found, but maintaining that these isolated segments fail to cohere in a unified work. The same point is made in MP 307, where Monboddo remarks that the unity which Aristotle stipulates in speaking of tragedy as the representation of one single action has been "much neglected by our modern Tragic writers, particularly Shakespear" (MP 307, p. 257).

As in MP 159, Monboddo is most insistent in MP 232 that drama should be not only unified, but consistent in
being either purely tragic or purely comic. Hence it is that *The Merry Wives of Windsor* receives such high praise, being not only suitably based round a fable "entirely of the Author's Invention" (p. 15), but also a show-case for the comic aspects of Falstaff's character, without the intrusion of political gravity and the crushing discomfiture of Falstaff which turn *Henry IV* into "that most absurd & ridiculous Composition called a Tragi-comedy" (MP 232, p. 15). But although strict neoclassicism demands that *Henry IV* be derided as "So Strange a Jumble of the grave & ridiculous" (p. 15), here as elsewhere the unconstrained enthusiasm of response which shines through Monboddo's more hide-bound critical verdicts is to the fore: concentrating on Falstaff, Monboddo praises the devices by which his character is revealed, such as the knight's reaction to the Gadshill robbery. We cannot tell whether Monboddo's special interest in Falstaff is at all attributable to Morgann's *Essay on the Dramatic Character of Sir John Falstaff*, published in 1777; Monboddo certainly does not mention the work, and allies himself rather with Mulgrave's view in his *Essay upon Poetry* (1682), albeit slightly misquoted, that "Falstaff Stands inimitable yet" (p. 15). The plays in which Falstaff appears are to Monboddo auguries that Shakespeare was indeed possessed of dramatic skills, which only the lack of methodical education barred him from employing to full advantage (p. 16).

Another feature of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* which
appealed to Monboddo was Pistol's use of bombast; one would expect that, in the light of his frequent praise of the simplicity of Homer's style, Monboddo would approve of Shakespeare's debunking of such pretentious language; as Monboddo says, "It is a good description that Sir John Falstaff gives of the plain and natural style, when he desires Pistol to speak like a man of this world" (O&P, III, 417, n.). Monboddo's approval was apparently accompanied by some awareness of the simplicity of Shakespeare's style in other places; an index to the missing MP 147 indicates that Monboddo considered Shakespeare as a model of the simple style in English.

Monboddo finds Shakespeare deficient on prosodic grounds as well as formal. Monboddo's ear, attuned to the ponderous cadence of Miltonic blank verse, found a lack of art in Shakespeare's practice of dispensing with, on occasion, "an Emphatical word at the end of the Line" (MP 241, p. 18(1)) when extending a sentence beyond the end of a line. Monboddo believes this fault to "confound the Sense, or destroy the Harmony of the Verse" (MP 232, p. 59; see also MP 237, p. 22 and O&P, V, 469). Not only does Monboddo hold that Shakespeare cannot produce satisfactorily the run-on lines at which Milton excels, but he also maintains that most of the time he does not even try, but "commonly terminates the sense with the verse" (O&P, IV, 242, n.; see also O&P, V, 469). Monboddo is often perceptive in bestowing his critical approval; but when
he feels constrained to prove his rules by citing the bad example of authors who transgress them, he is often led into the direst extremities of error. To aver, as Monboddo does here, that Shakespeare's blank verse is well nigh as end-stopped as the English rhyming verse which Monboddo believes is "composed all of sentences consisting each of ten syllables" (O&P, IV, 242, n.) is to be as wrong-headed as any critic possibly could.

Monboddo is generally distrustful of non-Miltonic blank verse, declaring of Shakespeare and Jonson "whatever praise we may bestow upon those Authors as Poets I think much cannot be said in praise of their Versification" (MP 232, p. 51). A brief historical survey of English verse in "Of the Origin & Formation of the Greek Language," in Volume 11 of the bound MSS, awards Shakespeare no more than a historical importance in the evolution of English poetry: "The Composition in Blank Verse in Britain was no earlier than the days of Queen Elizabeth, when it was begun by Shaltespear in his Tragedies. But it was reserved to Milton to bring it to any degree of perfection" (BF MSS, 11, 326-27). Two Gentlemen of Verona, in fact, is criticized merely for employing verse, or, as Monboddo disparagingly terms it, "a kind of Prosaic Verse" (MP 232, p. 18). Monboddo dislikes such works, on the basis that "Prose is the naturall Language of Men in common Life" (p. 18); verse, Monboddo would hold, is a pretentious vehicle for discourse unless the gravity of the sentiments calls for an abnormally elevated style: only in moments of
emotional intensity do men produce "poetic" utterances of the type littering *Fingal*, for instance; and such versified emotion carries the stamp rather of the tragic than of the comic.

Even when the heightened language of verse occurs in what Monboddo holds to be appropriate circumstances, during scenes of tragic intensity, he prefers the regularity of a character's diction to be dissipated by force of feeling, rather than retain an orthodox iambic pentameter form. Monboddo approves of, for example, Lear's broken verse on discovering Cordelia (*King Lear* IV. vii); once again his verdict supposes a similarity with Greek practice, since Shakespeare has here produced a "monody" as "the antient tragic poets were in use to do" (*O&P*, II, 389, n.).

In general, then, Monboddo cannot approve of Shakespeare's style as he does Milton's. Shakespeare's sublimity is unchecked by the methodical prosodic control which informs Milton's verse, and marred by a crudeness of technique which he shares with others writing at a time when the base metal of native English poetry had not been tempered by subjection to the refining influence of Greece and Rome. Such is the party line followed by Monboddo; but his natural response to Shakespearian characters, and his frequent recourse to Shakespearian quotation, point to Monboddo's appreciation of qualities in Shakespeare's art which remain undiminished despite the poet's flouting of classical authority. Monboddo
assimilated Shakespeare to the extent that he is seldom lost for an appropriate Shakespearian quotation to adorn even his scientific writings. It is true that the resulting words are often seriously transformed from the original: Macbeth's description of sleep as "Balme of hurt Mindes, great Natures second Course,/Chiefe nourisher in Life's Feast" (Macbeth II. ii. 35 - 36) is mated with Sonnet 39 of Astrophil and Stella, emerging finally as "Sleep. The Balm of Woe. Chief nourisher in Life's feast. Tired Nature's & c. as Shakespear calls it" (MP 268, p. 39). Approximations like this show that Monboddo was in fact well acquainted with Shakespeare, and was relying on memory rather than merely consulting a text to provide a suitable quotation.

Monboddo does not devote a comparable amount of attention to other dramatists of the Shakespearian era. Jonson shares the criticism levelled against Shakespeare for not ending each verse with a suitably emphatic word (MP 232, pp. 51, 59); and Massinger is pronounced particularly guilty for concluding a line with the word "of" (MP 232, p. 59(1)). In this last judgment it again becomes clear that Monboddo faults English for not being Greek or Latin; "of" is an unsuitable concluding word because it is "no more than a mark of the Genitive Case," and would therefore be absent in a passage of classical verse.
(b) **The Golden Age: Milton, Dryden, Shaftesbury**

The Restoration is the age in which Monboddo found the happiest compromise between the reality of an English-speaking Britain and the ideal of a literature classical in both spirit and language.

**Milton**

Monboddo's many comments on Milton's poetry (and, as I shall note later, his prose) are representative of an era when, for the first time, Milton's work can truly be said to have been studied with a view to assessing its poetic qualities rather than isolating for disparagement the author's politics or supposed plagiarism. Just as the contentions which fired the tracts of the 1640's are, by the mid-eighteenth century, safely assigned to a previous century, so that the way lies open to examine Milton's style with respect to its rhetorical effectiveness rather than the justness of its sentiments, so too the representative eighteenth-century critic can afford to inspect *Paradise Lost* for traces of the ubiquitous sublimity, rather than entertain doubts concerning the validity of Milton's religious tenets. The accusations of plagiarism levelled against Milton by Lauder had, by mid-century, run their course amid the usual welter of attack and counter-attack, and been exposed as not only unfounded but also irrelevant. These peripheral issues associated with Milton's art having largely worked themselves out in due course, the
tendency was for critics' attention to be devoted now to those features of Milton's works which Monboddo's classical training best equipped him to comment on: the language and versification.

This is not to say, of course, that it was in any way innovatory at the time when Monboddo was writing to discuss the advisability (or otherwise) of Milton's stylistic devices. Patrick Hume's annotations to *Paradise Lost*, included in Tonson's edition of the poems (1695), set up a high standard of exegetic commentary which, in addition to the citation of parallel Biblical and literary passages, noted the peculiarities of Miltonic prosody, diction and figurative language. This standard was maintained in Newton's variorum edition of 1749-52; and by the time of Todd's edition of 1801 Monboddo's own comments on Milton have been deemed worth of inclusion. Much of Monboddo's Milton criticism is to be seen as a supplement to such editions, although his debt to previous editors is not slavish; indeed, it is difficult to tell which edition of *Paradise Lost* Monboddo himself used. This difficulty does not occur with respect to other parts of the Milton canon: Monboddo himself indicates that a reference to one of the minor poems is to a 1772 Glasgow edition, and states in *Origin and Progress V* that he used Toland's 1698 edition of the prose; apparently Monboddo was not acquainted with Birch's 1738 edition.

Apart from specific remarks contained in these
editions, the criticism which set the tone for all
eighteenth-century Milton criticism was, of course,
Addison's Spectator papers of 1712, which worked system-
atically through each aspect of Paradise Lost and brought
to the forefront the poet's sublimity as being the
feature which, above all, was to be praised by any sub-
sequent critics of sensibility. But it should be noted
that only one of Addison's papers is concerned solely
with Milton's language; and that one scanty paragraph of
that paper is devoted to prosodic detail. Not that this
is to be taken as implying any censure of Addison, whose
journalist's awareness probably inculcated in him the
same instinctive suspicion of ponderous prosodic material
as was later evinced by Johnson in his Rambler articles
on Milton's versification. So although Addison's papers
helped to create an audience for Milton's poetry, it was
only gradually that the more technical aspects of Milton's
art came to be analyzed; as I have indicated, it was only
after the dust raised by Lauder had settled that the time
was deemed ripe for critics to apply themselves to an
examination of Milton's poetics. Initially this took the
eccentric form of the textual atrocities perpetrated by
Bentley in the 1732 "emendations" to Paradise Lost; but,
as John T. Shawcross shows clearly¹, the reaction against
Bentley's demand that Paradise Lost be constricted into
the smooth rhythmic mould of Denham had the positive

¹ Milton 1732-1801: The Critical Heritage (London:
of Milton scholarship in the age of Monboddo I am
indebted to Shawcross's marshalling of the source
materials.
effect of turning scholars' attention to a justification of the Miltonic œuvre as it stands, rather than a rewriting of it in terms of Augustan neoclassical conservatism. This growth in close linguistic criticism is part of the broader tendency alluded to in Chapter 3 (p. 137 above): the increasing sensitivity among poetic theorists and practitioners to verse as an elocutionary performance, to which the choice, distribution and sound of words all contribute. Attention hence comes to be focussed on how a poet achieves his auditory and rhythmic effects. Although part of Monboddo's Milton criticism is devoted to an Addisonian criticism of characterization, allusion, etc., most of his remarks fall into this newer category of linguistic criticism. The critical background against which Monboddo was writing can be usefully examined under the heads of versification, figurative language and diction.

From the outset, a favourite issue in Milton criticism had been whether Milton's resorting to blank verse in his masterpiece was to be applauded or censured. The opposing schools of thought championed by Dennis on the one hand, who applauds Milton's having written a sublime style without resorting to rhyme,¹ and Dryden on the other, who neglects Milton's own impassioned attack on

¹ Preface to The Passion of Byblis (1692); Hooker, I, 3-4.
rhyming verse in favour of the simpler theory that he had no talent for it, exist side by side throughout the eighteenth century. On the whole, though, critics tend to favour the varieties of Milton's verse rather than to find fault with its lack of discipline. An early representative of those in favour of Miltonic blank verse is Samuel Say, who in the "Remarks on the Numbers in the Argument to PARADISE LOST Written in the Year 1737" brings to our notice the manner in which Milton rings the changes in the metre of the opening lines of Paradise Lost; discussing, incidentally, the passage which came to be the standard choice of those who sought to demonstrate Milton's metrical variety. William Benson, in Letters Concerning Poetical Translations, and Virgil's and Milton's Arts of Verse (1739) mentions, in Letter V, dated 11 October 1736, such matters as the pauses interspersed at varying points in the lines of Paradise Lost, and Milton's departures from the orthodox iambic pentameter (Letters, pp. 39-59). James Harris, in "A Discourse on Music, Painting and Poetry," Three Treatises (1744), is among those mentioned above who allude to themetrical beauties of Paradise Lost I (Works, I, 54, n.); and, in the light of Monboddo's long-maintained friendship with Harris, it is probable that it was Harris who first turned Monboddo's

1 Discourse concerning the Original and Progress of Satire (1693); Swedenborg, IV, 15.

2 in Poems on Several Occasions (1745); rpt. in Shawcross (2), p. 24.
eyes towards this aspect of Milton's style. We know, at any rate, that Monboddo had read this Discourse, and cites it on occasion. A further similarity between Harris's and Monboddo's methods is discernible: just as Harris proves the existence of "a Charm in Poetry, arising from its Numbers only" by choosing a passage devoid of any other ornamentation yet nevertheless pleasing, so too we later find Monboddo parading passages of *Paradise Lost* which display beauty without ostentation (*O&P, II*, 558-565). In similar fashion, John Mason, with whose metrical essays we have seen Monboddo to be familiar, dissects *Paradise Lost* I.1-16 in his search for metrical unorthodoxies, not all of which he can sanction (*An Essay on the Power of Numbers*, pp. 53-58). The same lines furnish a text for Newton (*Paradise Lost* (1749), I, 3-5; reprinted in Shawcross (2), pp. 153-54). Drawing closer to Monboddo's own time, we find Kanes, in the *Elements of Criticism* (1762), presenting the same caricature of rhymed couplet verse as Monboddo himself, and praising Milton's avoidance of its pitfalls (*Elements*, II, 435-445). Gray sounds a fresh note by discussing Milton's prosodic licence in *L'Allegro* rather than in the *Paradise Lost* ("Observations on English Metre" (1760-61), *Works*, ed. Gosse, I, 332-33). By the time Blair's *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* (1783) are published, it is in praise of Milton, and not, as would have been the case fifty years earlier, in criticism, that Blair describes Milton's blank verse as "varied in its cadence, and
intermixed with discords" (Lectures, II, 475). Against this almost universal praise of Milton's blank verse, Johnson stands out as the only figure of stature to have stopped short of unqualified praise. His retort to an over-profuse praise of blank verse, that there is no "irregularity of numbers which credulous admiration cannot discover to be eminently beautiful"¹ seems at first sight churlish but is a timely check on unguarded eulogy. Monboddo, in his later years, lost no opportunity to cross critical swords with Dr. Johnson, as Origin and Progress V shows; and in this respect any word written by Monboddo in praise of Milton can be seen also as a point scored against his adversary.

Closely allied to Milton's variety of metre and pause, in the eyes of his eighteenth-century admirers, is the trait mentioned briefly by Addison as "the running of his Verses into one another" (Spectator No. 285; ed. Bond, III, 15). Kames, too, observes of blank verse that "there is access to make every line run into another" (Elements, II, 438). Johnson, like Monboddo, realized the rhetorical flavour which Milton imparted to Paradise Lost by the variety of his pauses, which "changes the measures of an English poet to the periods of a declamer" ("Milton," Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets (1781), I, 266); to Monboddo this was a point in the poet's favour, to Johnson a dangerous dereliction of poetic duties.

¹ Rambler No. 94; Works, Yale ed., IV, 139.
This capacity of blank verse to be extended beyond its line-divisions furnishes the poet with the opportunity to use a wealth of devices not sanctioned by the narrow compass of rhymed verse; as Kames observes, "the couplets of rhyme confine inversion within narrow limits," whereas "the loftiness of [Milton's] style arises chiefly from inversion" (Elements, II, 439). So it is that observations on Milton's versification lead naturally to a study of his figurative language, with a view to demonstrating the manner in which he indulged the licence granted by casting off the constrictions of rhyme. Addison has some comment to make on Milton's use of, for example, inversion and alliteration. ¹ Francis Peck outdoes Benson in his assessment of Milton's style prefixed to some very suspect "Miltoniana," ² and Hard makes brief mention of Milton's careful positioning of his words to maintain a tragic solemnity of tone ("Notes on the Art of Poetry" (1749), Works (1811), I, 73-74).

Nor was it only in the arrangement of words that Milton exhibited his stylistic peculiarities; in fact, the most obvious feature latched onto by collectors of Miltonisms is his choice or coining of single words. Dryden notes that "his antiquated words were his choice,

¹ Spectator Nos. 285, 297; ed. Bond, III, 13, 63.

² "An Examination of Milton's Stile," New Memoirs of the Life and Poetical Works of Mr. John Milton (1740); rpt. in Shawcross (2), pp. 111-17.

As well as the note on Milton's positioning of words mentioned above, Hurd points to their derivation as a source of the poet's "stateliness and reserve" (*Works*, I, 73). In 1724, Leonard Welsted strikes a discordant note in alluding to Milton's "second Babel, or Confusion of all Languages,"

anticipated Johnson's condemnation of Milton's "Babylonish Dialect" (*Lives*, I, 264). Peck, in the work mentioned above, excels himself in listing every operation performed by Milton on single words; whether lengthened, elided or simply invented, Peck has noted and categorized it.

The affinities between Monboddo's painstaking inventory of Miltonic classicisms and Peck's work are obvious; but there is no evidence to show how far Monboddo was aware of his contemporaries in the field. Certainly his examples seem to be his own; and he presents exegeses which found favour with no other commentator (consider, for instance, Monboddo's proposal for construing *Paradise Lost* III, 344-97, in *Origin and Progress* III, 94-96).

The result is that, by 1801, when Henry John Todd's edition of the poetical works appeared, Monboddo is established

---

1 "A Dissertation concerning the Perfection of the English Language, the State of Poetry, etc.", *Epistles, Odes*, & c. (1724), ix; rpt. in Shawcross (1), p. 244.
as a critic of Milton in his own right; copious quotations appear not only from the printed volumes but from certain unpublished communications between Monboddo and Todd of which there is no trace remaining in the Monboddo Papers. Quoting from "some observations with which he was long since pleased to honour me," Todd displays sentiments concerning the minor poems which, as will become clear, are substantially those which Monboddo had designed for the work on poetry, praising the variety of long and short verses, noting the widely dispersed rhymes and interplay of iambic and trochaic, and allying these poems with Dryden's St. Cecilia ode. Todd also reprints Monboddo's comments on Comus from Antient Metaphysics (III, xlii-xliii, n.).

It is interesting to note that, before this, Monboddo had earned a place in Thomas Warton's renowned 1785 edition of the minor poems. It is difficult to gauge Warton's attitude to Monboddo; from the stock of Monboddo's published comments on the minor poems Warton seems to have selected passages which imply that although Monboddo is now known as a Milton critic he has still retained a large measure of the crankiness often associated with him. After quoting a lengthy passage from Monboddo on the correct way to read a parenthesis in Comus (see O&P, III, 75-76), Warton dismisses Monboddo's suggestions with "This is very specious and ingenious reasoning. But

some perhaps may think this beauty quite accidental and undesigned.\(^1\) The spectral figure of Monboddo the critic is evoked simply to be knocked down again. A later note mentions the view of "The learned Lord Monboddo" that the elegy "Ad Carolum Deodatum" is equal to any elegy of Ovid or Tibullus (p. 431 n.); this seems to be inserted simply as a gibe at Monboddo's well-known classical bias. And a third reference again makes capital out of Monboddo's habit of individuality in literary preferences: "Lord Monboddo is the only modern critic of note, who ranks Milton as a prose-writer with Hooker, Sprat, and Clarendon" (p. 573). But Warton's chaffing is good-natured, and he is far from denying the justness of Monboddo's observations; he is simply aware of the antique quaintness hovering about them.

There is, then, a substantial body of eighteenth-century Milton criticism which pays close attention to the diction, rhetoric and versification of Milton's poetry. Only recently, however, in Shawcross's anthology mentioned above, has due credit been paid to Monboddo as a critic of Milton's style. The comments on Milton dispersed throughout Origin and Progress, when brought together within the covers of Shawcross's volume, compare favourably with the work of any other contemporary Milton critic - including Addison and Johnson. It is impossible to tell how far Monboddo's pronouncements

\(^1\) Thomas Warton, ed., Poems upon Several Occasions, 2nd ed. (1791) p. 186, n.
on Milton are shaped by a close reading, or even an awareness, of this body of thought; one of the very few signs that Monboddo was at all acquainted with such criticism occurs in MP 154, an early draft of Monboddo's prosodic theories: "Thus the Criticks have observed, that in Milton's Proemium of his Paradise Lost, there is a most beautiful variety of those stops" (p. 28).

The Monboddo Papers complement this Origin and Progress Milton criticism, by elaborating on the opinions contained therein and by providing comment on many matters not extensively dealt with by Monboddo in his printed works.

The source of Monboddo's admiration for Milton can perhaps be demonstrated most economically by reference to the following: "Milton, both in his prose and verse, has formed a stile, which I call the English Attick" (O&P, V, 245). In other words, Milton is praised by Monboddo for his allegiance to, and emulation of, the classical literary models which Monboddo held so dear. The Latinate diction and syntax; the expansive sweep of the periods of Paradise Lost; in short, all the departures from poetic precedent about which critics tended to have reservations: these constituted for Monboddo the lifeblood of Milton's art. Far from being a stumbling-block which had to be excused or attributed to the rampant sublimity of Milton's thought, these devices were looked upon by Monboddo as a praiseworthy attempt to approximate in English the stateliness of the learned
tongues. Milton is seen as a link connecting the present-day reader with the finest classical style, bridging the intervening abyss brought about by successive stylistic lapses in both ancient and modern times: "The French Wits in Lewis the fourteenth's time imitated Tacitus & Seneca, and the English the French . . . Hence comes the Difference betwixt the present Stile & the Stile of Milton & Clarendon" (MP 159, p. 60).

The relationship in which Monboddo sees himself with respect to Milton is not simply that of critic to author; it is more intimate than this. Monboddo not only lauds Milton, but also professes to model his own style upon him: "I flatter myself that [my stile] is not unlike the stile of Milton, the best English writer, in my opinion, both in verse and prose" (O&P, VI, 449). Monboddo extends this parallel still further. It is Monboddo's constant contention that the finest literary critic of the classical world is Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Just as Dionysius fulfilled the role of literary critic by elucidating the technical devices employed in the poetry of Homer, the foremost ancient poet, so Monboddo stands as the modern counterpart of Dionysius, pointing out to the modern world the stylistic beauties of the present age's most illustrious poet - Milton. In much of his criticism, Monboddo follows the same lines as Dionysius, and therefore bestows the same praise on Milton as Dionysius bestows on Homer. Confirmation of Monboddo's debt to Dionysius in his comments on Milton is found in MP 208,
Of the Oration of Demosthenes in defence of Ctesiphon.

In a short assessment of "the English oratorial Authors" (p. 3) prefixed to this account, Monboddo concludes with the judgment that the most faultless is "Milton, particularly in the Speeches in the Paradise Lost" (p. 4). "His Speeches have that Beauty," he continues, "which the Halicarnassian praises in Homer, of joining Composition in periods, with the Harmony of verse" (p. 4).

Indeed, it is interesting to ponder the degree to which Monboddo's critical stance was influenced by a conscious or unconscious identification with the situation and methods of Dionysius. Certainly the parallels between the two writers are there, to be drawn if required.

Dionysius, like Monboddo, promises treatises on particular topics which never materialize; like Monboddo, he idolizes Demosthenes; like Monboddo, he adopts a rather pedestrian tone. More importantly, both Dionysius and Monboddo are aware of living in an age of literary decadence, and both hark back to a Golden Age of culture.

Both, too, saw their work as requiring constant research, and themselves as performing a service to their age by mapping for posterity the summits of artistic excellence.

Of Milton's superiority to all other English poets Monboddo was in no doubt. He holds in MP 159 that "Milton is in my Judgement the greatest Poet by many Degrees that this Island has produced" (p. 42). And in a letter to Sir George Baker Milton is described as "the only Poet in English that can be compared with Homer"
It is, according to Monboddo, Milton's learning which elevates him above Shakespeare, "and makes his Regular Song So much preferable to the Native Wood Notes Wild of Shakespear" (MP 159, p. 42). Monboddo never tired of reminding his reader that the variety of Milton was to be preferred to the "teadeous uniformity" of Pope. More surprisingly, perhaps, Virgil's oratory is pronounced inferior to Milton's: "I do not hesitate to Affirm that we may as well Compare the Declamations of Portius Latro with the Philippicks of Demosthenes, as the Speeches of Virgill with those of Milton" (pp. 44-45). However, standards must be maintained, and Monboddo stops short of awarding Milton the ultimate accolade: "To say that Milton .. . excelled or even equalled his Master Homer, would be Saying too much" (p. 44). Milton's oratory displays more conscious ornamentation than Homer's, and it is for this very reason that Monboddo prefers the pristine austerity of Homer to the Demosthenes-inspired craftsmanship of Milton, no matter how astute. In an untypically ungracious passage in MP 159, Milton and Clarendon are put forward as English models worthy of imitation "but not in every thing as they no doubt have their faults" (p. 64). Instead, Monboddo here recommends that the student look beyond the modern authors to mould his style on those who they themselves have imitated; as Pope would have it, to "trace the Muses upward to their Spring." Monboddo's dismal conclusion here is that Milton and Clarendon themselves
provide nothing more than "a Stock of good English words" (p. 64). This paragraph, however, is not consonant with the bulk of Monboddo's Milton criticism, in which Monboddo is sufficiently enlightened to praise Milton for his deployment of available literary materials rather than blame him for not being an ancient Greek. While recording the more eccentric of Monboddo's pronouncements on Milton, it is appropriate to mention the one occasion on which a living poet is preferred to Milton: as if by way of appeasement to his contemporaries, Monboddo makes the extravagant claim, in MP 148, Of Composition, that John Armstrong, whose Art of Preserving Health (1744) had a most healthy and prolific run of popularity in the latter half of the century, "exceeds even Milton in the variety of his Figures, & equals him in the closeness of his Matter, & the vigour of his composition" (MP 148, p. 29).

Quite apart from Milton's skill as a versifier, another aspect of the poet which endeared itself to Monboddo was his familiarity with Greek philosophy. Bearing in mind that the reintroduction of the philosophy of the Greeks by means of Antient Metaphysics was the major pursuit of Monboddo's later years, we should not be surprised that Monboddo applauds Milton's extensive reading in Plato and Aristotle. Monboddo sees in the facetious Vacation Exercise and De Idea Platonica, and in a reference to the "Loerian Remnants" in the Tractate on Education evidence that Milton laid down at university a firm base of knowledge of ancient philosophy, "the only Philosophy
worth being known" (MP 241, p. 45). Monboddo makes an unequivocal statement on Milton's superiority to the poet of mere natural abilities: "Horace makes it a Doubt whether Genius or Learning be most necessary to make a Poet... Milton has join'd both in an eminent Degree" (p. 46). Milton's language, implies Monboddo, is adaptive not just to poetry but to the most abstruse philosophy. Monboddo intended this to be understood quite literally: Milton is quoted several times in the course of Antient Metaphysics to elucidate tricky philosophical points; and in MP 11, Of general Physicks and of Ideas, Monboddo cites Milton when trying to describe the telepathic communion of one mind with another. The verses of "our learned and truely divine Poet" (MP 11, p. 25(1)) in which Raphael fobs off Adam's enquiries with a suitably vague account of "the embrace of spirits" are presented by way of explaining this knotty problem. But, just as Johnson felt that devotional exercises are too high for poetry, so too Monboddo feels that even the majesty of Milton's diction cannot do justice to metaphysical complexity: "It is in this way hardly to be expressed even in Miltons Language" (p. 25(1)).

At various points Monboddo digresses to present a sustained eulogy of Milton; and I will endeavour to build up Monboddo's general view of Milton as depicted in those encomia before proceeding to examine Monboddo's detailed account of Milton's poetic technique.

An early MS, MP 159, shows Monboddo's high opinion
of Milton to have been held from a point near the start of his literary life. In *Origin and Progress* III Monboddo embarks on a résumé of the life and works of Milton, whom he sees as "the best standard for style, and all the ornaments of speech, that we have in our language" (*O&P*, III, 68 n.). A similar commendation in *Volume V* is slanted more towards an appreciation of Milton's prose, which is "the best we have in English; for it certainly comes as near to the Greek and Latin composition as the imperfect grammar of our language will admit" (*O&P*, V, 254). This high estimation of Milton's worth is maintained in the unpublished MSS, where Milton is cited as an incontrovertible precedent for English verse in the manner that Homer is customarily cited as a judge of poetic rectitude against whom no appeal is possible. In English verse, says Monboddo, "the Number of Accents or Pulsations, as we may call them is fixed to five, or in our Alexandrine Verse to Six, but which I observe is not used by Milton, whom I hold to be the Standard of our Poetry both Blank & Rhymed" (MP 239, p. 44). In MP 240 Milton's role as arbiter of taste is spelled out even more explicitly: (it must be borne in mind, as observed in Chapter 3, that "Hexameter," when used by Monboddo in relation to English verse, is a solecism for "Pentameter"): "our own Hexameter consists only of ten Syllables with Sometimes an Alexandrine Line, but which I observe is never used by Milton, and therefore I will consider it as not properly belonging to our Hexameter" (MP 240, pp. 12-63). In MP 277, of the
Love of Money, a panoramic view of the moderns' achievements in literature, Milton is seen as a lone preserver of the standards of serious poetry in an age whose literary landmarks tend to be only of the satirical type: "As to the higher kinds of Poetry, except it be what Milton has written, and some few Tragedies, I think we have nothing excellent" (p. 47).

The most extended assessment of Milton to be found in the MSS, however, is located in MP 241. Chapter 3 of this MS is devoted largely to a study of Milton's use of rhyme in the minor poems; but after conceding that Milton's rhyming in small-scale pieces is indeed laudable, Monboddo feels constrained to launch into a prolonged "Eulogium of Milton" (MP 241, p. 21(3)), putting forward a view of the poet which he feels compelled to deliver "however different from that of Dr. Johnson and his admirers" (p. 38). Against Johnson Monboddo contends that Milton has demonstrated himself in both his major and minor poems to be the modern poet par excellence. It is clear that Monboddo's high estimation of Milton is based on the premises that a poet is successful to the extent that his work utilizes classical poetic forms; and that Milton's poetry is of value insofar as it approximates to those forms. Hence Milton "has written the best Epic Poem I mean the Paradise Lost . . . that has been written since the days of Augustus Caesar" (p. 39).

It is, admittedly, true that Monboddo is aware of a disparity between Paradise Lost and primary epic. As
part of a tirade against Dr. Johnson in Origin and Progress V, Monboddo repudiates Johnson's claim that "the Paradise Lost is not the greatest of heroic poems, only because it is not the first." Since the subject of an epic must, according to Aristotle, be "The imitation of a human action" (O&P, V, 263), whereas the action of Paradise Lost takes place largely in the realms of the supernatural; and since the characters of Milton's work are too wholly good or bad to be acceptable by Aristotle's standards; it is quite wrong, concludes Monboddo, to rank Paradise Lost on a par with Homer's epic. These opinions had been germinating in Monboddo's mind for some years, and paraded among the literati in London, as a letter to Sir George Baker indicates: the subject of Paradise Lost is an unfortunate one, whereas that of Comus "is, as I believe I Observed to you in Conversation, much better Chosen; and therefore I hold the Comus to be the better Poem of the two" (2 October 1782; MP Box 22, fol. 7/87, pp. 3-4). MP 159, Illustratns. of Aristotle's Topicks, elaborates on this point: "The greatest Defect in the Plan of Milton's Poem is with respect to the Manners for The Characters are all Perfect of their kind either Perfectly good or Perfectly Bad, whereas the True Poetick Characters are the Mixed" (p. 52). At the same time, Monboddo is susceptible to the dramatic appeal of the fallen angels, and, again exercising his comparative faculty to the utmost, is willing to award the palm to Milton in preference to Virgil insofar as the modern
poet's characters are more plentiful, and more vividly painted, than the ancient's: "Milton has indeed Endeavour'd to Vary the Characters of his Devills, & I hesitate not to Affirm that there is more of Character in the Second Book of Paradise Lost than in the whole 12 Books of the Eneid" (p. 52).

Monboddo's Volume VII statement on poetic characterization shows a drift away from this strict Aristotelianism. At first, Monboddo here recapitulates on the view that Paradise Lost's divinities are "too exalted above Humanity to be brought upon the Scene or even into an Epic Poem," and that "Even the Devils in Milton are more wicked than Men" (MP 243, p. 27). In particular Monboddo finds fault with their predilection for aerial combat rather than for the hand-to-hand combat of the Greek gods; one gets the impression Monboddo felt the devils are not quite playing the game. But although Monboddo criticizes these supernatural figures as "something above Humanity, whose doings or Sufferings cannot much move us" (p. 27), he evidently feels that such splendid creations cannot be dismissed from the realms of true poetry simply because their sphere of action is removed from the human.

Monboddo therefore exempts from his general censure those episodes "where Milton introduces his Devils as Speaking and Debating" (p. 27), in which the devils' actions and attitudes approximate sufficiently to the mundane.

Monboddo's criticism is noticeably evaluative rather than descriptive: his concern is ultimately to reaffirm Homer's supremacy over Milton, by highlighting the
shortcomings in Milton's characters. The consequence is that Monboddo continually views *Paradise Lost* as an epic flawed by the intrusion of a Christian supernatural, rather than as a permissible fusion of epic and Biblical doctrine in a newly-wrought form, artistically valid albeit "unattempted yet in prose or rhyme."

Thinking along Addisonian lines, Monboddo perceives that Christianity as a religion does not lend itself to realization in epic fashion. He sees the persistence of pagan mythological figures in a Christian culture as necessitated by the comparative poverty of Christian iconography. The religion of Renaissance Italy, for instance, "instead of furnishing subjects such as the Gods & Heroes of Antiquity, afforded nothing but Saints & Madonas & Nursery Scenes such as no Art cou'd make truly beautifull or gracefull" (*MP 4, History of Religion*, p. 33). The paucity of material afforded by Christian doctrine to the purely literary arts has resulted in a return to the heroes of an earlier era: "And in proper Subjects of Poetry, it was still more deficient, & we are obliged to have recourse to the Heathen Mythology for the Ornament both of our Verse & Prose" (p. 33). As one might expect, Milton serves as an example of Anglicized pagan mythography: "So that even our pious Poet, who has sung so well the fall of Man, was obliged to draw from this Source the chief Ornaments of his Poetry; nor do I think it is possible to make a mere Christian or Jewish Poem truly beautifull" (p. 33). Discussing, in *MP 159,*
the two sources of classical mythology in ancient history and allegorical fiction, Monboddo says "Our great Milton has made excellent use of both of them even in a Christian Poem, & I think our later Poets have neglected this Study, formerly So much in fashion, a great deal too much" (p. 40). Milton's skill in turning a portion of Biblical narrative into twelve books of epic is paraded as an example of the depths of Milton's learning: "if we consider how bare & naked of Circumstances the Story is as told in our Sacred Books, we must needs admire the Genius of the Poet who has been able to Adorn it with So many Beautifull & Surprizing Incidents" (MP 159, p. 42). Such a task is too weighty for a mere natural genius, and demands the efforts of "a Mind like Milton's Stock'd with all kinds of Learning & which upon the Wings of Science had traversed Heaven & Earth, Hell & Chaos" (p. 43).

Monboddo, then, is concerned not, in a positive manner, with the fusion of classical and Christian, but only, negatively, with the incongruity and incompatibility of the two traditions. Here, too, Monboddo's classical bias shapes his criticism: where Christian dogma distorts the normal form of classical epic, as in the characterization of Paradise Lost, the alteration can only be for the worse; and where a Christian poem adopts classical motifs this is attributed to the imagistic barrenness of Hebraic tradition. On other occasions, however, the narrow limits of Monboddo's classical caste of mind lead him to a surprisingly fruitful avenue of
approach to a poem. The MP 241 eulogy of Milton, for instance, demonstrates Monboddo's consideration of a knotty problem concerning *Paradise Regained*: can the account of Christ's temptation be accorded epic status? Emendations in the MS show that Monboddo twice tackled the point. His first draft affirms "I do not reckon the Paradise regained an Epic Poem but a History of our Saviour's trial such as we have it in the Gospels" (p. 39). The Biblical account of the temptation is seen as purely factual; therefore, in Aristotelian terms, any reworking of the material must necessarily be by way of a history rather than a poem. In an emendation, however, Monboddo has shifted his critical stance, with a corresponding increase in insight: the work is now seen as "a Dialogue betwixt our Saviour and Satan the Subject of which is taken from the Gospels; for it wants that Action which constitutes the Fable, and is absolutely necessary to any Heroic Poem" (p. 39). By assimilating *Paradise Regained* to the tradition of the philosophical dialogue by which pre-Aristotelian philosophy has been transmitted to the present age, Monboddo fosters an approach to the work which has important implications even for current Milton scholarship. We may wish to stress the epic quality of Paradise Regained in the light of Milton's talk, in *The Reason of Church-government*, of "that Epick form whereof . . . the book of Job [is] a brief model" (Works, Columbia ed., III, 237); but it cannot be denied that Monboddo's characterization of *Paradise Regained* as
a dialogue quite legitimately focuses attention on Christ's role as the ideal of the contemplative philosopher. The function of the protagonist in a Platonic dialogue - exposing the specious intellectualizing of his opponent, and reaffirming the value of reason and rectitude against the lure of the temporal and material - is paralleled in *Paradise Regained* by Christ's triumph over Satan. Certainly Christ's quiescence and spirituality in Milton's poem are more consonant with the temperance of the Greek philosopher than with the activity and strong physical presence of the epic hero.

*Comus*, too, is deemed worthy of praise by virtue of its classical precedents; in this case, the orchestic and pantomimetic productions of the Greek stage (although a reference in MP 237 allies *Comus* with other artistic forms, labelling it "the best Imitation of the Italian Opera that we have" (p. 28). See, too, MP 232, pp. 41-44, for an encomium of *Comus*'s structure and content as forming "the finest Dramatic Poem that I believe ever was Exhibited upon any Modern Stage" (p. 44). Bereft of its theatrical trappings, Monboddo implies, *Comus* would lose its similarity to Attic entertainments, and consequently its literary value; with them, it would be "a Representation worthy of the stage of Athens" (MP 241, p. 39). Typically, Monboddo views as a stumbling-block to a dramatization of *Comus* the elocutionary problems associated with Miltonic diction: the presentation would be successful only "if Players were to be found, that could
wield as I call it, the Language of Milton" (p. 39).
Perhaps Monboddo was here recalling the anecdote related to him by "the late Mr. Glover" that "Mr. Garrick, the famous player . . . could not, as I have been well assured, pronounce the periods of Milton" (O&P,IV, 241).
In Origin and Progress VI Monboddo explains just why Milton presents such problems to the would-be declaimer. Monboddo's prosodic doctrines constantly revert to the theme that English pronunciation turns language into a string of stressed and unstressed syllables, devoid of musical pitch and quantity. One regrettable consequence of this habit is that our harsh emphases prevent the smooth flow of a rhetorical period, diverting the listener's attention from "that continuation of the sense, which it is necessary he should carry on to the end of the period" (O&P,VI, 238) as well as interfering with the auditory properties of the recitation. Monboddo's observations on this point are evidently based on experience: "This I have observed, particularly in hearing some men read the periods of Milton's Paradise Lost, which they made hardly intelligible by their many and violent emphases" (O&P,VI, 238). This experience, or a similar one, suggested to Monboddo the comment in one of the MSS on rhythm that "I have already Observed that the Accenting even a Syllable makes Some little pause of the Voice, but an Emphasis upon a Word makes Still a greater. And in this way the Verse is marked tho' the Sense is carried on to the next Line, which is generally the Case of
This, then, is the ideal to be pursued in reading Milton: a slight but perceptible pause at the close of each verse maintains the rhythmic flow of the poetry, while its content is comprehended only by looking beyond the scope of one verse to grasp the significance of a period taking up several lines. One of the beauties of Milton's composition, to Monboddo's mind, lies in the poet's having "contrived to terminate his verse with a word upon which the sense requires that some emphasis be laid" (O&P.V, 468), so that the semantic content of the verse reinforces the rhythmic pattern by inducing the reader to insert a terminating stress, with a concomitant pause, in each line. This point is reiterated in the MP 237 passage quoted above; and is even adopted by Monboddo to demonstrate Milton's superiority over Shakespeare: "But if the Word can bear no Emphasis, which I have Observed to be Sometimes the Case in Shakespeare then there can be no Stop with any Propriety & So the Verse must be lost" (MP 237, p. 22).

But, as has been said above, this is the case in an ideal rendition of Paradise Lost; the complexity of Milton's blank verse tends to beguile the reader into over-compensating by relying too heavily on the closing pause to define the rhythmic structure: "But tho' the Word will bear an Emphasis the Pause must not be too long, otherwise the Period will be lost, & very often the Sense too. And this is what makes the nicety &
Difficulty of reading Milton's Verse (which is Such that no man accustom'd only to read Rhyming Poetry, or the blank Verses of Shakespear which commonly terminate the Line with the Sense, can pronounce the Verses of Milton as they ought to be pronounced" (MP 237, p. 22). See, too, MP 236, p. 13. Monboddo has further recourse to the elocutionary challenge afforded by Comus in Antient Metaphysics III, in a lengthy footnote occasioned by his approval of the Lady's sentiment that virtue and pleasure are conjoined in the rational soul (703-704, badly misquoted by Monboddo even in the printed volume). The expression of this noble opinion, declares Monboddo, will appear "flat and insipid" (AM,III, xlii, n.) to those who are too modernistic to appreciate Milton's classic simplicity. There follows praise of Comus's poetic style as well as its content. The subject is granted to be superior to that of Paradise Lost, for the reasons outlined above; Comus is "a fine Mythological Tale, marvellous enough, as all poetic subjects should be, but at the same time human" (xlii, n.). The Euripidean prologue, says Monboddo, is the "finest and grandest opening of any theatrical piece that I know, antient or modern" (xlii, n.). The versification is equalled only in Dryden's St. Cecilia Ode (xliii, n.), and the style more elevated than a modern player can handle or a modern audience appreciate (xliii, n.).

Monboddo's praise of Samson Agonistes is based on its solid core of rational thought. In MP 159 Monboddo
draws a distinction between the austere argumentation of Demosthenes' oratory, and the florid sensationalizing of rhetoric in its decadence. To the former of these he attributes Milton's style in his speeches; to the latter, Virgil's. The condensed reasoning of Milton's oratorical style is seen by Monboddo as sadly lacking in the works of modern poets, "even our Tragic Poets to whose Province it more particularly belongs" (MP 159, p. 49). Hence whereas the true business of tragedy, as exemplified in that of the Greeks, is the debate and resolution of specific moral issues by means of sustained and rational dialogue, the modern travesty of the form has nothing to offer but "Description, Passion or Surprize" (p. 49). Such decadent tragedy not only falls short of the standards set by Sophocles, but is "very different likewise from Milton's Idea of Tragedy, as may be Seen from the only Piece of that kind which he lived to finish the Samson Agonistes" (pp. 49-50). Indeed, Samson's conversation with Dalila is here singled out as "a more rationall Entertainment" than is to be met with in any other English drama. This dialogue is also praised in MP 307 (p. 261), where Monboddo directs the reader to an extended discussion, unfortunately lost or never completed, of Samson Agonistes as "a most perfect Imitation of the Antient Greek Tragedy." A sample of Monboddo's views can be found in a cancelled section of MP 307: declaring that the Euripidean prologue is an unnatural and inferior method of providing an audience with
relevant plot information, Monboddo says that "tho' Milton has employed it in his Comus, where he makes the
Spirit prologise" (p. 184), in \textit{Samson Agonistes} he has
substituted for it a true soliloquy, dramatically appro-
priate and organically connected with ensuing events.
Monboddo's comments on the writing of \textit{Samson Agonistes}
have a certain biographical poignancy to them: acting
on the traditional assumption that this "last and most
faultless, in my judgment, of all his poetical works"
\textit{(O&P,III, 71, n.)} was written in the author's sixty-
second year, Monboddo remarks on its composition in
the face of physical affliction and political devastation.
Monboddo himself was sixty-two when this volume appeared,
and one can imagine his sympathy for his subject;
Monboddo too lived in a world which was hostile, not
only in its real or supposed degeneracy from a Grecian
Golden Age but in its rejection of Monboddo's own
attempts to close the flood-gates by a rekindled rever-
ence for Attic culture.

Also praised in \textit{MP 241}, and also classically sanc-
tioned, is \textit{Lycidas}, described as "a pastoral Monody"
(p. 41) and receiving a much more reasoned and sympa-
thetic treatment than that accorded it by Johnson.
Monboddo comments on Milton's indebtedness to Virgil's
fifth Eclogue, preferring Virgil's "Bucolic" style to
that of his epic and Georgics. Despite Monboddo's
aversion to rhymes, the artistry and variety of \textit{Lycidas}
lead Monboddo not only to exempt it from his scathing
condemnations but even to declare that "the piece would not have been the Worse in my opinion if there had been more of them" (p. 42). Praise indeed from the most virulent opponent of "the jingling sound of like endings" of the age. The remainder of the MP 241 eulogy is taken up by an assessment of Milton's Greek, Latin and Italian poetry, and of his prose, similar to that in *Origin and Progress* III.

In MP 159 Monboddo examines Milton's methods with respect to the traditions from which he selected his materials. I have drawn attention to Monboddo's dissatisfaction with the figurative barrenness of Christianity; in MP 159 Monboddo suggests a field of human endeavour which, he believes, might have furnished a legion of heroes comparable to those of the ancients, but which has been largely neglected: the Crusades, "which may be truly called the Modern Heroic Ages" (p. 40). Monboddo records Milton's intentions of embarking on an epic drawing, in this way, on the age of chivalry, and evidently regrets that the *Arthuriad* never saw the light of day.

As well as equipping Monboddo for the business of criticism by allocation to the genre, Monboddo's classical reading also enabled him to pinpoint specific passages on which Milton has modelled his poetry. In *Origin and Progress* II, for instance, he traces Adam's reaction to Raphael (*Paradise Lost* VIII. 1-4) to the enchantment of Socrates in the *Protagoras* (*O&P*, II, 562-63), "an
allusion, which I think has not been observed." An appended note comments on Milton's informed use, often at a far remove, of Homer and Demosthenes as models (see a reference in O&P,V, 332; and a similar passage in MP 158, pp. 13-14, on which the printed version is based, practically word-for-word). From Homer Milton takes the plot and stylistic ornamentation of his poem; from Demosthenes, his rhetoric. An apposite example of this synthesis occurs, as Monboddo shows, in Paradise Lost II, 445-66: the sentiments expressed relating to the obligations of kingship are drawn from Sarpedon's speech to Glaucon (Iliad XII, 310-28); the rhetorical expression is Demosthenes' (O&P,III, 133).

We have seen that, in general, Monboddo's admiration of Milton is based on his having produced a replica in English for most of the literary forms of classical literature. Monboddo is careful to show, too, that Milton's classicism is discernible in the particularities of style as well as in the overall form and tenor of the poems. Even those who saw Monboddo primarily as an object of ridicule would admit that his erudition in matters concerning Latin and Greek was considerable; and it is his extensive reading in the classics which makes Monboddo so responsive to the Latin and Greek character of Milton's diction, syntax and word order.

Monboddo's praise of Miltonic diction is based on the premise that English is acoustically inferior to Latin, and that this discrepancy can only be compensated
for by introducing into the English language words which come as close as possible to imitating the beauties of Latin. The preponderance of consonants and monosyllables in English testifies to "the greater sweetness of the Latin language" (O&P, II, 404); therefore it is by eliminating these features that Milton improves the base stock of the English vocabulary: "Milton, when he would give a sweetness or a flow to his verse, either compounds the words, or more commonly uses the foreign words which we have adopted into our language from the Greek or Latin" (O&P, II, 405). A similar observation occurs in the MSS for Origin and Progress VII: after pointing out the shortcomings of English mentioned above, Monboddo continues "Of this Defect Milton appears to have been very Sensible, & he has endeavour'd to remedy it as much as possible by using foreign Words when he could do it with propriety, & by compounding the Words of his own Language." (MP 235, pp. 24-25). Italian, too, provides a source of polysyllabic surrogates for Milton, as Monboddo notes in Origin and Progress II when praising the smoothness of Milton's "Thick as Autumnal Leaves that strow the Brooks" (O&P, II, 406). The lines containing this simile, indeed, are Monboddo's favourite example of Miltonic diction, and one to which he reverts on numerous occasions. In MP 237 he talks of "the Simile of fallen Leaves Strewing a Brook, no grand Image but which he has raised wonder-fully by his Versification" (pp. 17-18). Indeed, it is the contrast between the lowly image and the lofty
diction which Monboddo latches on to most frequently: in MP 235 the simile is called "a very vulgar Image" (p. 25), and in MP 240 we are told Milton "has made fine Poetry in his Paradise Lost of a very common Vulgar thing, Leaves strowed upon a Brook" (p. 77). Monboddo's discussion in MP 241 reinforces his point that, conscious elaboration apart, Milton's diction tends to simplicity: "we find in the first [line] but one word that is not a Monosyllable, that is the word Autumnal, a word taken from the Latin" (p. 15). The inclusion of the Italian "Vallombrosa" and "Etrurian" in the following line ensures an additional smoothness, and the third line illustrates the second category of Latinate words isolated by Monboddo, namely compounded English words, in "overarch't" and "imbowr" (p. 15). The word "imbowr" is elsewhere singled out for comment on the grounds of its poetic appropriateness: "The Reader will also Observe that he has made the word Embower which very well expresses the thick Shade which those Trees of Vallumbrosa make over head" (MP 235, pp. 25-26). In MP 235, Monboddo's comments on this simile extend beyond an analysis solely of its auditory qualities to a considered discussion of poetic figures which, because it is linked so closely with the passage under consideration at present, may best be dealt with here. As well as contributing to the rhythmic pattern of the passage, "giving a flow to the Verse which no English Word could give it" (p. 25), Milton's polysyllables make "the Image more striking especially to
those who have seen Vallumbrosa." It is appropriate that
the authority on which Monboddo bases this naive empiri-
cist theory of the nature of poetry is Milton himself:
"Poetry is not of an Abstract, but Sensuall Nature as
Milton somewhere says, & therefor it delights in realis-
ing things by naming Places & Persons" (p. 25). Monboddo
lists other ways in which Milton has "used as much free-
dom with single words as the genius of the language would
permit, and perhaps more" (O&P, III, 21-22) (apparently,
even Monboddo had his doubts lest Milton's word-mongering
should lead, at times, to the destruction of the language
rather than its enrichment). These include:

(a) drastic elision, as in "sdeind" for "disdeind"
(O&P, III, 22);

(b) apocope, as in "with difficulty and labour hard"
(O&P, III, 21).

In general, Monboddo is against elision, on the grounds
that any detraction from the number of vowels in an
English word renders it still more consonantal, and there-
fore inferior. There is, incidentally, in this passage
further data for Paul Fussell's examination (in his Theory
of Prosody Ch. 3) of the relationship between the spoken
language of the day and the "heightened" poetic diction
derived from it. Monboddo makes it plain that a preterite
such as "loved" is normally disyllabic, and that the con-
traction "lov'd" is to be permitted only to the poet, and
only for prosodic reasons. (This is an appropriate point
at which to note two more comments on pronunciation which
Monboddo makes, and which involve a reference to Milton's word usage: (i) Monboddo prefers the Miltonic "retinue" to the less distinct modern "retinue" (MP 230, p. 11(3)); (ii) again criticising the modern tendency to place an emphasis on the antepenultimate syllable, Monboddo says "if we pronounce Horison accented upon the first Syllable as I have heard Some people do, Milton could not have written - the Horison round - Investing with bright Rays" (MP 232, p. 49)).

(c) completely dropping a last syllable, as in "impregn" for "impregnate" (O&P,III, 22);

(d) word enlargement by restoring a word to "its proper etymological orthography," as in "Eremits" for "Hermits" (O&P,III, 22);

(e) word enlargement by forming new compounds from standard English words, as in "overarch't" and "imbowr" (MP 241, p.16);

(f) employing a word in its archaic signification, as in "bucksom" in the sense of "yielding" or "obedient" (O&P,III, 25; see also MP 159, p. 55; and the index to the missing MP 147 shows that this MS contained remarks on the "perverted" use of Latinate words such as "pomp," "intend" and "observe" (MP Box 18, B56, pp. 191-92);

(g) omission of an antecedent, as in "So fail not thou" for "So fail not thou him" (O&P,V, 246-47, n.); and

(h) introduction of obsolete words (O&P,V, 259).

Despite these ornate bulwarks against the inherent harshness of the English language, however, Monboddo
attributes to Milton a simplicity of style. "In the choice of Words," says Monboddo, "Milton is not distinguished from other Poets: And indeed his poetical Language is the most simple of any in English" (MP 232, p. 52). It is this lack of elaboration which constitutes the excellence of Milton's rhetoric: "his Style, in his Speeches, is, according to Aristotles Rule, not ornamented or Poetical, but as plain as the Language of Demosthenes whom he imitated" (MP 208, p. 4). In MP 159 Monboddo explains how Milton achieves this simplicity without a loss in elegance: appropriate use of figures affecting sentence construction enables him to introduce variety without resorting to others' practice of importing into the language "improper Ornaments which make it too Florid" (p. 56). By skilful arrangement of a stock of words not chosen for mere decorative effect, Milton has developed a style "more Simple than that of any of our Poets yet less Vulgar" (p. 56). In Origin and Progress II Monboddo comments at large on Milton's "many passages, not only beautiful, but even sublime, without metaphor or figure, or any thing of what is now called fine language" (O&P, II, 559), and devotes several pages to the detailed analysis of passages from Paradise Lost with a view to showing that Milton retains "the simplicity of the diction" (II, 562) while maintaining an elevated style simply by just sentiments, decorous expression, and the harmonious interplay of varied versification and lengthy period. In a MS specifically
devoted to oratory, the Letter on Rhetorick (MP 157), Monboddo rejects an abundance of figurative language in speeches, and declares further that "even good Poetry does not bear a great deal of it. Witness the Poetry of Milton where I maintain there is less of that kind of Froth than in the Declamations of Mr Pitt" (p. 4).

This must have seemed to Monboddo an apposite description of the ornate language eschewed by Milton; it recurs, at any rate, in the statement that Milton's style, though frequently sublime, has "less froth or bombast" than any other comparable modern writing (O&P,III, 112). In MP 132 Monboddo backs up talk of Milton's simplicity of style by an interesting claim which suggests that he had been carrying out "field work" as part of his study of Milton: Monboddo has been told by foreign students of English that they find Milton the most readily comprehensible of English poets (p. [117]). Curiously, a similar point is made in the Richarsons' claim, in their commentary on Paradise Lost, that "a Learned Foreigner will think Milton the Easiest to be Understood of All the English Writers."¹ A newcomer to the intricacies of Paradise Lost might be forgiven for dissenting from this view; and indeed Monboddo realizes that despite Milton's alleged international admiration, the untutored English reader finds the style of Milton "harsh, obscure and Pedantic" (p. 118). This fact Monboddo attributes to the degenerate literary diet of his contemporaries, used only to "the common productions of this

¹ J. & J. Richardson, Explanatory Notes and Remarks on Milton's Paradise Lost (1734), p. CXLII.
Age" (p. 118); one might compare this with Monboddo's observations in MP 159 that modern audiences cannot appreciate the intellectual rigours of ancient tragedy, nourished as they are on the modern drama of sentiment. (See, too, mention of the simplicity of Milton's vocabulary in MP 232, p. 52; and the wrapper to the missing MP 147, which indicates that this MS set up Milton along with Homer as models of the simple style in poetry.)

In general, then, Monboddo recommends, and praises in Milton, a diction which contains a high percentage of multisyllabic words. On some occasions, however, Monboddo is willing to admit that a mellifluous rhythmic flow is not the only effect worth achieving in verse. By adapting the sound of poetry to its sense, in true Essay on Criticism fashion, the vividness of the verse is enhanced, as Monboddo realized. In Origin and Progress II Monboddo, commenting on the monosyllabic harshness of English, approves of this quality in verse where it is appropriate: "In some verses, where the sense requires frequent stops, this is no fault, but may be rather accounted a beauty; as in this verse of Milton, Him first, him last, him midst, and without end (O&P, II, 405). It is worth noting that it is not the mere presence of monosyllables which Monboddo sees as breaking the flow of this line, but of the pauses between them; and that Monboddo vacillates between praise and censure of this poetic device. In MP 232, Monboddo distinguishes the pause between syllables, and that between words, taking
occasion to mention the relevant line from Milton with respect to the latter of these, adding "There are no Such Verses in Greek or Latin nor indeed do I think them pretty as there are too many Stops or breaks in them & of such a kind as to make the Composition quite gaping" (MP 232, p. 25, n.). Such is Monboddo's opinion on the sound of the line; there is a curious judgmental schizophrenia in the following afterthought: "at the same time I think this Verse of Milton not improper for expressing what he intended" (MP 232, p. 25, n.). Monboddo's final verdict would appear to be that in MP 235: in a purely monosyllabic line "the Stops would be both too great & too many & the Verse would run like a shallow Stream chatting among Pebbles" (MP 235, p. 24; a rare glimpse of Monboddo waxing lyrical). Here Monboddo's distaste for such roughness ultimately prevails over his demands for auditory appropriateness: "There is not nor I think can there be such a Line in Greek or Latin, but Milton has One that comes very near it

Him first, him last, him Midst & w'out End
which may express very well what he meant, but it is certainly a very rough unmusical Line" (MP 235, p. 24). Monboddo singles out as examples of typically consonantal English monosyllables the "first" and "midst" of the offending line. It is to remedy such harshnesses, says Monboddo, that Milton has such frequent resort to imported polysyllables.

Monboddo distinguishes two separate functions of
monosyllabic lines in Milton. The first employs a number of pauses to demarcate the equally numerous divisions of the verse into units of meaning, as in the line just quoted; in the second, the frequently interrupted flow of the verse serves not simply to render the meaning more distinct, but also to convey an impression of fragmentation. "where it is intended to express something broken or discontinued, as in this other verse of Milton, O'er bog, o'er steep, through rough, dense, smooth, or rare" (O&F, II, 405).

As well as approving Milton's choice of words, Monboddo finds much to praise in the way these are set together. Once again, the desideratum is that English be moulded (some would say forced) into a greater similarity to Latin. In a heavily inflected language like Latin, great liberty can be taken with the order of words in discourse, the syntactical relationships between them being, for the most part, adequately indicated by the suffixes. In English the case is different: largely devoid of inflected word terminations, English discourse relies to a great extent on the juxtaposition of syntactically related words. Monboddo appositely points of a Horatian ode (I. v) to Milton's translation as being deliberately calculated to point out the shortcomings of English word arrangement; particularly in the rendition of "Qui nunc te fruitur credulus aurea" as "Who now enjoys thee credulous, all Gold." This is an instance of a MS passage elaborating still further on a matter brought up in the printed
Volumes: Despite mentioning Milton's treatment of Horace's ode several times in the course of the *Origin and Progress* (II, 354-55; IV, 129-31; V, 452), Monboddo provides his most thoroughgoing analysis of the matter in MP 230, a MS ostensibly devoted to the language and style of Homer. After praising the arrangement of words in the Latin original as clear and perspicuous despite being the result of artifice, Monboddo continues: "How incapable any modern Language is of being so composed Milton has very clearly shown in a literal Translation" (MP 230, p. 19). The superiority of the Latin to the English in the aforementioned line is explained in detail: the association of the English "credulous" with "Who" cannot be made "for want of the Connection of Genders" (MP 230, p. 19).

It would be wrong to infer from such passages that it is only intellectual snobbery which leads Monboddo to propose Latin models for English discourse (although it would be equally misleading to deny that this is an element in Monboddo's mental make-up). The basis on which he rests his preference for the Latin manner strikes right to the heart of Monboddo's aesthetic theory.

Referring back to *Origin and Progress* II, Monboddo declares in MP 230 that "I think I have shown elsewhere that the Words in that Artificial Order may be so arranged as to make the Sense more perspicuous and to come more forcibly upon us than if the Words were arranged in what we would call the Natural Order, that is the order in
which they are construed together in Syntax" (MP 230, pp. 18-19). In other words, word order contributes towards the clear communication of meaning, in addition to its role in establishing the rhythmic structure of the verse. In following up Monboddo's reference to Volume II, we find ourselves confronted with another *Paradise Lost* passage, one to which Monboddo has recourse time and again, and which more than any other displays, for Monboddo, the glories of Milton's style. Monboddo identifies the passage in another reference to Volume II: "I have elsewhere observed how Milton has taken advantage of the English having an Oblique Case for the pronoun (I), to make one of the finest Periods to be found in an English Author. It is in Satan's Speech, with which he opens the Council of Pandaemonium.

"Me, tho' just right, & the fixt Laws &c." (MP 230, p. 21).

Certainly this is among the most overtly Latinate of Milton's constructions, the initial "Mee" not being followed by its governing verb till five lines have elapsed. A similar example of uncommon word order, made possible by the difference between the English nominative and oblique cases of pronouns, is noted elsewhere: "Thus Milton says, HIM the Almighty power hurled head¬long" (*O&P*, II, 351).

In *Origin and Progress* II Monboddo envisages the objection to this irregular construction which he imagines would be raised by advocates of a more modern, French,
style: the drift of the sentence is interrupted and obscured by a welter of parenthesis interpolated between pronoun and verb. Monboddo counters the charge in various ways: it is quite appropriate that the topic of Satan's speech should hold the initial position in the sentence; and the parentheses, far from being irrelevant, not only contribute to the meaning but "fill up the sense most properly" (O&P, II, 357). Furthermore, Monboddo's contention in MP 230 that words thus arranged help to convey the significance with greater vividness is fully explained in Volume II. This period of Milton's is to be comprehended only by considering it in its entire compass, where the connection between verb and pronoun will be apparent; and to Monboddo's mind it is of the essence of discourse that it is to be understood "every part of it at once, in the view of the mind" (O&P, II, 360). Hence far from obstructing this all-embracing act of perception, Milton's convoluted arrangement serves to bind the sentence together. A comparison might well be made with Monboddo's aesthetic theory as set out in Antient Metaphysics: beauty consists in system, therefore the perception of beauty consists in the perception of system; that is, the awareness of parts' subservience to a whole. Hence Monboddo's belief that in training the mind to understand composition like Milton's we are exercising "that best talent of the mind, the power of uniting, and seeing both the one and the many, both what is first and what is last, at once" (O&P, II, 362). (This section of
Paradise Lost obviously appealed to Monboddo. In Origin and Progress III he indulges in a literary jeu d'esprit, giving several different renditions of the passage — prosaic, ornate, rhetorical — to demonstrate that Milton's version is the most "rounded, compact, and nervous" (O&P,III, 143) possible. And in MP 208 Monboddo opines that this speech "is more in the Style & Manner of Demosthenes than any thing I know in English" (p. 4). See also O&P,VI, 117-18, n., 128; MP 154, p. 23; MP 241, pp. 18-18(1)).

To sum up, then, it can be said that the structural devices praised by Monboddo are all conducive to Monboddo's primary critical criterion: variety. Monboddo contrasts Milton's wealth of periods of varying members with the curt verse and prose of his own day (O&P,IV, pp. 270-71); in MP 230 this variety is attributed both to the lack of endstopping, and to the varied positioning of pauses throughout the verse (pp. 6(7)-6(8)). The factor setting Milton's pauses above those of rhymed verse, like Pope's, is that Milton's serve only to indicate the meaning of his periods, unlike those of rhymed verse which, in Monboddo's eyes at any rate, are only an unpleasant side-effect of couplet verse; Monboddo finds no pause at all in "And in persuasive Accents thus began," his version of "And with persuasive accent thus began," which he considers a test case because no halt at all is required to render the meaning intelligible (MP 237, p. 19). This "beautifull Line" (p. 18) is cited again in MP 241, where
Monboddo also demonstrates the variety of Milton's style by analysing the variation in pause position in the first five lines of *Paradise Lost*, from the fourth to the third foot; a common text to choose for such purposes, as noted on pp. 196-197 above (MP 241, pp. 17-18; see, too, MP 154, p. 28). To this halt is added the pause at the end of each line, which sets blank verse even above prose (MP 238, p. 28; see also MP 238, pp. 11, 13).

An alternative way of expressing Milton's achievement, and one which Monboddo borrowed from Dionysius, is to say that "Milton has given to his poetry in *Paradise Lost* all the beauty of prose composition" (O&P, V, 464). This is echoed in the view that "if therefor it be such a Beauty in Poetry, to join with the Verse what is of the greatest Excellency in Prose composition - Milton in that respect if in no other ought to be reckon'd among the first of Poets" (MP 238, p. 11). MP 232 expands on this, explaining that it is this prose-like quality in Milton which elevates him above Shakespeare, Jonson and Surrey, who, "being but newly emancipated from the Slavery of Rime" (MP 232, p. 52) still constructed their verse on the end-stopped model of their predecessors. (See also MP 154, p. 28; MP 159, p. 58.)

So much, then, for Milton's choice and arrangement of words. Monboddo also comments extensively on Milton's figurative language, particularly in *Origin and Progress* III, a handbook of grammar and style in which Monboddo
draws his examples mainly from Milton. This part of Monboddo's Milton criticism, then, is almost incidental, taking the form of examples dispersed through many pages rather than a sustained analysis of Milton's style. The wealth of figures Monboddo finds, however, and the number of examples he provides, bear witness to a thorough and perceptive reading of Paradise Lost.

The first category of figures defined by Monboddo is figures of syntax, those in which the author introduces a deviation from orthodox grammatical form:

(a) **ellipsis** Monboddo not only points to instances where Milton omits words or phrases, as in "Wont ride" for "Wont to ride" (P.L.1.764), but regularly supplements his remarks with instances of similar Latin and Greek practice which back up his observations that Milton draws extensively from classical grammar (O&P,III, 67-72; MP 159, p. 56. For a résumé of Monboddo's views on ellipsis, and on the other devices to be met with in figurative writing, see O&P,VI, 122-28).

(b) **parenthesis** Milton's motives in interpolating parenthetical clauses into his speeches, says Monboddo, are two-fold: the pursuit of variety, and the clarification of his meaning (O&P,III, 74). Monboddo sees himself as making an observation insufficiently stressed in previous Milton criticism, and therefore cites as an example the lengthy parenthesis immediately prior to the highly praised "Mee though just right . . . " passage. Here, too, Monboddo gives lengthy instructions on the
correct reading of a single parenthetical line from *Comus*, "(Not being in danger, as I trust she is not)" (369). The first half of the line has discernible rational content, in that it contributes to the speaker's meaning; and the speaker is quite justified in altering his tone of voice to accommodate this change in meaning. Contrasted with this correct diction is that of too many contemporary actors, says Monboddo, who resort to unwarranted variations of voice. The second half of the line under discussion Monboddo sees as an appeal to sentiment, which "throws in some passion or feeling into the discourse" (p. 76). Here, then, is a restatement of Monboddo's position that verse exists to be recited, not merely read; and further proof of my thesis that Monboddo, in common with his age, consistently comes to verse with the critical apparatus of the elocutionist. (on parenthesis, see too O&P,II, 561-62; O&P,V, 466).

(c) repetition The oft-quoted demand for unity amidst variety, which we have seen to lie at the heart of Monboddo's aesthetics, is here echoed in the stipulation that "there should be similarity as well as diversity" (O&P,III, 77-78). For this reason, the repetition of words and phrases is permissible where it is appropriate that the verse should excite pathos and express "vehemence of contention" (O&P,III, 79-80).

(d) inconsequence Monboddo cites the passage in *Paradise Lost* (IV.344-49) describing the angels' reaction to God's speech, opting to construe the lines as a
quasi-Homeric construction rather than either an Anglicized ablative absolute or an error of transcription. Monboddo observes that the use of this figure, which involves the omission of words necessary to the full grammatical comprehension of a sentence, is prone to abuse, and therefore not resorted to except by Milton (O&P, III, 94-95).

(e) classical idiom As well as employing figures known as conscious literary devices by the ancients, Milton also imports into English idioms which form part of the orthodox, and not necessarily poetic, literary stock of Latin and Greek, but which represent a departure from standard idiom when applied to English; such as "arrive / The happy Ile" (P.L.II, 409-10) for "accessit insulam" (O&P, III, 96-100).

(f) hyperbaton Even among the ancients, to whom the varied arrangement of words in a sentence was a norm of linguistic usage, the use of such transposition to a marked extent was elevated to the level of a poetic figure. This too is paralleled by Milton; in, for example, "Daphne was / Root-bound, that fled Apollo" (Comus, 660-61; O&P, III, 101-102).

(g) an unclassifiable "Miltonism" Unprecedented in Latin or Greek, but stylistically valid; such is Monboddo's estimate of Milton's "virgin of Proserpina" (P.L, IX, 396; O&P, III, 100-101).

The figures discussed so far contain unorthodox grammatical constructions, but do not represent a
divergence in meaning from a non-literary expression of the same sentiment. The next type of figure which Monboddo finds in Milton, however, "figures of the sense or meaning" (O&P, III, 107), are those in which the actual meaning is altered for literary purposes:

(a) **exclamation** Compared with the second rank of classical authors, and the moderns, Milton has infrequent resort to such passionate outbursts; a noteworthy example, praised for its appropriateness, is the "0 unexampl'd love" of *Paradise Lost* III.410 (O&P,III, 108-109).

(b) **hyperbole** As in his use of exclamation, Milton displays more restraint and decorum in employing hyperbole than most moderns. Monboddo appreciates, for instance, Milton's having compared the motion of the fallen angels to distant, rather than loud, thunder, thereby producing "a sound not loud or strong, but awful" (O&P,III, 113) in contrast to the unsubtle colouring of most modern poetry.

(c) **epithet** *Paradise Lost* is a fertile source of grandiloquent description, by which Milton elevates his style to Homeric proportions, and, as Monboddo himself here points out, answers to Milton's purpose in giving "Heroic name/To Person or to Poem" (F.L. IX.40-41; O&P,III, 114, n.).

(d) **characterization** In adherence to the classificatory scheme of classical criticism, Monboddo discusses *Paradise Lost*'s characterization as a stylistic device (O&P,II, 130-132; see pp. 211-213 above).
(e) **interrogation** as instanced in the renowned "Mee though just right . . ." (O&P, III, 143-44).

(f) **simile** Milton merits praise for his similes, extended after the fashion of Homer and animated by the inclusion of human interest (O&P, III, 146-47). Monboddo writes to Baker that as far as Homer's similes are concerned "The one that comes nearest him, I think is your Milton in this as well as in other respects" (20 August 1782; MP Box 22, fol. 7/82, p. 7).

(g) **allegory** Monboddo joins in the common condemnation of the allegory of Sin and Death in *Paradise Lost* (O&P, III, 150).

Such, then, is an outline of Monboddo's views on Milton's language, mainly as manifested in *Paradise Lost*, the work to which Monboddo's critical axioms naturally lead him. However, despite Monboddo's aversion to rhyme, several MSS, especially MP 241, contain extended appraisals of Milton's shorter, rhymed poems. Monboddo finds himself in a quandary with regard to Milton's rhymed verse. On the one hand, he has the precedent of *Paradise Lost* and the other later poems, as well as Milton's diatribe against rhyme in the preface to *Paradise Lost*, to back up his numerous condemnations of the "tedious uniformity" of rhymed verse. In a letter to Baker Monboddo allies himself with Milton's verdict on rhyme, "with or without the leave of Dr Johnson" (12 December 1782; MP Box 22, fol. 7/91, pp. 4-5). At the same time, however, Monboddo is attracted to the elaborate rhyme schemes of the
earlier poems; which, representing as they do such a considerable part of Milton's output at least merit consideration of the artistry involved. But it is disapproval which is to the fore. Milton's preface to *Paradise Lost* might have been written as Monboddo's poetic manifesto, and he quotes from it with relish. He approves of Milton's distaste for both the sound of rhymed verse and its handicapping effect on fitness of expression, adding, with a typical desire for thoroughness, that the need for a terminating rhyme leads poets not only, as Milton says, to inferior expression but even to the very omission of relevant sentiments (MP 241, p. 30). The earlier MP 232 contains similar sentiments: a cancelled passage condemns this "grievous Bondage to which Poets are subjected, when instead of studying the Sense & Sentiments, & proper Ornaments of Diction, they are Obliged to beat about for Rhymes not Duetts only but Tripletts Sometimes, & even Quadruplets" (MP 232, p. 43). Monboddo's polemic stance is discernible when he takes up cudgels against his antagonist Dr. Johnson, who, says Monboddo, dismissed blank verse in favour of rhymed because he himself wrote none; against Johnson Monboddo pits Milton, "This so respectable Authority" (MP 241, p. 27). Monboddo observes that Milton is particularly opposed to the use of rhyme in long works; and this provides Monboddo with the only redeeming factor he finds in the more extended rhyming verse towards the end of *Comus*, and the *Vacation Exercise*: Milton's mature judgment in
the *Paradise Lost* preface is more to be trusted in that it is based on the author's earlier experience of the restrictive influence of rhyme. For it is plain that Monboddo was quite averse to extended rhyming, even when by Milton: "his long [rhyming verses] have that Defect which all such Verse must have . . . the regular Stop in the middle of the Verse" (p. 31). Monboddo's overall attitude to Milton's shorter poems is primarily one of regretful incredulity that one who displayed such a zeal for unrestrained action in his public life should have submitted to the severe curbs attendant on rhymed verse.

Monboddo at least condescends to dissociate himself from those who reject Milton's sonnets *in toto*: "I do not condemn them all by the Lump, as some Critics do" (MP 232, p. 41). The "Sonnet on his Blindness" is even singled out for praise, although Monboddo would have preferred a complete absence of rhyme: "That a man who was so great a Scholar and of So free a Spirit as Milton, should have subjugated himself to such a bondage, I could not have believed, if we had not evidence of it incontestable" (MP 241, p. 30). Milton's adoption of these poetic forms Monboddo attributes to tenderness of years and the influence of his peers. At the same time, however, Monboddo shows an admiration for the complexity of Milton's rhyming; sometimes grudging, sometimes flowering into a concession that rhyme is a necessary counter to the otherwise all-pervasive monotony of the English language. In MP 241, for instance, Monboddo declares the use of rhyme to be
sanctioned by the ancients; and if classical authors, having at their disposal the entire rhetorical apparatus of the ancient languages, nevertheless availed themselves occasionally of rhyme, why should a modern writer, working with the inferior material of English, disadvantage himself by avoiding it? (pp. 37-38; see too MP 232, p. 37).

The predominant tone of MP 241 is that "in his short Verses he is admirable" (p. 31). This means that while the Attendant Spirit's forays into rhyme in Comus are criticized, Monboddo is full of praise for sections in the poem identifiable as individual song units. One feels that Comus's song beginning "By dimpled Brook, and Fountain brim" (119-144) receives the Monboddo seal of approval mainly because he can force it into the mould of classical precedent, calling it "the best Anacreontic piece of Poetry that ever was written" (MP 241, p. 31; c.f. MP 232, pp. 37-38; MP 237, pp. 24-25). And in MP 238, too, Monboddo remarks that Milton "has not only varied the Numbers in different Lines of the same Piece, but also Sometimes in the same Line" (p. 44, cancelled). Monboddo finds in all the songs of Comus a similar "Doric Sweetness" (MP 241, p. 32). Having justified such verses by setting them in context against their Greek predecessors, Monboddo feels free to enlarge on their poetic qualities, commenting on Milton's alternating between iambic and trochaic metre. It is difficult to assess whether Monboddo pays sufficient attention to detail in his comments: either he is quite blind to the nuances of Milton's
scansion, or he is purposely refraining from listing all
the variations of metre in the lines he discusses. Con-
sider, for instance, his treatment of Comus's song (93-144): 
Monboddo talks as if the descriptive passage with which
the song opens is set off by its iambic metre from the
subsequent trochaic lines containing Comus's exhortation
to his followers; and that this is a conscious artistic
ploy on Milton's part. But of Monboddo's nine supposedly
iambic lines, only two are orthodox iambic tetrameters;
of the remainder, five are catalectic trochaics, and the
remaining two iambics each have an initial trochee. We
would probably be just in giving Monboddo the benefit of
the doubt, and assuming that he would not turn this wealth
of metrical permutation into a block of solidly iambic
verse; presumably he was leaving it to his reader to note
that the "iambic" lines are not all so. But we may still
query the propriety of his methods in failing to make this
explicit. (On Milton's variety of metrical feet, especi-
ally in Comus, see also O&P, IV, 271; and MP 241,pp. 9-10,
where Monboddo also records the lack of anapaeasts in
Milton's verse.) A similar ambiguity arises with respect
to L'Allegro: despite Monboddo's claim that Milton changes
to a trochaic meter "after giving the Geneology of
Euphrosyne in Jambics" (MP 241, p. 33), only eight of the
fifteen so-called iambic lines are entirely so; the rest
are either catalectic trochees, iambics with initial
trochees or full-blown trochaic tetrameters. Similarly,
the "trochaic" lines which ensue contain a fair sprinkling
of iambic tetrameters. While on the subject of Milton's minor poems, it is worth mentioning a curious passage contained in PB 28 (pp. 33-46), which, although dealing with substantially the same aspects of Milton's poetry as the MSS, is noteworthy for its mixture of insight and ignorance. Discussing Milton's use of the iamb and the trochee, Monboddo explains the type of verse to which each is suited. The iamb, due to the voice's halting on the accented syllable, has "a Stability & a certain gravity" (PB 28, p. 41) suiting it to grave topics; the trochee, on the other hand, makes for an impetuous rhythm suited to "Subjects of Pleasantry & Gayety" (pp. 41-42).

As an example of the latter of these feet in use, Monboddo quite naturally quotes the invocation of Euphrosyne's train in L'Allegro, composed "in such Numbers as make you think you see them dancing & Skipping along" (p. 44).

Throughout L'Allegro, says Monboddo, Milton resorts to trochees whenever he describes a scene of great animation. Here, however, Monboddo's critical faculties desert him: in proving that this tendency is a conscious act on Milton's part, he puts forward the indefensible notion that "in the Penseroso of which the Subject is quite different, he uses no Such measure" (p. 45). It is true that there are twice as many trochaic lines in L'Allegro as in Il Penseroso; but for Monboddo not to have found a solitary example in the latter shows only too clearly an ability to distort facts to fit his theories. Monboddo's remarks on Milton's iambic and trochaic variety are at their best when he does
not resort to close and misleading scansion, but simply makes his point in brief; as in an addition to MP 154, where he merely notes that the trochee "goes off the Tongue more glibbly" (p. 40) than the Iamb, and that both feet are put to appropriate use by Milton. However, Monboddo's remarks on the "Song. On May Morning" contain an accurate account of Milton's metrical scheme, and suggest that Monboddo simply intended his prosodic remarks on Comus and L'Allegro to be taken in the broadest possible sense: The pattern of iambic and trochaic lines in this poem is correctly identified, although Monboddo does not comment on the trochaic substitution with which the poem begins (it is unclear whether Monboddo would stipulate a similar substitution in the "Thus we salute thee . . . " of line 9, or simply read the line as an orthodox iambic pentameter). It is curious, however, that Monboddo should omit all mention of Milton's initial trochees at this juncture, when the subject would appear to demand at least an allusion to their occurrence; especially when we compare Monboddo's silence here with his praise of Milton's trochaic substitution in Origin and Progress II as "an irregularity, if it may be called one, which gives a beautiful variety to the verse" (O&P,II, 388, n.). The same criterion of variety stands here as a justification for Milton's notorious "Burnt after them to the bottomless pit."

As well as remarking on Milton's varieties of metrical feet, Monboddo also commends his manipulation of
intermixed lines of varying length, and final rhymes often set further apart than those of the orthodox couplet. By such means Milton is said to compensate for the monotony of rhymed verse. The most eminent example cited by Monboddo is the intricate a b b a c d d e e c prelude of L'Allegro and Il Penseroso (MP 241, p. 35). In Origin and Progress IV Monboddo relates these two poems to what Dionysius has to say about certain types of Greek lyric poetry containing similarly long intervals between like rhymes, which suggests that this may be another case of favouring Milton mainly for having copied the Greeks. Such highly varied verse Monboddo attests to be "rather measured prose than poetry" (O&P, IV, 267) but nevertheless prefers it to more regular types. Despite his approval of L'Allegro's rhyme scheme, however, Monboddo saw the sonnet form as taking such practices to absurd lengths. A cancelled passage in MP 232 laments Milton's having taken upon himself the straitjacket of the Italian stanza, "which cramps the Genius of the Poet so much" (p. 45). Monboddo talks as if Milton used a standard sonnet form containing "but four Rhymes making two Quadruplets and as many Duplets [sc. Triplets]" (p. 44); a claim not strictly true: fourteen of the sonnets introduce a fifth rhyme in the tercets. (See MP 237, p. 25; and p. 28, where Monboddo adds the proviso, omitted in MP 232, that "sometimes instead of 2 Triple Rhymes we have 3 Distichs" (p. 28). The mysterious numerals adorning the wrapper of MP 237
are, incidentally, explained away if we picture Monboddo poring over the 1772 Glasgow edition of the minor poems (witness the reference in MP 241, p. 26), and listing on his writing-paper the rhyming lines of a Milton sonnet: "1.4 5. 8. /2.3.6.7 /9 11.13/10 12 14.")

Monboddo believes Milton's metrical practice, like his choice of figures, to be dictated not only by the pure versifier's pursuit of melodic rhythm, but also by a desire to convey a vivid image of the object described. Hence Milton's numbers are "wonderfully suited to the Subjects he expresses" (MP 241, p. 36); a specific example occurs in the diction of L'Allegro where "the Words may be said to Dance, as well as the Persons they describe" (p. 34). Monboddo, indeed, finds one solitary example of a poet achieving a fusion of sound and sense comparable to Milton's: Dryden's Ode on St. Cecilia's Day (pp. 36-37; c.f. MP 238, p. 28).

Monboddo declines to criticize Milton's Italian poems, considering himself ill-equipped linguistically (MP 241, p. 42), but the comment on his Greek and Latin poems bestows the same praise on them as on his English. To the Volume II encomium on the elegy Ad Carolum Diodatum which concentrates on the lines containing the hyperbaton praised in MP 132, Monboddo adds in MP 241 a commendation of Milton's description of the feminine denizens of the grove frequented by the poet (p. 44). The Epitaphium Damonis is examined with respect to its ancestry, the overall plan being compared to that of Virgil's fifth Eclogue, the refrain to the eighth.
Finally, despite his distaste for such abbreviated forms as the epigram, Monboddo sees fit to praise Milton's. Monboddo sees Milton's Latin poetry as being of a high standard, despite the early age at which the bulk of it was written; and applauds its learned application of mythological trappings, "without which I think it is impossible that Poetry can be much Ornamented" (p. 44).

It is to be expected, in the light of Monboddo's high opinion of Milton's poetry, that similar praise would be lavished on the prose; as Monboddo himself has it, "it is impossible that a Man who has Succeeded So well in making Verse like to Prose, should not have written plain prose well" (MP 241, p. 45). Here and in Origin and Progress V Monboddo is conscious that he dissents from the spirit of the age in approving of Milton's prose style, which an ear tuned to the *vibriolae sententiae* of the French style will pronounce "Harsh, obscure, and perplexed" (O&P,V, 254); but, as ever, Monboddo relishes his non-conformism, holding the present unpopularity of Milton's prose style to be "no small part of its praise" (MP 241, p. 45). Part of the praise Monboddo would allot to the materials with which Milton was working; availing himself of Cicero's remarks on the excellence of Plato's Greek, Monboddo comments on Milton's language "that, if Jupiter were to speak English, he would express himself in this manner" (O&P,III, 99-100). Monboddo writes enthusiastically of reports that have reached him suggesting that the people of New England have
preserved "the language spoken in England in the days of Milton, when men both spoke and wrote better in England than they do now" (O&P, VI, 236, n.). Monboddo's method of illustrating the rhetorical balance of Milton's prose is identical to that by which he shows the excellent arrangement of the "Mee though just right . . . " speech: by providing successively downgraded rearrangements of the opening passage of Eiconoclastes, Monboddo highlights the finely balanced pace of the original (O&P, III, 51-54). For once, Monboddo is even moved to take cognizance of non-stylistic features, mentioning the "weight of matter" and "high republican spirit" of the text. A similar exercise in the fifth volume, however, reverts to a total ignoring of content, remarking only on the presence of long and short members, and "very natural cadence" of two periods from the Reason of Church-government (O&P, V, 257-59). We must conclude, nevertheless, that Milton's sentiments did in general communicate themselves to Monboddo; at any rate, it is amusing to note that in Origin and Progress IV, having despaired of instilling a regard for Milton's style in "the fashionable reader," Monboddo urges his reader "to study his Polemical writings, both Political and Theological, if not for the stile, at least for the matter" (O&P, IV, 134).

The Tractate of Education Monboddo appears to have studied with an inordinate attention to the content, not simply to the length of clauses. This is attributable to Monboddo's concern with education, which extends to a
Letter on Education (MP 121) containing remarkably modernistic sentiments on the importance of studying the classics as a means to gain an insight into a body of thought rather than as dead languages; and which is evident throughout the prosodic MSS, in Monboddo's criticism of methods of teaching the humanities in English schools. Milton's Tractate is described in MP 235 as "a grand and noble plan of Education" (p. 62), as fine a specimen of Milton's accomplishments as any of his works. From it Monboddo culled a variety of information, on matters such as the bad influence of climate on an Englishman's pronunciation (O&P, IV, 1044,n.), a sentiment sure to strike a chord in the heart of Monboddo, with his theory that all the finer aspects of language can be traced to origins in warmer climes. The Tractate is also referred to in stressing the benefits of a classical education (MP 285, p. 162). This work, too, is praised for its rhetorical qualities as well as its sentiments: in discussing English prose style in "Of the Art of Language" (PB 22), Monboddo directs the reader to the Tractate, which he holds to be "composed in long Sentences but so well composed that there is no Obscurity in it, and the form & Structure of them so varied that there is hardly one of them like another (PB 22, pp. 54-55). Particular attention is paid to Milton's parentheses, which impart variety while at the same time drawing attention to the sentiments expressed in them; Monboddo even finds fault with Toland for not marking the parentheses
as such (pp. 55-56).

As to Milton's style in Latin prose, Monboddo commends the "short commatic sentences" interspersed between the beauties of his longer periods (O&P, IV, 133-34). In Volume V a discussion of Johnson's attack on Milton's Latin in the Defensio pro Populo Anglicano degenerates into five pages of nit-picking debate on the defensibility of Milton's coining a passive participle "vapulandus" from an already passive verb. This attempt to cast aspersions on Johnson represents the low point of Monboddo's criticism, and it is ironic that this eminently forgettable smear campaign should have been conducted as part of the body of Miltonic analysis which is Monboddo's most informed and valuable contribution to English criticism.

Dryden

Monboddo's critical opinion of Dryden can be safely inferred from his general principles of versification: as one might expect, Monboddo concentrates his praise on verse in which Dryden exhibits the same beauties as are to be found in Milton's minor poems: differing lengths of verse, varied metre, and widely spaced rhymes. This naturally means that the vast bulk of Dryden's work is dismissed out of hand: in making the oft-repeated claim that rhyming verse of any substantial length is not to be tolerated, Monboddo adds that "a whole tragedy such as some of Dryden's . . . cannot be approved of by any Man
of taste" (MP 232, p. 38). The most that Monboddo is prepared to concede to Dryden's rhymed verse is that it is better than Pope's: although Dryden transgressed, like Pope, simply in adopting the couplet form, he is not so steeped in sin, since Monboddo does not find in Dryden the same unvaried, medially-divided monotony which he reads into Pope's verse. Monboddo makes this point both with respect to the prosody and the rhetorical structure of Dryden's poetry. On the one hand Dryden, compared with Pope, "has not the halt so often in the middle of the Verse as Pope"; and on the other, "there is not so much of Point & turn and Antithesis in Mr Dryden as in Pope" (p. 46). Monboddo is even prepared to allow that, within the confines of couplet verse, Dryden makes an effort to extend his syntax beyond the boundaries of each couplet, and "makes his Verses run more into One another" (p. 46) in the manner of Milton. These few remarks apart, nothing more is said by Monboddo concerning Dryden's large-scale works; and indeed Monboddo devotes all his discussion of Dryden to praise and analysis of Alexander's Feast (1697). Monboddo would no doubt have been heartened by Dryden's letter confiding to Tonson that he himself esteemed it above all his works.¹

In Origin and Progress this examination is limited to a brief account of Alexander's Feast as a "noble specimen" containing a fine variation of iambic and trochaic, along with verses of varied length (O&P, II, 400). Similarly, MP 241 asserts that only this "one

¹ British Museum Egerton MS. 2869, f. 34 (Dec. 1697).
Single Poem of Mr Dryden's" (p. 36) can hold a candle to Milton's shorter poems. It is interesting to see Monboddo, who advocated above all the fostering of a scientific adherence to systematic principles in artistic matters, praising the liberties taken in this ode, "where the Author has exempted himself from all Rules of Rhyming or Versification" (PB 22, p. 53).

MP 232, however, contains an extended commentary on the poem, closely linked to the text, running to several pages. Prior to a glance at this analysis, however, it is amusing to note that it was by way of reconsideration that Monboddo opened his eyes to the full variety of this ode. Despite his praise of the metrical variety of Alexander's Feast in Origin and Progress II, a later MS, MP 230, indicates that Monboddo subsequently reverted to a lower opinion of the poem. In a passage in MP 230 finally cancelled in the light of Monboddo's mature, and better, judgment, he talks as if there were no variety of metre in the poem: "And if this Variety [i.e. of iambic, trochaic and anapaestic intermixture] had been joined to the other two Varieties I have mentioned [i.e. of length of verse, and of rhyme distribution], in Dryden's Ode, I am persuaded it would still have been a finer Poem" (MP 230, p. 6(9)). At some point Monboddo obviously re-read Alexander's Feast and realized that the metrical variety he yearned for had in fact already been provided by Dryden himself. Compare the first (cancelled) and final versions of this passage from
later in MP 230:

I wonder our Poets in their Compositions, which they intend for Music, have not mixed all the three kinds of Verse, which I am persuaded in a Poem such as Dryden's Alexander's Feast, where various Passions were to be expressed, would have had a very good effect, And made the Ode still finer than it is.

I wonder our Poets in their Compositions, which they intend for Music have not imitated Drydens Ode on St Cecilia where all the Variety of Numbers is used that the English Language is capable of. (MP, pp. 16-17).

In MP 232 Monboddo amplifies on this statement to the extent of working through the Ode, literally line by line, giving the metrical construction of each verse in turn; a procedure which, if uninspired, at least corroborates Monboddo's claims concerning the poem's variety; indeed, so anxious is Monboddo to read all the beauties of metrical variety into the lines that he overstates his case, introducing a greater variety of feet than is strictly warranted. For example, although, quite correctly, reading "(Such is the Pow'r of mighty Love.)" (27) as an iambic verse with initial trochaic substitution, Monboddo does not treat "Flush'd with a purple Grace" (51) in similar fashion, but prefers to read it as a dactyle, a trochee and a residuous syllable. If Monboddo's interpretation of "Fallen, fallen, fallen, fallen" (77) as two spondees rather than four trochees raises suspicions that Monboddo is making things difficult for himself, these will not be allayed by his interpretation of "On the bare Earth expos'd He lyes" (82), which can be easily assimilated to the trochee-followed-by-iambs model previously
mentioned by Monboddo, as an anapaest, plus cretic, plus iamb. The lines 109-111 prompt Monboddo to new heights of inventiveness: "The Prince, unable to conceal his Pain" (109), incredibly, is said to consist of an iamb, a dactyle, an anapaest and another iamb. This leaves four unaccented syllables contiguous; which flies in the face of Monboddo's own premiss that in English prosody not even three, let alone four, unstressed syllables are placed in sequence (MP 235, pp. 20-20(1)). We must also disagree with the contorted scansion of "Gaz'd on the Fair" (110) as a trochaic dimeter; an accented "the" is distinctly unpalatable. An incidental point of note is that "Inglorious on the Plain" (140) is read as iamb-anapaest-iamb; Monboddo's prosodic instincts are in transition from a conservative policy, which would simply elide the "i" of "Inglorious" to make the verse an orthodox iambic trimeter, to one which accommodates itself to everyday pronunciation, rather than vice-versa.

Monboddo's approval of the irregular Pindaric form is paralleled by a more liberal attitude to themetrical variety it contains. This freedom of thought, however, is one which it was easy for Monboddo to abuse; as witness the scansion of "Behold how they toss their Torches on high" (143) as iamb, anapaest, antibacchius, and iamb instead of a straightforward alteration of iamb and anapaest. Similarly Monboddo substitutes a cretic in line 144 for the initial anapaest which one would normally assume to be intended in "How they point to the Persian
Abodes." Monboddo's predilection for an accented "their" (see line 143) is in evidence again later, turning a simple iambic pentameter into a tetrameter ending in an anapaest and cretic (145); line 147 is similarly complicated. By now, Monboddo has sold his soul in favour of trisyllabic feet: a verse which, earlier in this same MS, Monboddo would have read as two trochees and a residuous syllable is now labelled a trochee plus cretic (148); and an iambic trimeter (149) is metamorphosed into an amphibrach plus anapaest.

This profusion of feet is a curious indication of Monboddo's mixed feelings over matters of scansion: the same man who believed that English heroic verse is strictly decasyllabic and iambic is prepared to transgress the boundaries of reasonableness to laud the presence of imagined cretics and amphibrachs in verse which terminological economy, if nothing else, demands should be viewed in terms of more common disyllabic feet.

The licence Monboddo here displays in his scansion can sometimes be seen as a quite valid reaction against a too rigid metrical system, and indeed gives some insight into contemporary pronunciation (or at least Monboddo's own!). Less pardonable are Monboddo's undeniable errors. By no stretch of the imagination can line 74 be read, as I understand Monboddo to read it, "Soft Pity to infuse." Such considerations might lead one to conclude that Emily Cloyd's opinion that this account is "a remarkably fine thing of its kind" (Cloyd, p. 150) is
rather an overstatement. Miss Cloyd appears to have noticed only one of the peculiarities of Monboddo's analysis, remarking that his reading of line 51 "has at least the merit of singularity" (Cloyd, p. 152, n.), but fails to comment on, for instance, his misreading of the iambic line 53 as trochaic. No mention is made of such slips, either, in the Kinsleys' Critical Heritage volume, which reprints selections from Dr. Cloyd's transcripts of MP 232. ¹

It would be unfair, however, to dismiss Monboddo's criticism; his analysis of the ode amply substantiates his original claims concerning Dryden's variety, as well as making several perceptive points. He notes, for example, that the longest line of the poem, "And thrice He routed all his Foes; and thrice He slew the slain" (68) is a fitting vehicle to express "the vain, tedious boasting of the King" (MP 232, p. 70). And a fruitful result of Monboddo's syllable-counting is his observation that the seventh and final section of the ode is, though retaining a variety of length of verse, entirely iambic. The result of this, as Monboddo says, is to establish a "plainer and simpler" (p. 79) finale to the sustained cadenza of the main body of the poem. There is more sympathy with the poet's intent here than is shown by Dr. Johnson, who notices that "His last stanza has less

emotion than the former" ("Dryden," Lives, II, 176) without registering any awareness that this might be the result of conscious endeavour on Dryden's part. A similar proneness to mistake artifice for artistic falling-off is exhibited earlier in Johnson's "Life": the single unrhymed lines which Monboddo approved of as being conducive to a type of poetry "more pleasant to my ear than any regular versification we have" (O&P, IV, 267) Johnson views as one of the poet's "negligences," and "a defect" (Lives, II, 176). Johnson views it as a case of critical imperceptiveness in himself that he failed for so long to notice Dryden's unrhymed lines; Monboddo sees it as a pleasing, and intended, part of the ode's overall effect that "the ear hardly ... discovers that some of the lines do not rhyme at all with any other" (O&P, IV, 267).

In one respect, however, Monboddo and Johnson are, for once, in critical accord: both assent to the general consensus of opinion that Dryden's ode outshines Pope's offering on the same subject. Monboddo's verdict is that Pope's Ode on St. Cecilia's Day is "much inferior to Mr Dryden both in Sentiments and Diction, and also in Variety of Versification" (MP 252, p. 81); and he finds only six lines meriting commendation. Johnson awards the palm in similar fashion, attributing to the historical basis of Dryden's ode its superior emotional impact to Pope's ("Pope," Lives, IV, 178). Joseph Warton, writing at the same time as Monboddo was formulating his poetical credo, also praises the abrupt transitions in tone of
Dryden's ode. Monboddo's preoccupation with this small corner of Dryden's poetic output occurs at a time when poets and would-be poets, spurred on by the example of such as Gray and Collins, were adopting the ode as a suitable form for the emotional and sublime sentiments they wished to poeticize; his discussion of Alexander's Feast is a more than usually detailed catalogue of the poetic effects such would-be Pindars found at their disposal.

Shaftesbury

Monboddo's admiration for Shaftesbury's work is confined mainly to An Inquiry concerning Virtue and The Moralists; the other treatises he considers to be "of a loose desultory kind" and "with too great a profusion and Luxuriance even of the best Words" (MP 267, p. 1). One might have expected the same criticism to be levelled against The Moralists; but instead Monboddo bestows the highest praise on it. The dialogues of Plato provide a classical precedent which Monboddo sees as sanctioning the style of ornate philosophical dialogue which Shaftesbury adopted for this work. Monboddo holds The Moralists to be more than a piece of mere didacticism: because the work contains a narrative plot against which the philosophical argumentation of Theocles and Philocles is set, it satisfies one of Aristotle's criteria for poetry: a fable. For this reason, concludes Monboddo, "it is truely a Dramatic Piece . . . and considered as a peice
of Poetry, I think it is most Beautifull: Nor do I know any thing of the kind, in modern times, nearly equal to it" (MP 267, p. 2).

For once, too, Monboddo is prepared to sanction a departure from classical precedent, by approving of Shaftesbury's having spread the action of his work over three days rather than the over-compressed single day within which Plato restricts the debate of The Republic (MP 272, p. 3). The strict adherence to the time limit of a day which Monboddo elsewhere demands of works in dialogue is here inapplicable: this, "as it is not written for the Stage, is certainly no Fault" (p. 3). This longer time-span enables Shaftesbury to ring the changes in his settings, which are, for example, "agreeably changed from the Fields and Philosophicall Conversation, to a Dinner with a few friends" (p. 7; see also p. 32).

Monboddo's conclusion is that "There is a Variety too Sufficient in the Characters as well as the Incidents, and they are all Suited to the Subject of the Piece, & excellently well kept up" (p. 32). At the same time, in keeping with the principle of uniformity amidst variety, Monboddo observes that his author "by keeping the Principall Question allways in View . . . has . . . preserved perfectly the Unity of his Piece" (p. 32).

Although Monboddo was quite prepared to defend the appropriateness of Theocles' raptures against the strictures of Pope (see p. 280 below), it is clear that Monboddo's allegiance to The Moralists came close to
faltering when confronted with the exuberance of Theocles' rhapsodies. Monboddo draws a definite distinction between the conversational and rhapsodic portions of the dialogue, adding that Shaftesbury excels more in the style of the former, which is admirably suited to the characters despite "a little redundancy of Words" (p. 33), though less so than in the other sections of the Miscellaneies.

As to the more ornamented style of Theocles' rhapsodies, Monboddo explains this by asserting that Theocles is "in Some Degree inspired" (pp. 16-17), and that "all Enthusiasm & rapturous Passion of every kind, Speaks in a Language much above common Stile" (p. 33). Monboddo adopted from Dionysius of Halicarnassus the precept that the successful writer introduces into prose the beauties of verse, and vice versa (this being the basis of his praise of Milton); and in these rhapsodies, says Monboddo, Shaftesbury has taken this principle to its limits, having introduced, along with its "loose Numbers," "as much Rythme as our Language will admitt in Prose" (p. 17). Such practice must not be sustained, says Monboddo: "if it had continued very long, I should have thought the Piece too Uniform" (p. 17). Monboddo's considered verdict, however, is that the style of the rhapsodies is, though "very high & professedly Poeticall," nevertheless "far from being bombast" (p. 33).

Monboddo finds in Shaftesbury a kindred spirit, one who sought to stem the tide of modern materialism by an appeal to the spirituality of Platonism. This explains
the unbounded praise of Monboddo's declaration that
*The Moralists* is "the greatest Work of Genius & the
Sublimest Philosophy which this Age has produced" (p. 33).
As so often, Monboddo relishes the gulf between his lone
stance and that of the literary majority: the work is
"too Sublime I doubt to be understood in this Age, which
is the reason that it is So much neglected & undervalued"
(pp. 33-34).

The importance of the *Inquiry* for Monboddo's own
aesthetic theory I have demonstrated in Ch. 2. Both the
*Inquiry* and *The Moralists* are amply praised in *Origin and
Progress* IV, in terms comparable to those I have quoted
from the MSS. Here, too, Monboddo records the principal
fault he finds in Shaftesbury, "the too great freedom
which he has used with religion," although this is partly
excused by "the arrogance and high stile of authority,
which was assumed by some churchmen of those days" (*O&P*,
IV, 385; c.f. *O&P*,III, 285, n.).

Among other poets, we find in Monboddo some famil-
arity with Butler; Monboddo's disapproval of rhyme is
toned down sufficiently for him to concede that "those
double and uncommon rhymes, which Butler and Swift have
used with so much success" (*O&P*,II, 391) are an effective
source of humour in light verse (c.f. *O&P*,III, 313-14;
MP 154, p. 29).

It is worth noting that Monboddo's admiration for
Dryden does not blind him to the cogent criticism of
that writer in Buckingham's *The Rehearsal* (1671), a play which Monboddo refers to with obvious relish: "There is one Species of Poetry, which has a very intimate Connection with Vanity, the predominant passion of this Age, I mean the burlesque and the Ridiculous, which has been much cultivated in Modern times, but more I think in England than any where else. Of this kind we have several admirable Poems, such as the *Rehearsal*, which, at the same time that it is exceedingly ridiculous, is the best piece of Criticism in English" (MP 277, p. 46). Similar praise is bestowed in *Origin and Progress* III, where Monboddo notes especially the dramaturgic skill of Buckingham's having placed Bayes, the caricature of Dryden, along with two other spectators of his play, "one of whom flatters him, and the other contradicts and finds fault with him; - the way, of all others, the most proper to make a fool show himself" (O&P, III, 78).

It is not difficult to see why Monboddo found *The Rehearsal* so congenial. The English heroic drama as practised by Dryden, and as caricatured by Buckingham, draws on both the grandiose excesses of Marlowe and the French classical theatre, traditions for neither of which Monboddo had much affection. The dramatic practices ridiculed by Buckingham are for the most part exactly those which Monboddo himself criticizes: the pursuit of novelty as an end in itself; resorting to personal fancy rather than nature; the use of Gallicisms to display "breeding"; insufficient attention to the unity and
development of a plot; and, needless to say, rhyme. Monboddo's comments on the shortcomings of Bayes' dramatic principles reflect the aesthetic propounded in Monboddo's own theoretical writings. Bayes' intention to secure variety by juxtaposing a funeral with a dance is criticized by Monboddo in *Origin and Progress* III (p. 77); in one of the MSS this criticism of unchecked variety is reconciled with Monboddo's comments elsewhere that variety is in fact one of the cardinal literary virtues: "Tho' Variety is absolutely necessary to make Language or any Work of Art beautiful, yet even Variety requires that there should be Sometimes a Similarity by way of change for Mr Bayes Rule that there should not be any One thing like another, is not a good Rule of Writing, any more than that every thing should be like another" (MP 237, p. 23). Similarly, although Monboddo is ever eager to applaud scenes which uplift or agitate the mind, he nevertheless condemns Bayes' efforts "to elevate and surprise," on the grounds that in Bayes's case this is to be accomplished by mere ostentation of language, "which is any thing but plain and natural" (O&P,III, 215). An example of what Monboddo has in mind occurs later in the same volume: lambasting one of the more purple passages from Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, Monboddo declares "So common a thought, so dressed and adorned, makes what Mr Bayes calls a stile that elevates and surprises" (O&P,V, 280).

Passing references to two other writers can be included
to illustrate the range of Monboddo's reading: Monboddo has evidently read Roscommon's *Essay on Translated Verse* (1684), and agrees with his opinion of Homer, as well as wrongly attributing to him a line in praise of Falstaff which is actually from Mulgrave's *Essay upon Poetry* (1682).

(c) The *Augustan Age*

**Pope**

Monboddo's criticism of Pope provides a rare opportunity to compare Monboddo's mature methods with the approach he adopted as a young man. It will have been observed that Monboddo's concern with the literary and linguistic topics which became such an obsession with him sprang up, quite unheralded, in the 1760's, and continued with accelerating fervour until his death in 1799. It will also be evident that the vast bulk of Monboddo's purely literary MSS are concerned with matters of style. This being so, several pages on Pope's "morall Epistles" (BF MSS 13, pp. 20-22, 36-38) stand out in marked contrast to Monboddo's later Pope criticism, both chronologically and in content. The only clue to the exact date of this volume is a reference to an author "whose Book is printed in the year 1737" (p. 85), a choice of phrase which might be taken to imply that the year in question is a recent one. At any rate, the hand is obviously an early one. For some reason the sections of
Volume 13 dealing with Pope are not included in the index appended to the volume by Kirkpatrick Williamson. One wonders whether this was because Monboddo's later methods of literary assessment had developed, during the gap between writing and cataloguing, along lines quite contrary to those exhibited in this MS, and that these early views did not even merit inclusion in the list of contents when this volume came to be indexed. This exposition of the Moral Epistles is nothing more than a prose résumé, devoid of any comment on poetic aspects; indeed, there is no indication that Monboddo is even discussing poetry. The contrast with Monboddo's later work could not be more complete. The discussion is limited to a recapitulation of the philosophical principles underpinning the Epistles, which Monboddo apparently accepts wholesale.

At a transitional stage between this early moralizing and the later Pope criticism in Origin and Progress is MP 159, Illustratns. of Aristotle's Topicks, which contains some slight criticism of the deficiencies of Pope's characters. In accordance with the principles later set out in Origin and Progress III, 124-128, Monboddo draws a distinction between poetic description of character (a narrative account of personality traits) and imitation (a dramatic enactment giving a character scope for self-revelation of his thoughts and emotions). Applying this distinction to Pope, Monboddo claims "Some reputed Poets are in this respect no better than Historians, for Example Mr Pope in his Satires and Epistles
has described many Characters in a very Lively Witty Manner, but So far as I remember neither there nor in any other Part of his Works has he imitated Any" (MP 159, p. 21). (A cancellation made, in the Origin and Progress years, to the latter half of this passage reaches the kinder verdict that "he has imitated Characters only in the Rape of the Lock, Dunciad and some Satires, which he has imitated from Horace and one or two of his own invention.") Even here it is evident that Monboddo is turning his attention from the content of the poems to the poet's methods of composition. But it is not until the Origin and Progress years that we can witness Monboddo's critical antennae displaying full responsiveness to Pope's poetic techniques, and finding, as one might deduce from the general prosodic principles with which Monboddo associated himself, only an unchanging monotony of composition.

Monboddo's antipathy to Pope's versifying developed from the late 1770's onwards. In 1776 he is prepared to make the statement, hardly a radical one, that Pope "has carried the rhyming versification, in English, to the highest point of perfection" (O&P,III, 112, n.). But the ensuing years saw a quiet but significant reorientation in the critical evaluation of Pope by critics, which took the form not of iconoclastic dispraise, but rather an awareness that the critical values that had established Pope as the representative Augustan poet were not necessarily at one with those of the present
generation of poets and critics. Joseph Warton's essay on Pope served to praise Pope, not to bury him; but is nevertheless imbued with the notion of Pope as an accomplished versifier rather than as the repository of all the poetic virtues which was his accepted image. By the 1780's, at least one sector of the poetic audience wished to be awed by the sublimity of a Milton (or surrogate) rather than lulled into laughter by polished couplets.

While this is true as far as the more modish minds of the age are concerned, it must still be stressed that for the more conservative late-century reader Pope continued unassailable in his tenure of the first rank among poets. Such a reader would hold that Pope, having perfected the technical art of the iambic couplet, was thereby another Alexander with no more worlds to conquer. It is precisely this view of Pope's couplet art as smooth, unobtrusive and unquestionably praiseworthy which Monboddo sets out to counter.

That this polarization of opinion on Pope into two schools is clearly discernible even to the eighteenth century writers themselves is attested to by Vicesimus Knox, who perceives differences of opinion over Pope as part of a more general split in critical circles. Writing in 1782, Knox notes that "the admirers of English poetry are divided into two parties . . . On one side, are the lovers and imitators of Spenser and Milton; and on the other, those of Dryden, Boileau, and Pope"
(Essays Moral and Literary (New Edition, 1782), II, 186-7; reprinted in John Barnard, ed., Pope: The Critical Heritage (London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973)). The poetic characteristics favoured by each group can be sketched in thus: on the one hand, an archaic and ornate diction, and a tendency to rich description and emotive lyric; on the other, a style clipped, urbane, and neoclassical in the French vein. One need only point to Dr Johnson's presence at the head of the ranks of the orthodox to imply that Monboddo is to be sought in the camp of the apostates.

The 1789 instalment of the Origin and Progress sets out in brief the depths to which Monboddo's opinion of Pope had by then sunk: regular rhymes, along with regularly-spaced pauses, between half-lines, lines and couplets, combine to produce "a disgusting uniformity and sameness" (O&P, V, 468). It is substantially these sentiments which are enlarged on in the unpublished MSS.

In MP 237 Monboddo sets out to explain just why it is that Pope's verse should have such a constant medial pause (pp. 18-21); his rather simplistic account is that the voice naturally halts at the end of each verse, and cannot cover ten successive syllables without a halt at the mid-point. In Pope's poetry such a pause is "So constant and regular that it is needless to give examples of it" (p. 19). This explanation is put forward, too, in MP 232, this time with specific reference to Pope's expression of filial piety in the Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot:
"our ear always expects a chime at the end of the Verse, and not being able to run it on without some stop, we naturally halt about the half way" (p. 56). Here, too, Monboddo puts forward the thesis that it is quite impossible to combine rhyme and rhetorical sentence structures of some magnitude: enjambment eliminates the terminating pause which must be prominent if the rhyme is to be noticed; the result being, in Monboddo's phrase, that "there would not be stops sufficient at the end of the Verse to make us perceive the Clink" (pp. 56-57). The same lines afford Monboddo an opportunity for practical criticism in MP 241, pp. 23-25, where Monboddo makes it clear that one source of his objection to Pope's caesural pause is its tendency to cut across syntactic divisions. Hence the subject and its verb are unnaturally separated in Monboddo's slightly rewritten version of "Me, let the tender Office long engage" (408); and accusative and genitive are split asunder by the pause in "To rock the Cradle of reposing Age" (409).

These, then, are the sentiments held by Monboddo concerning Pope's rhyming art, and which underlie his occasional grudging admission that among iambic couplets Pope's are good of their kind. Even this infrequent praise is often tinged with irony, as in the following back-hand compliment: "Variety is so essential to the Beauty of Writing, that even disagreeable Sounds now and then please, And a continual flow of Sweet Sounds makes what we call a Sing-Song, not unlike a great deal of
Mr Pope's Rhyming Verse" (MP 132, p. 112(2)). MP 230 amplifies on this view: "I admit that Mr Pope's Verse is very smooth, and if you will flowing, but it is a flow which to my Ear is very like Sing-Song" (p. 6(7)). Indeed, Monboddo can only approve of such verse when it is employed to satirize an over-indulgence in mellifluous versifying. For this reason Monboddo praises Pope's imitation of such poetry in the Epistle to Augustus (29-32). Monboddo remarks, wickedly but shrewdly, that Pope's satire here recoils on itself: despite the critical intent of Pope's lines, "almost all he has written has more or less of that same sweet flow as he calls it" (MP 230, p. 6(7). As a typical example of Pope's 'sing-song' style Monboddo cites the Epistle to Robert Earl of Oxford.

It has been observed in the chapter on Monboddo's general prosodic doctrine that he believes the adoption of the couplet style necessarily circumscribes the range of syntactic variation available to the poet. Monboddo accordingly holds that in Pope's poetry in particular "the Structure and Composition of the Language is not sufficiently varied" (MP 230, p. 6(7)). In terms of individual syntactic figures, Monboddo comments in MP 132 on Pope's excessive use of antithesis, only one of the compositional devices used by Pope in the translation of Homer which misrepresent the spirit of the original, Homer having "less of that Witty Figure than any Author I know" (MP 132, pp. 154-155; see also O&P, III, 175).
In Origin and Progress III, Monboddo has occasion to remark that Pope's style, being so distinctive, is easily imitated (O&P, III, 175), and refers to Isaac Hawkins Browne's popular lines on tobacco, in imitation of Pope, "which were published in a Magazine about forty years ago, and which, I have been told, affected Mr Pope more sensibly than any thing that ever was written against him" (p. 175; the magazine in question is actually the London Evening Post, December 2, 1735). Monboddo thus builds up in the published works some support for his claims that Pope's art boils down to a small number of much-used stylistic devices; and it is to be expected that he should return to the topic of Browne's imitation in the intended volume on poetry. Accordingly we find Monboddo, in MP 232, writing that the "Point & turn and Antithesis" which relegates Pope to a rung beneath Dryden "has been very well imitated & I think ridiculed, tho' I believe that was not meant, by the Author of the Verses upon Tobacco" (p. 46; see, too, MP 230, p. 6(7)).

On the credit side, the rhetorical questions heralding the renowned portrait of Sporus in the Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot (305-308) "make his Versification there more than commonly beautifull" (MP 230, p. 6(7)).

With scant regard for any suggestion of paradox, Monboddo, the arch-enemy of rhymed verse, decides, on the grounds of Homeric precedent, that when the rhymes are internal as well as at line endings, their presence becomes a device conducive to variety rather than a bane,
giving "an agreeable relief to the Ear by varying a Little the Chimes of the Rhymes" (p. 6(7)). Monboddo cites an example from the *Epilogue to the Satires*, Dialogue II; transcription of the full couplet alluded to by Monboddo will clarify the point:

Point she to Priest or Elder, Whig or Tory,  
Or round a Quaker's Beaver cast a Glory.  

(96-97).

In view of what he sees as these radical faults in Pope's style, Monboddo proposes a rethinking of critical opinion concerning Pope, transferring attention from the style to the content of his writings: "The Merit therefore of Pope's Poetry is not as is generally believed the Versification but the Sentiments and likewise the diction" (MP 230, p. 6(7)). This praise of Pope's sentiments seems to a large extent based on Monboddo's reaction to the sentimental picture of Pope as maternal guardian in the *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot*, which Monboddo thought "some of the finest Lines, which I think Mr Pope ever wrote" (MP 241, p. 23), and which gives Monboddo "an high Opinion of his heart as well as of his Genius" (MP 232, p. 56). This preference is interesting, suggesting as it does that Monboddo was quite willing to play the man of feeling when appropriate, accepting wholesale the image of righteous piety which Pope here portrays. Such intimations of nobility of thought and expression constitute Pope's saving grace in Monboddo's eyes: "by this Censure of Mr Pope," he writes, after tearing Pope's prosody to shreds, "I would not be understood to condemn his Writings altogether" (MP 241, p. 28).
Alongside Pope's sentiments Monboddo lists the poet's diction as a commendable ingredient in his style; but here too Monboddo's praise is guarded. Just as Monboddo could only approve of Pope's rhythmic smoothness when it was being employed for satirical purposes, so too he holds that Pope's artificially heightened diction is properly employed not in the translation of Homer's pristine simplicity, but in mock-heroic; the conscious mis-matching of matter and expression in The Rape of the Lock and The Dunciad evoked an enthusiastic response in Monboddo. This evaluation of the relative merits of Pope's works is not, of course, one with which many modern readers would wish to quarrel; and to realize that Monboddo's opinions are in any way out of the ordinary we must compare the enormous contemporary popularity of Pope's Homer with the disparagement shown it in certain quarters in the latter half of the century, not only by Monboddo but by others such as Cowper. In Origin and Progress III, Monboddo latches on to Pope's use of hyperbole to demonstrate, choosing most effective examples, how Pope expands Homer's strong, plain poetry into over-inflated bombast. Homer's ἐὰν ἐπαύζῃ ἡμέρα (Iliad IV.451) reaches absurd proportions in Pope's "With streaming blood the slippery fields are dy'd, /And slaughter'd heroes swell the dreadful tide" (O&P, III, 111, n.). Monboddo's receptivity to the condensed economy of Homeric poetry is readily understandable in the light of the many pages he devotes in his MSS to the genesis and art of Homer's language. In
MP 230, Of the Language and Stile of Homer, Monboddo's treatment of his main subject is interrupted constantly by reference to modern poets, whom Monboddo values insofar as they adhere to the principles of Homer's art. Not surprisingly, Pope comes off badly: Pope's versification and diction are "very ill-suited for the translation of Homer," on the grounds that Homer's are "wonderfully various and at the same time very simple" (MP 230, p. 6(7)). Not only is Pope's diction pompous, he has also committed the sin of using rhyme not as an ornament of lyric, but as the mainstay of a prolonged work; and "a long heroic Poem, such as Pope's translation of Homer... cannot be approved of by any Man of taste" (MP 232, p. 38; see also p. 15).

The other branch of Monboddo's Pope criticism is concerned with a complementary praise of Pope's mock-heroic, for the reasons outlined above: by dressing low matter in lofty style, the poet not only brings effective ridicule on his subject, but also elevates to the level of acceptability affairs which would otherwise be too low for the discerning reader. Speaking of the Dunciad in MP 230, Monboddo comments that Pope "has heighten'd the Ridicule very much by the Images & descriptions he has taken from the true Heroic poems of the Iliad & Aeneid" (MP 230, p. 6(7); the text indicates that it was intended to insert appropriate examples of such allusion). In Origin and Progress III similar examples are in fact provided: Monboddo quotes Curll's reaction to Dulness's tapestry
(II.143-44), evidently assuming on the part of the reader an awareness that it corresponds to Aeneas's vision of Troy in Juno's temple; and the augury of Ward's fame (III. 138-40) based on the mourning of the countryside for Umbro in Aeneid VII.759-60 (O&P,III, 111, n.).

This classical allusion, Monboddo notes, is supplemented by a suitably Latinate diction and turn of phrase. Monboddo's compliments to Pope on this topic are double-edged: while affirming that Pope is adept at manufacturing pseudo-Virgilian phrases, Monboddo also implies that such false art came naturally to Pope; hence, in MP 230: "This too Splendid & Over-pompous Stile of Mr Pope makes him the best Poet of the ridiculous and burlesque kind that is Extant" (MP 230, p. 6(7)). In MP 232 Monboddo, invoking yet again the Aristotelian stipulation that a poem must have a fable, goes as far as to say that only The Rape of the Lock and The Dunciad among Pope's works are true poems (p. 12). In MP 277, entitled Of the Love of Money but encompassing wide-ranging comment on ancient and modern society, Monboddo holds of the Dunciad that "tho' the Subject be the lowest and filthiest imaginable, yet he has raised it so much with the heroic pomp of Language and Imagry, that he has made it most highly ridiculous, and the best thing in my opinion he ever wrote" (MP 277, p. 46). This passage is closely paralleled in MP 232, where Monboddo goes on to voice his preference for Pope's mock-epic over the burlesque methods associated with Scarron and Cotton, which employ a low style to
detract from the status of a noble subject (MP 232, pp. 12-13). The only subject of Dunciad satire to which Monboddo takes exception is Shaftesbury: Pope's association of Shaftesbury with those taking the "high priori Road" (a route well trodden by Monboddo himself), by representing a "gloomy Clerk" who combines freethinking with a liking for "that bright Image... Which Theocles in raptur'd vision saw" (Dunciad IV.487-88), does not amuse him. In a defence of Shaftesbury's writings (MP 267, Of the Philosophy of Lord Shaftesbury) Monboddo voices his admiration for the high-flown enthusiasm of The Moralists, saying "in the Rapsody it is carried much farther, to a height that has been endeavoured to be ridiculed by no less an Author than Mr Pope, as quite visionary, tho' it certainly is no more so than the Philosophy of Plato" (MP 267, p. 2). Theocles Monboddo admits to be "a singular Character" (MP 272, p. 1), but one whose enthusiastic outbursts are validated by the lofty nature of their themes. Theocles' sentiments are not those of "a Religious Enthusiast of the ordinary kind," or of "a common Lover" (p. 1), or even of a mere man of taste. Instead, the object of his contemplation is "Nature & the great Author of Nature the Source of all Beauty & Perfection" (p. 2). Theocles is therefore not the crazed enthusiast portrayed in the Dunciad, but comports himself as befits the true lover of knowledge: "however Strange Such a Character may Seem, & even ridiculous as Mr Pope would make it appear, it is no other than the Character of a
perfect Philosopher of an exalted Genius" (p. 2; c.f. O&P, IV, 384).

MP 277, from which the above praise of the Dunciad is quoted, sheds interesting light on Monboddo's estimate of Pope's rank among poets. Just as Joseph Warton points out that Pope's poetic achievements are confined to the lower poetic genres, so too Monboddo sees Pope's instinctive feel for satire rather than epic as symptomatic of modern degeneracy. This point would no doubt have been made in greater detail in a portion of MP 274, Of the Restoration of Letters, of which only a synopsis now remains (MP Box 18, B56, pp. 431-438). These notes show this MS to have been a "progress report" on the state of modern literature, naming Italy as the present home of the Muses, and lamenting that, the present climate being inconducive to the production of epic, our poetry excels most at the more vulgar forms, Pope's two best poems being of that type.

Monboddo's dislike for prolonged rhyming, coupled with a rejection, on Aristotelian grounds, of poetry not based on a fictitious plot, conspire to produce a marked antipathy to the Essay on Man. In the first place, Monboddo judges Pope's philosophical work as Aristotle judges Empedocles' scientific writings in Poetics I: it is improper to label as a poet one who simply versifies technical matter. In a comparison with Empedocles, in fact, Pope fares even worse: Empedocles' work was his own, but "Mr Pope's Ethic Epistles were a Translation
from the Prose of my Lord Bolingbroke, which Old Lord Bathurst told me he saw" (MP 232, p. 14).

This remark by Monboddo incidentally serves to corroborate another report of Bathurst's having confided to an acquaintance that Pope had recourse to a prose work by Bolingbroke in writing An Essay on Man. Charles Henry Parry quotes, in his Memoir of the Revd. Joshua Parry (1872) a letter from Bathurst to Parry to the effect that Bolingbroke gave Pope "a dissertation in prose, which gave Pope the scheme he pursued, and turned into that fine poem" (Parry, pp. 301-302; quoted in a note by George Sherburn on Pope's Essay, Philological Quarterly 12 (1933), 402). That Pope had to hand "very large prose collections on the happiness of contentment" when composing the Essay is attested to by Joseph Spence; the probable use that Pope made of prose materials is a topic further pursued by George Sherburn in "Pope at Work," in Essays on the Eighteenth Century Presented to David Nichol Smith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1945), pp. 49-64. But, as Maynard Mack points out in his introduction to the Twickenham edition of the Essay, one's natural supposition that any MS materials supplied to Pope by Bolingbroke would be of a piece with his published works leads one to

1 Observations, Anecdotes, and Characters of Books and Men, ed. Osborn, 310, I, 158. On Bathurst's frequent relation of the anecdote to Hugh Blair and Joseph Warton, see Observations II, 632 (Appendix B to 310).

2 Works, ed. Butt, III-i, xxvi-xxxi.
the conclusion that they are likely to have been of use to Pope only in Epistle IV. This makes Monboddo's contention that Pope's essay is a mere "prose translation" from an original by Bolingbroke appear as a gross distortion of any information likely to have been confided to him by Bathurst. (Monboddo does seem to have been on terms of some intimacy with Bathurst: MP 62, Comparison betwixt Man in his Natural State, And Man Civilized, uses an anecdote concerning the temperament of savages which Bathurst related to Monboddo (pp. 8(2)-8(3))).

Tracing the source of the Essay also provides Monboddo with another ground for complaint: bearing in mind Monboddo's devotion to his task, in Antient Metaphysics, of reintroducing Aristotelian philosophy, it is not surprising that the ethics of a mere modern should receive only disparagement: "No good System of Philosophy," declares Monboddo, "could be expected from the Quarter from whence that Essay came" (MP 232, p. 47); adding, by way of appeasement, "tho' there are no Doubt very Shining passages in it." Shining enough, indeed, to lodge in Monboddo's mind, and to reappear in sundry quotations throughout his works.

But although reinforced by an aversion to the principles it contains, Monboddo's main objections to the Essay on Man are the usual stylistic ones: "if the System were ever So good, I could not be reconciled to Arguments tagged with Rime, or a Series of Philosophicall Reasoning carried on in Metaphors Antitheses, Points & Turns" (MP 232, p. 47).
Such, then, is the scope of Monboddo's Pope criticism; a body of opinion more remarkable for its limitations than for its insights. Monboddo's remarks serve to remind us that a critic is often at his least appreciative when considering the art of the era immediately prior to his own. On the other hand, Pope and Monboddo are on equal footing in their responsiveness to classical allusion; Pope could scarcely have hoped for a reader more receptive to the nuances of Homeric and Virgilian parallel than Monboddo, and consequently Monboddo's feel for Pope's mock-heroic is full-blooded and perceptive. And it is Monboddo's first-hand acquaintance with Homer in the original that leads him away from Pope's ill-matched translation towards the satires and mock-heroic; a preference shown by many later-century critics, few of whom would have been able to base their preference on such a firm classical basis as Monboddo.

**Swift**

Because Monboddo defined poetry with reference to its content rather than its style, he had no qualms about describing novels as poetry, and I follow his lead in including Monboddo's comment on Swift and Fielding in a chapter on poetic criticism.

Monboddo's allegiance to Dionysius of Halicarnassus provided him with a basic division of literary style into three main types: the simple, ornamented and middle styles. Swift's main achievement, in Monboddo's eyes,
was to have brought to perfection the first of these. Monboddo's concern with grammatical matters means that in assessing any author he is more likely to take stock of the syntactic and stylistic complexity of his writings than the content. This technique is applied to Swift in the first instance too, and Monboddo's initial conclusion is that he "does not diversify sufficiently the structure of his language" (O&P, III, 179), which bodes ill for a subsequent appraisal of Swift which will do justice to his position as the most devastating satiric force of his age. But Monboddo happily diverts his attention to the positive consequences of Swift's choice of style, rather than dismissing him out of hand, by continuing "and therefore the style, in which he chiefly excells . . . is the simple style, where very little variety of composition is required" (O&P, III, 179). Later in Volume III Monboddo enlarges on his remarks, applying them in particular to Gulliver's Travels, and showing that it is due to the narrative's being "wonderfully plain and simple, minute likewise, and circumstantial" (O&P, III, 195) that the reader's interest is held and his disbelief suspended. Monboddo notes that "the character of an English sailor is finely kept up in it" (O&P, III, 195), recognizing Swift's construction of the satiric persona of Gulliver whose deceptively plain description of the events he witnesses belies the thrust of Swift's satire. Monboddo distinguishes two effects of Swift's manipulation of the simple style: the air of reality imparted by finely-detailed
description, so great that the Travels "imposed upon many when they were first published" (O&P, III, 196); and "the hidden satire" and "grave ridicule" which turn a travelogue into an indictment of mankind.

These pages of Origin and Progress III devoted to Swift appeared in 1776, and are alluded to in the unpublished MS MP 132, where Monboddo notes "we are much more disposed to believe a particular circumstantial Narrative than a general one" (MP 132, p. 191). Monboddo continues "This Virtue of Stile [i.e. credibility] Doctor Swift in his Gulliver's Travels has shown in a very remarkable way: for as I have elsewhere Observed he has made the narrative of his Monstrous Stories more Credible by the simplicity of his Stile, and the Minute circumstances of his Narrative than many a true history."

Swift's combination of feigned simplicity and underlying venom is commented on in MP 277: "And there is Gulliver's Travels, in which the Ridicule is still finer, because it is more concealed by a Simplicity of Stile, such as made many people believe that it was a true Narrative" (MP 277, p. 46). The fictional worlds of Gulliver's Travels even entered into Monboddo's own thinking: he defends the beneficence of nature in making men mortal by inviting his reader to consider the unhappiness which would result if "any one individual of the Species was like the Strulbrugs of Dr. Swift, condemned to live for ever" (MP 267, Of the Philosophy of Lord Shaftsbury, p. 9).

As often happens, Monboddo is aware of a discrepancy
between the style he is commending and the taste of the age, claiming that "This plain style is not . . . much used in our prose compositions, and is altogether out of fashion in our verse" (O&P,III, 197). This does not stop him, however, from maintaining that "Dr Swift is at the head of all that Class of Writers [i.e. satirists], because he had more Sense and knowledge of the World than any of them, and a great deal of Genius too,"; concluding, with the introduction of a moral vein, "which I am sorry he should have applied upon such Mean Subjects" (MP 277, pp. 46-47).

These reservations about the more scatological portions of Gulliver's Travels display Monboddo's misgivings as to the poetical eminence of Swift. Quoting the ancients' maxim that no man was equipped to write both the nobler tragic or epic and the less elevated comedy, Monboddo opines that Swift "very wisely, in my opinion, forbore to attempt either tragedy or heroic" (O&P,III, 314), gravely delivering the judgment that Swift is no "sublime genius." Monboddo shares his age's antipathy for the presentation of base subject matter no matter how moral the intent: he would have preferred Swift's ridicule "if it had been more cleanly" (O&P,III, 314), and quotes Cicero to the effect that the censure of depravity must not itself be depraved.

On the whole, however, Monboddo's opinion of Swift is high, and he asserts that he "had not only more wit and humour than any man, I believe, that ever lived, but,
I think, was the best philosopher of his age" (AM, III, 225, n.). This extravagant eulogy concludes with the assertion that "there is more pleasantry, ridicule, satire, and, at the same time, sense and knowledge of men and manners, in his Gulliver's Travels, than is to be found altogether in any other work, antient or modern."

Monboddo was also familiar with Swift's poetry (see the appreciative comments on Swift's prosody in O&P, II, 390-92), and the shorter prose writings. Swift's Modest Proposal also appealed: MP 276, On Population, shows Monboddo in one of his least savoury elitist moods, apparently advocating the wholesale trading of Britain's poor as cannibal fodder, and observing "Dean Swift has proposed Something like this with regard to the children of the Poor in Ireland. There is a great deal of humour in the little tract, & there is allways Sense in the Dean's humour" (MP 276, p. 41, n.). One can only hope that Monboddo is here out-Swifting Swift.

Fielding

Moral considerations apart, Monboddo is impressed by the sustained simplicity of Swift's style, and the vivid realism of his narrative; two characteristics on which he bases his preference of Swift to Fielding in Origin and Progress III. Monboddo's distaste for the mixed mode of tragi-comedy has been touched on in discussing his Shakespeare criticism; and his aversion to unwarranted variety applies to any work which fails to
maintain a consistency of tone throughout. Consequently, instead of appreciating the humour inherent in Fielding's Homeric and Virgilian parody in Tom Jones (which, as we have seen, he was quite prepared to do in the case of similar mock-heroic in the Dunciad), Monboddo can only fault the departure of Fielding's comically florid passages from the literal narrative style of the main body of the novel. In particular, Monboddo questions the propriety of the churchyard fray of Book 4 Chapter 8, despite its being "an excellent parody of Homer's battles" (O&P, III, 296). A side-effect of Fielding's interpolated mock-heroic against which Monboddo also complains is that it detracts from the plausibility of the narrative, which, as Monboddo here reminds his reader, is the main virtue he finds in Gulliver's Travels. Here we see a principal short-coming of a theory of literature such as Monboddo's which postulates as the essential quality of art its imitative capacity. A theorist who believes, as Monboddo does in the most simplistic terms, that the artist's sole function is to produce as close a similarity as possible to the beauty, whether real or ideal, of his subject, is debarred from praising any steps taken by the author to examine the status or limitations of the imitative process itself. In debunking the trappings of epic by applying them to decidedly non-heroic material, Fielding is helping to question the credo that lies behind neoclassicism; namely, that the writer can only aspire to a recreation of the Graeco-Roman literary tradition. The
ultimate effect of thus challenging classical motifs is the erosion of neoclassicism itself by highlighting its inapplicability to real life. To this aspect of Fielding's art Monboddo is quite blind: as far as he is concerned, classical Greek literary techniques are, and will continue to be, the only ones which are valid for artistic representation, simply because they were evolved at a time when cultural, anthropological and linguistic conditions were conducive to the formulation of universally valid aesthetic principles. Instead of seeing Fielding's mock-heroic, therefore, as a critique of epic as such, Monboddo can only lament the incongruity of these purple passages with their more sober surroundings. Similarly, Monboddo has no time for the intrusion into the narrative of Tom Jones of the author, "who had nothing to do in it at all" (O&P,III, 297-98)! The role of the artist is solely to hold a mirror to nature, and it is no part of a mirror's role to query the nature and validity of its own reflections. It is worth noting that the work of this period which was pre-eminently devoted to self-scrutiny of the writer's function, Tristram Shandy, is never referred to by Monboddo. Whether he simply dismissed it out of hand because of its radical departures from regular novelistic technique, or whether Monboddo did not have the conceptual apparatus to recognize the book as literature at all, must remain an academic question.

We have seen, however, in the case of Pope,
Monboddo's capacity for combining harsh criticism of a writer's style with high praise of his content and compositional methods; and the same potential for hybrid judgment is discernible with respect to Fielding. In allocating Tom Jones to a particular genre, Monboddo seems to have taken to heart the Preface to Joseph Andrews. In the first place, Monboddo would have discerned a kindred spirit in Fielding by virtue of his statement in the Preface that epic poetry may be either in prose or in verse. Monboddo would have found echoed in this preface his own contention that verse is not essential to poetry, and would no doubt be kindly disposed to Fielding in the light of his defence of prose epic. Consequently, Monboddo accepts Fielding's characterization of the genre into which Joseph Andrews (as well as Tom Jones) falls, "a comic Epic-Poem in Prose," (ed. Brooks, p. 4) at face value, without any awareness of Fielding's tongue-in-cheek juggling with technical terms. Monboddo does not acknowledge any debt to the Joseph Andrews Preface, but similarities of sentiment and expression put the matter beyond reasonable doubt. Fielding's parallel between comic romance and epic is twice echoed by Monboddo: in Origin and Progress III Monboddo talks of Tom Jones as having "the same relation to comedy that the epic has to tragedy" (O&P, III, 134); and in MP 232, as part of a spirited defence of "prose poetry," this is slightly adjusted to the observation that "Novell writing . . . has the Same relation to the
Epic, that Comedy has to Tragedy" (MP 232, p. 19).
Further evidence of Monboddo's having read Joseph Andrews exists: both have recourse to the lost Margites of Homer as a model of the comic epic (ed. Brooks, p. [3]); and both cite Fenelon's Telemaque as an example of prose epic (ed. Brooks, p. [3]; Monboddo, unlike Fielding, does not approve of prose epic where elevated subject matter is concerned). Monboddo differs slightly from Fielding in depicting the novel as a separate genre, distinct from the epic, rather than, as Fielding does, dividing epic into comic and serious epic. Despite such variations, however, it is clear that Monboddo follows his author's lead in determining the classical precedents of the novel.

Monboddo's lead was followed by Beattie, who allots Tom Jones to the species of romance which "follows the poetical order; and which may properly enough be called the Epick Comedy" ("On Fable and Romance," Dissertations Moral and Critical (1783), p. 571). Indeed, we might well suspect Monboddo's influence here, especially since, in an earlier work, Beattie writes "By versifying Tom Jones and The Merry Wives of Windsor, we should spoil the two finest Comic poems . . . in the world" ("On Poetry and Music," Essays, p. 563). The juxtaposition of two such unlikely candidates for the title of "poetry," both cited by Monboddo, suggests some discussion on the matter between the two critics.

When he is not criticising the unclassical stylistic
variety of *Tom Jones*, Monboddo is full of praise for the features of the novel which lend themselves to assessment in orthodox Aristotelian terms. The characterization of *Tom Jones*, for instance, delights Monboddo, who points out that even the minor characters are well-defined and individualized. And with respect to the novel's plot, we see Monboddo again making a perceptive comment on a work by the judicious application of Aristotelian criteria. In accordance with the stipulations of the *Poetics*, the catastrophe "is so artfully wrought up, and brought about by a change of fortune, so sudden and surprising, that it gives the reader all the pleasure of a well written tragedy or comedy" (*O&P*, III, 298, n.); it is perhaps worth mentioning that Coleridge was a later critic who also appreciated the well-wrought plan of Fielding's fable. Monboddo's favoured principle of uniformity amidst variety is brought to bear upon the novel too: despite its length, and wealth of incident, the plot of *Tom Jones* is basically simple. Monboddo's overall conclusion is that Fielding was "one of the greatest poetical geniuses of his age" (*O&P*, III, 298, n.), and adds that he feels Fielding's critical reputation does not match his true worth; perhaps Monboddo is thinking of his rival Dr. Johnson's shocked reaction to *Tom Jones*.

Discussion of other earlier-eighteenth-century poets is brief. Monboddo makes an unprofitable comparison of chalk and cheese in comparing *The Beggar's Opera* with, of
all things, \textit{Comus}, pointing out, apparently in all seriousness, that \textit{The Beggar's Opera} "no doubt is a very pleasurable piece, tho I think not so much calculated to please Men of refined Taste as the Comus, but it is not at all Moral" (MP 241, p. 40). \textit{The What D'Ye Call It} is not discussed in its own right; but Monboddo does suggest that its title might suitably be transferred to Gibbon's \textit{Decline and Fall} (O&P,V, 276-77).

Prior earns the following backhanded compliment: "yet have we in Modern times Some Fabulists of whom we need not be ashamed, and the Author of the Tale of the Laddle whoever he be (for the Invention of it does I think much exceed the Genius of Prior) is in my Judgement no mean Poet & may take his Place I will not say next to Aesop but at not many Removes from him" (MP 159, pp. 18-19).

(d) \textbf{Post-Augustan Developments}

\textbf{Thomson}

Thomson, although writing at the same time as Pope, attaches importance to aspects of poetry which became increasingly significant to the later poets of the century, and which Monboddo himself responded to enthusiastically: the evolution of an alternative verse-form to the heroic couplet; a recourse to an archaic fictional world; and the attribution of an increased importance to the rural and the imaginary. This, added to the fact that Thomson, like other poets in this section, was personally known to Monboddo, whereas Pope and his school were seen by Monboddo
as having instituted a literary orthodoxy with which Monboddo felt no personal affinity, makes it appropriate to discuss Thomson here.

"I have known Men who possessed what is commonly called Genius, and excelled in the fine Arts, such as Poetry, who had a very vulgar Appearance. Mr Thomson, the Author of the Seasons, the Castle of Indolence, and other Excellent Poems, had as little the look of one of the inspired Train, as any Man I ever saw." (MP 285, p. 99). This observation is the only indication of Monboddo's personal acquaintance with James Thomson; fortunately Monboddo managed to divert his attention sufficiently from Thomson's allegedly unprepossessing appearance to pronounce, on several occasions, on the poet's more literary qualities.

It might be expected, in the light of Monboddo's admiration for Milton's blank verse, that the Seasons would have held more appeal for Monboddo than the heavily rhymed Spenserian stanzas of the Castle of Indolence; but such is not the case. We have seen how Monboddo could condone, and even praise, rhyming which was appropriate, and of limited duration, in the work of Milton and Dryden. In the case of Thomson's Castle he is even prepared to dispense with his proviso that rhyme be restricted to short poems. The result is that the Castle is at all times preferred to the Seasons.

This verdict is based on both formal and stylistic grounds. In the first place, it is made, as are so many
of Monboddo's evaluations, in the light of Aristotle's demand for a plot or fable at the heart of all true poetry. The Seasons, says Monboddo, are for this reason only an incoherent assemblage of descriptions devoid of the unifying principle which Monboddo's aesthetics taught him to look for in works of art, "fitt only to entertain the raw fancies of Children" (MP 232, p. 9). Elsewhere Monboddo notes that the Seasons consist only of such descriptions plus "some few Degressions," whereas the Castle has a plot connecting the whole poem, and concludes with "a very proper Catastrophe" (MP 243, p. 18). Added to this is the preponderance in the latter of ideal, imaginative scenes, whereas the Seasons' images are "all of Natural Appearances" (p. 18); the muddled nature of this distinction I have discussed elsewhere (see pp. 56-58 above). Monboddo extends the superiority of the Castle to its vocabulary and style as well. MP 147, a missing MS dating probably from the 1760's, contained the observation that the Castle reverted to a simplicity of style missing from the Seasons (see index in MP Box 18, B56, p. 192). A substantial section of MP 232 is devoted to demonstrating that the style of the Castle "is perfectly different from the Stile of his Seasons," with the comment tacked on that "I think I could hardly praise it more" (MP 232, p. 48). Monboddo is here generous with his praise of the Castle as "the best riming Poem in English of any length" (MP 232, p. 47; see, too, O&P IV, 406, where the Castle is designated "the best rhyming poetry we have in English,"
and an even more extravagant eulogy of the poem as "the best allegorical and descriptive poem that I know in any language" (O&P, IV, 385). Here, as so often, Monboddo is lamenting the poor taste of the age in its churlish treatment of the work in question. And in *Antient Metaphysics* II Monboddo transcribes sizeable passages from the *Castle* to demonstrate his views on the nature of dreams, praising Thomson's work as being "as fine descriptive poetry as is to be found in this, or in any other language" (AM, II, 273).

The MP 232 passage (pp. 47-48) lists Monboddo's reasons for his high opinion of the *Castle*: Thomson has avoided the pitfall of rhyming poetry, the temptation to compromise one's meaning in order to ease the difficulties of finding suitable rhymes. Like Homer and La Fontaine, he has imbued his writing with the antique charm of obsolete poeticisms (c.f. O&P, IV, 406). Above all, though, he has, in availing himself of the Spenserian stanza, adopted the only type of rhyming verse form which permits the poet to write in sustained and lengthy periods. Such, at any rate, is Monboddo's view: that the Spenserian stanza, although so demanding in terms of rhymes, does not lure the user into a series of curt, antithetical couplets as does the form favoured by Pope. Certainly the passage Monboddo goes on to quote from the poem serves to demonstrate his point, as well as giving him the opportunity to show his awareness of the auditory effect of Thomson's "The Murmuring Main was heard and scarcely heard to flow."
While it is not true that, as Monboddo implies, couplet verse is necessarily end-stopped and therefore suitable only for small-scale, epigrammatic statements, there is some substance in his claim that the Spenserian stanza is more conducive to a stately, measured rhythmic flow than is the iambic couplet. This passage can be seen as the application to Thomson in particular of an enthusiastic general account of the Spenserian stanza in Origin and Progress II. Monboddo there outlines the virtues of the stanza: its variety and complexity, and the latitude it permits for transposition, sweeping rhetorical periods and antique vocabulary; the very qualities he later praises in the Castle in MP 232. Even in Origin and Progress II Monboddo has Thomson in mind, along with Spenser and Beattie: we are told that Spenser has been "very successfully imitated . . . by Mr. Thomson, in his Castle of Indolence, the best, in my judgement, of all his works" (O&P, II, 399).

It is amusing that Monboddo even relates the alleged improvement in Thomson's work between The Seasons and The Castle of Indolence to the influence of his beloved ancients: the Castle is better than the Seasons because it was written after Thomson had visited Italy and felt the beneficent influence of the "Noble Simplicity" (p. 48) of Roman art (c.f. O&P, IV, 156-57).

It is worth noting that Monboddo's deep-seated distrust of rhyme threatens to displace his admiration for the Castle, especially in MP 241. Here Monboddo
anatomizes the stanza-form used by Thomson, with no comment as to its advisability; but as this analysis follows hard on the heels of a vociferous criticism of the grievous bondage of rhyming, comment is quite redundant; we feel, indeed, as if Monboddo is reporting an atrocity (MP 241, pp. 29-30). Later Monboddo alludes to another MS (possibly the missing MP 146 or 147) in which he opines that in some stanzas of the Castle the rhymes could be jettisoned without affecting the poetic quality of the verse (p. 42). A similar ambivalence can be seen in the following: "Or if the Reader desires a more regular Chime [i.e. than in Dryden's Alexander's Feast], he may go to Thomson's Castle of Indolence, where he has not only distich Rhymes but Triple and Quadruple Rhymes all regular and in good Order, being according to the Rules of the Octavo Rimo in Italian, with what I think a great improvement of that kind of Rhyme, I mean the Alexandrine Line concluding the Stanza" (PB 22, pp. 53-54).

At the same time, the Seasons are not always held in the contempt which some of Monboddo's comments imply. At one point Monboddo ranks the Seasons, and Liberty, along with Armstrong's Art of Preserving Health and Home's Douglas as the sole exemplars of well-composed modern blank verse (BF MSS 11, 327).

"Ossian"

If Ossian did not exist, it was necessary to invent
him; the eighteenth century needed a poetic figurehead evidencing a native bardic tradition comparable to the Homeric, and corroborating contemporary hypotheses as to the origin and nature of poetry in the early stages of civilization. The scraps of translation from the Gaelic which James Macpherson foisted on a receptive public in 1760 were eagerly seized on as intimations of the requisite poetic qualities having been at work in the dim Scottish past; and Macpherson was led to eke out these fragments into the full-blown Fingal and Temora of Ossian.

The rise of Monboddo's interest in the genesis of literature coincided almost exactly with the arrival of Ossian, and Monboddo is as keen as his contemporaries to augment his theories by taking stock of Macpherson's findings. But unlike Hugh Blair, whose Critical Dissertation on the Poems of Ossian, the Son of Fingal (1763) has been succinctly described as "one of the most eloquent and convincing pronouncements on the wrong side of a case that can be found in English literary history,"¹ Monboddo maintained a healthy scepticism concerning Ossian which developed into downright disbelief.

Up to, and including, Origin and Progress I, it is true, Monboddo was a firm believer in the authenticity of the Ossian poems. His interest in Ossian is two-fold.

In the first place, Monboddo was alert to the poetic qualities of Ossian. The conclusions of the following extract from MP 123, *Observations upon the Odyssey*, contain little over which Blair would quibble:

"In the same manner the different parts of Fingal were dispersed in the highlands of Scotland, till they were collected and published by McPherson. For tho Fingal be a Poem of much less Art than the Iliad or Odyssey yet I can have no doubt, but it was intended by the Author for one work, & written upon one Plan. The Poetick Art, as well as other Arts was certainly not carried near to the same perfection, in which it was in Greece, in the days of Homer. But what I desiderate chiefly in Fingal is that exactness, and what a modern critick wou'd call Minuteness of Description which we find in Homer, by which we are made as well acquainted with everything relating to the life & manners of those Heroes, as we are with our own way of living. Whereas in Fingal there is so little of that sort of Painting, that we are at a loss to know how his Heroes were fed; What they drank at their Feast of Shells. How they were cloathed, or whether they were cloathed at all, in what manner they fought, & whether they used their Spears as Missiles, or pushed them only with their hand, as the heavy armed Greek Soldiers did in later times, with many other particulars both of their domestick & military life, concerning which we are left entirely in the dark. In short Ossian is not so good a Painter as Homer," (MP 123, pp. 25-26.)

Both critics accept the integrity of Fingal; both see nothing risible in comparing Ossian and Homer, since both poets demonstrate the forms taken by natural genius in an environment conducive to the production of the most sublime sentiments. Although there is no positive proof, Monboddo's criticism of Ossianic description may have been triggered off by Blair's remark that "It has been objected to Ossian, that his descriptions of military actions are imperfect, and much less diversified by circumstances than those of Homer" (Blair, *Ossian*, p. 46).
Monboddo, however, needed no precedent in order to indulge in some championing of Homer, and it is just as likely, especially in the light of Monboddo's frequent affirmations that particularized description is one of the principal beauties of poetry, that Monboddo came to these conclusions in MP 123 quite independently. What is certain is that Homer's superiority to Ossian is quite clear-cut to Monboddo, whereas Blair puts forward the defence that Ossian's pathos and sublimity "led him to hurry towards grand objects" (Blair, Ossian, p. 46).

Where Monboddo parts company more radically with Blair is in viewing Ossian rather as a potential source of philological data than as an exponent of the sublime. The following point of comparison will demonstrate this. As part of his eulogy of Ossian, Blair has occasion "to discover whether the Gothic poetry has any resemblance to the Celtic or Galic" (Blair, Ossian, p. 4). His concern is solely with the emotional and imaginative qualities of both; which is just as well, since he is comparing a Latin translation of one with an English translation of the other. He duly concludes that Ossian's poetry is more refined, regular, benevolent and sentimental than the verses of Regner Lodbrog which he lifts from Wormius. Monboddo is in agreement with Blair's initial premiss that the comparison of Celtic and Gothic is worthwhile; but whereas Blair relies on the "translations" of one whose poetic bias is consonant with his own, thus enabling himself to find in Ossian exactly those beauties he would
have inferred a priori, Monboddo wishes to return to the
Gaelic original with a view to the philological analysis
of its relation to other languages. The history of
Denmark by Paul Henri Mallet from which, as I recount
below, Monboddo derived his information about the mytho-
logy of the Edda also inspired him to thoughts of philo-
logical enquiry. Towards the end of MP 106 Monboddo
declares that it would be "a very great work of Criticism"
to compare with the old Icelandic poems "the most antient
remains of the Celtic, which I take to be Ossian's Poems"
(MP 106, p. 45). Monboddo even voices these intentions
in *Origin and Progress* I: he affirms, in terms that show
that the matter of MP 106 is very much in his mind, that
it would be "a very fine field of criticism" (*O&P*, I, 413)
to locate similarities between the Celtic, Teutonic and
Gothic tongues, with a view to proving the common origins
of the races who spoke them. Again, in another MS of this
period, MP 88, *Of the Indians in North America* (1769),
Monboddo sees Roubaud's remarks on linguistic similarities
between North American and Celtic languages as being fur-
ther confirmed by what "Mr McPherson the Publisher of
Fingal observed when he was in Florida that some of the
nations there used the same form of Salutation, & in the
same words as in the Highlds. of Scotland, signifying,
*are you well*?" (MP 88, p. 33).

The point should be made, however, that although
Monboddo's interest in Ossian runs to linguistic analysis,
he is initially attracted to Ossian by the same nobility
of sentiment over which Blair enthuses in the Critical Dissertation. A passage in MP 106 demonstrates how Monboddo looks to philology for corroboration of his initial premiss, made on aesthetic grounds alone, that there is Norse influence in Ossian. Speaking of Mallet, Monboddo writes as follows:

"Had he known of our Antient highland Poems, lately published I mean, the Poems of Ossian, he would no doubt have derived the Poetry, the Music, the Love, the Heroic Valour and the high Sentiments of Generosity which appear in them from the Intercourse which it is clear that Fingal & his people had with the Norwegians. And indeed I think it is the only way possible to account for so much Softness of manners, and Generosity of Sentiment, as appears from those poems to have been among the Highlanders of Scotland, & it removes a Suspicion against the Authenticity of those poems, stronger in my Opinion, than any that I have heard mentioned. It would be a curious piece of Criticism to compare the poems of Ossian with those Iceland poems. From that Comparison, I imagine would appear not only that conformity of manners & Sentiments, which appears in the Translations, but also a Similitude in the Structure of the Verse, & perhaps also in the Language." (MP 106, p. 31)

We are not to assume, however, that Monboddo's interest in Gaelic is prompted by any true patriotism, or desire to rekindle this native Gaelic tradition, but rather by a detachedly scientific desire for the comparison of relevant philological data. Monboddo saw himself as a North Briton, not a Scot.

Because Monboddo's preoccupation was with the linguistic significance of Ossian, he was less susceptible to the urgencies of the poems' bardic outpourings. Consequently he was less prone to cling to a conviction of their authenticity. Monboddo was led from the fold
of believers by Charles O'Conor's Dissertation on the First Migrations, and Final Settlement of the Scots in North-Britain; With occasional Observations on the Poems of Fingal and Temora (1766). This tract, published with O'Conor's Dissertations on the History of Ireland, is a scathing attack, often genuinely humorous, on the spurious genealogy imputed to the Scottish monarchy by Macpherson. Its effect on Monboddo was not to convince him of Macpherson's having perpetrated a conscious forgery, but to persuade him that the works of Ossian predate their discoverer Macpherson by only a couple of hundred years. Some of the humour of O'Conor's account seems to have escaped Monboddo. O'Conor's statement that "The Son of Fingal, therefore, lived near our own Times, and it is best known to Mr. Mac Pherson, whether he is not, in the Whole, or in Part, alive to this Day" (Dissertation on the First Migrations, p. 59) is as near as the writer can decently come to identifying Ossian with Macpherson himself. Monboddo, however, takes O'Conor at face value, to be implying a third party: "He even insinuates that it may be a living Author known to Mr. Macpherson, who has composed them" (MP 108, Notes upon the Dissertations On the History of Ireland by O'cconnor printed at Dublin 1766, p. 5). Such suggestions Monboddo cannot countenance possibly because John Home, of Douglas fame, whom Monboddo held in such high esteem, was in the forefront in encouraging Macpherson on the publication of his Fragments of Scottish Verse in 1760. But although not a complete
Monboddo has taken O’Conor’s criticism to heart: "that this is not the Case I am well assured, but that they are not so antient as the 3d Century I think is very probable from the Reasons alleged by our Author, particularly the Gross Anachronisms, and the Errors in Geography" (MP 108, p. 5).

Among the charges which were levelled against the Ossianic poems was their lack of a religious dimension. Even Blair found this a "sensible blank" (Blair, Ossian, p. 40), holding that "the most august and lofty ideas that can embellish poetry are derived from the belief of a divine administration of the universe" (p. 40). Fingal, one feels, is being faulted for not being Paradise Lost. But where Blair is merely conscious of an aesthetic and moral flaw in the pattern of Ossian’s poetry, Monboddo sees further information suggesting that Ossian is spurious:

"But there is another Reason against their Antiquity, which, tho' not insisted upon by our Author, appears to me to be of itself decisive, And that is the want of Religion in those Poems. Mr Macpherson endeavours to account for this by the Destruction of the Druids which he supposes to have happen’d sometime before the Age of Fingal. But the Fact itself, as our author observes, is a mere Supposition, for which Mr Macpherson does not even allege any Nauthority sic not so much as that of Tradition, upon the Credit of which he derives our Royal family from Fingal. But allowing the Fact to be true there must then have been an interval in the highlands of Scotland of some Ages betwixt the Abolition of Druidism & the Establishment of Christianity, during which there was no religion at all in the Country. Now this is such an Event as is not to be paralleled in the history of mankind. And in general there is no Example of any antient Narrative poem of any considerable Length such as the poems of Ossian, without a great deal of Religion in it" (MP 108, pp. 5-6).
It is curious to note that Blair infers from Ossian's silence concerning religion directly contrary conclusions: that the poems cannot possibly be the work of a comparative modern, since a writer born and brought up in a Christian society must of necessity betray traces of his religious environment in his work. Monboddo's speculation as to the religious element which he expected to find in any authentic Ossianic poetry would have been shaped by his acquaintance with other ancient poets. The part played by the gods in Greek and Roman epic springs to mind immediately; but there is evidence that Monboddo's thinking was more in terms of the Icelandic Eddas. Monboddo subjoins to MP 106, Observations upon the History of Greenland by David Crantz, his notes on Mallet's Histoire de Danemarc, (1758), in which he remarks on the "perpetual Alusions to their Religion" (MP 106, p. 28) which mark ancient Icelandic verse. It is likely that, on reflection, Monboddo was led to scepticism by the lack of similar allusion in Ossian; although such conclusions did not occur to him in the course of writing MP 106 itself, in which Monboddo is still a firm believer in Ossian.

It tells a lot about Monboddo's estimate of the relative importance of the spiritual and the material that he should set more store by Ossian's lack of religion than plain anachronism. Monboddo concludes MP 108 with his own theory as to the source of Fingal:

"If then the poems ascribed to Ossian are not so old as Mr Macpherson makes them, And if they are not neither of yesterday as our Irish Author Supposes the Question is when they were composed, And my Opinion is that they are the work of some highland Bard, perhaps two or three hundred years ago, who wanting to make them pass for very
antient poems, And being Learned enough to know that the Christian Religion was not then established in the Country but not being Learned enough to know what other Religion was then in it, he chose to give no Religion at all to his Poetry nor any thing savouring of it, except the Vulgar Superstition which no doubt prevailed in the Highlands in his time concerning Ghosts & departed Spirits." (MP 108, pp. 6-7.)

Monboddo's dating of Ossian may well be attributed to a passage in which Blair specifically denies such a possibility. Blair declares, by way of intended reductio ad absurdum, that if Fingal is the result of imposture "it must have been contrived and executed in the Highlands of Scotland, two or three centuries ago" (Blair, Ossian, p. 19), during the period back to which the continuance of an Ossianic tradition in Scotland can be traced.

Blair discounts the possibility that a land as barbarous as the Scotland of those times could have perpetrated such a sustained hoax as the works of Ossian without revealing the true origins of the bard. Among the tell-tale anachronisms which Blair believes would be imported into such a forgery are signs of Christianity, as I have indicated above; but Monboddo, not in agreement with Blair over the supposed intrusion of religion, sees Blair's case not as a reductio ad absurdum but as a demonstration that such a forgery did in fact take place.

Armstrong

If Monboddo himself were asked to name the most important poet of the age, he would doubtless have chosen John Armstrong, whose Art of Preserving Health enjoyed
a great vogue, but whose painful attempts to bestow suitable poetic garb on sanitary and gastronomic principles make him a prime candidate for D. B. Wyndham Lewis' and Charles Lee's anthology of bad verse, The Stuffed Owl (1930; rpt. London: Dent, 1963), which accordingly catalogues the most noteworthy of his circumlocutions, one of the most splendid of which is his exhortation to "frequent the gelid cystern" (or, for the benefit of the vulgar, take a cold bath).

In Of Composition (1766), MP 148, Monboddo has occasion to set forth the reasons for his high estimate of Armstrong:

"I will mention a living author who I think exceeds even Milton in the variety of his Figures, & equals him in the closeness of his Matter, & the vigour of his composition, I mean Dr. Armstrong in his Poem upon Health which has likeways such a true spirit of Poetry in it, that I am not afraid to pronounce it the best Didactick Poem that ever was written, For tho' perhaps Virgil in his Georgicks may exceed him in the ornaments of Diction, & particularly in the variety of his Figures, yet the Doctor as much or more exceeds him in weight of matter, & knowledge of the Art of which he treats, a thing absolutely necessary in a Didactick work whether in verse or in Prose; & the difficulty of such a Poem is to join well with the accuracy of Science, the ornaments of Poetry . . . the Dr. has joined both together, & without hurting the accuracy or perspicuity of Science, has every way adorned his Subject as much as the nature of it was capable of." (MP 148, pp. 29-30.)

The points made here are repeated on several occasions. For instance, Monboddo's preference of Armstrong to Milton (within limits) recurs in the following: "I cannot help saying that in the choice of words he very often exceeds Milton, who sometimes lets his Stile
down to prose" (MP 232, p. 61). In *Origin and Progress V*, this is modified thus: "the diction is more splendid than even of Milton's Paradise Lost; but the versification has not so much the merit of giving the verse the beauties of prose composition. And particularly it has but few of those periods with which Milton has adorned his poetry so much" (*O&P*, V, 467).

Secondly, Monboddo's placing of *The Art of Preserving Health* above the Georgics turns up in MP 232: "There is a Didactic Work in English, written in excellent Verse & in Language as much & as well Ornamented as any in English, & which has this Advantage over the Georgics of Virgil, that there is more in it of the Art he professes to teach, than there is of Agriculture in the Georgicks . . . The reader I am persuaded will be at no loss to guess that the Work I mean is Armstrong's Art of Preserving Health" (MP 232, p. 9). Here, incidentally, is another example of the crossed wires which bedevil Monboddo's criticism so frequently, and of the conflict between his Aristotelian head and sentimental heart: the passage just quoted refers to Armstrong only to make the point that Armstrong's poem on health is not, in the strict sense of the word, poetry at all, being didactic rather than creative. Generally, though, Monboddo chooses to ignore this slur he himself casts on his friend's poetic status.

Ten years after the 1766 MS MP 148, Monboddo published his fullest eulogy of Armstrong, in *Origin and Progress III* (pp. 165-76), intended to show that "even
these coster-monger days . . . have produced, at least, one poet, that deserves to be quoted as a model of good composition" (O&P, III, 165). And quote he does, to the tune of 87 lines, finding the most exquisite Virgilian echoes in such execrable lines as

ye who waste,
With pale and bloated sloth, the tedious day,
Avoid the stubborn aliment, avoid
The full repast. (2.51-55.)

Our delight in the sheer awfulness of such verse should perhaps be tempered by instruction: if we are to claim any real inwardness with the poetry of an age, we should try to respond not only to the timeless beauties which evade the restrictions of temporal remoteness, but also to those features which can render poetry inaccessible to the modern reader. In the case of Armstrong, this involves acknowledging the classical models in the name of which his verses are perpetrated; and Monboddo's close commentary on Armstrong's Virgilian and Lucretian imitations are as helpful an insight as we could hope for.

At the same time, the praises Monboddo heaps on Armstrong for having imitated Virgil carry their own limitations: Virgil is a second-rank poet, not a Homer. Just as Virgil elaborated his style to suit the jaded palates of the Rome of Maecenas, so too "The same complaisance to the taste of the times very probably made Dr Armstrong, in his admirable poem upon health, imitate Virgil rather than Lucretius. For, had he delivered his precepts for preserving health in the same plain language and artless numbers that Lucretius has used in delivering
his doctrines of philosophy, no body would have read him" (O&P, III, 364).

Two brief concluding comments. In defending Armstrong Monboddo once again sets himself against the tide of popular opinion: "I should wonder the more at this [i.e. the literary eclipse of Shaftesbury], if I did not know some other fine writings that appear to be forgot in much less time, such as the Art of Health by Dr Armstrong" (O&P, IV, 384). And, as in the case of Thomson, the only legacy of Monboddo's personal friendship with the poet is a disparaging account of Armstrong's appearance: "Dr Armstrong, who I think was also a great Poet, had a most unpromising Appearance, and was as much as any Man I have ever known, ingenium ingens, inculto sub, Corpore" (MF 285, p. 99).

Other Contemporary Poets

Beattie, although a close personal friend of Monboddo, at least in the earlier part of his life, receives no more than a passing mention in the printed works for having achieved an admirably Spenserian tone in The Minstrel. From a letter of 1769 to James Harris, however, we can deduce that Monboddo took an active part in disseminating and championing Beattie's poem:

"In the first place I send you a Specimen of a Work that is just now going on, which I hope will merit your approbation, & will entertain your Ladies for whom I chiefly intend it. The Author is a great favourite of mine, as I am sure he would be of yours if you knew him, which perhaps makes me a little partial in favour of his Work. His Name is Beattie a Profr. in the Marishal College Aberdeen, &
already known to the world by some Poetical Works which he has published. It is in my Judgement the best thing in that sort of Verse that has been written since Thomson's Castle of Indolence, & the kind of verse I like better than any other Rhyming verse in English. The Subject too I think is good without which both you & I agree that neither Poem nor Picture can have any real merit and I like it so much better than Mr. Thomson's Subject that it is altogether Historical & not Allegorical" (MP Box 22, fol. 2/12, pp. 4-5.)

Richard Glover figures in Monboddo's writings only as the author of a useful prosodic model. Just as John Byrom's Pastoral was cited as an example of English Anapaestic verse, with, as Monboddo duly notes, an initial iamb (MP 154, p. 30; O&P, II, 345), so too Glover's Admiral Hosier's Ghost is presented as an example of trochaic verse; Monboddo's exposition of the point is made distressingly awkward by his unfortunate misquotation of "As near Porto Bello lying" as "Before Porto Bello lying," an error which forces him to conclude that the strongly trochaic rhythm of the verse constrains the reader to force the word "Before" into a trochaic mould (O&P, II, 392; c.f. MP 154, p. 29). The mention of the ballad, however, is of interest in implying that Monboddo had read Percy's Reliques, the most accessible source of Glover's poem. In a letter to Harris Monboddo praises Glover, who "in the midst of a great trading City . . . devotes himself to the muse, tho' his Muse be of a Kind much inferior to yours" (MP Box 22, 2/12).

Hervey's Meditations (1746) are briefly recommended as "One of the most remarkable of this sort[i.e. examples
of the florid style] that has been published of late years" (O&P, III, 283).

(e) **Dramatic Poetry**

Monboddo does not, like many eighteenth-century critics, draw an artificial distinction between dramatic and non-dramatic poetry: the drama, like the novel, is reckoned poetry by Monboddo provided that it displays evidence of a suitably Aristotelian plot. Monboddo extends to the drama the same principles which he applies to the criticism of Pope and Milton, and consequently approves of blank dramatic verse for the same reasons that he approves of the verse of *Paradise Lost*. His interest is stimulated by whatever attempts he can locate to establish a strong tradition of English blank verse drama.

Monboddo was an avid play-goer, and his experience of the theatre covers the standard fare which one might expect to have been set before a theatre buff of the time in Edinburgh and London. He seems to have been familiar with Congreve, but is uneasy as to the function of wit in his comedies. The punning of Scrub in *The Beaux Stratagem* he feels "destroys the native simplicity and humour of the character" (O&P, III, 347). Too studied an attention to the cultivation of wit is, he feels, "the great fault of the dialogue in Congreve's comedies, which are overlaid with wit; and, in general, it is the fault
of most of our English comedies" (O&P,III, 351-52). At the same time, Monboddo can appreciate an excessive preoccupation with verbal effects when placed in the mouths of characters to whom it is satirically appropriate: he praises Lady Wishfort's talk of being "prone to iteration of nuptials" in The Way of the World (O&P, III, 417, n.)

The sole surviving evidence of Monboddo's acquaintance with Rowe is a reference, in the index to the missing MP 147 to "the Want of Simplicity in Rowe's Dramatic Stile" (MP Box 18, B56, p. 192).

The characterizations of Samuel Foote's works register with Monboddo, despite his misgivings that the ultimate fates of the characters should have been more suitably tailored to pointing a moral: Sir Robert Riscounter, the bankrupt in Foote's play of the same name,¹ being intrinsically honourable should not have been discomfited, whereas Sir Matthew Mite in The Nabob (1778) "is one of the most proper subjects of ridicule that ever was exhibited on any stage . . . and, if the poet had brought him, in the conclusion of the piece, to misery and disgrace, which certainly poetic justice required, I should have thought the piece very compleat" (O&P,III, 312-13).

This preference for a discernible and emotionally urgent moral core at least partly explains Monboddo's wholesale approval of "the Scottish Shakespeare," John Home. An early sign of Monboddo's high opinion of

¹ The Bankrupt (1776)
Home's Douglas occurs in Monboddo's correspondence with Harris during 1769. Monboddo takes it upon himself to introduce Harris and his family to the beauties of Douglas, and accordingly provides a synopsis of the plot, a selection of choice quotations and an evaluation of its literary worth (28 September 1769, MP Box 22, fol. 2/12, pp. 6-13). I have already pointed to areas where Monboddo's classicism and his more contemporary love of sentimental emotion come into conflict; Douglas, however, presents itself to Monboddo as a work meriting praise whether assessed by classical or sentimental standards. On the one hand, the Poetics set up a standard of formal excellence which Douglas fully exemplifies: the subplots (or, strictly speaking, episodes) are not too many or too involved to detract from the predominance of the main story-line, which is just as Aristotle would have prescribed. (It should be added that Monboddo later qualifies his praise of the formal balance of Douglas, which he sees as being diminished by a second catastrophe towards the end of the play which "destroys entirely the Unity of the Piece & makes it in Effect two Tragedies" (p. 13).) It is Aristotle, too, whom Monboddo cites in defending the status of Douglas as a tragedy despite the wholly imaginary nature of its subject. Although tragedy is customarily an aesthetically heightened representation of a historically factual series of events, says Monboddo, Aristotle makes mention of tragedies of which the plot is entirely fictional;
"And there is of that kind one in English that I think the best we have, I mean the Douglas" (MP 232, p. 10(3)).

On the other hand, Monboddo has a heart ever receptive to the affective aspects of art, and it is only a slight exaggeration to say that any utterance terminating in an exclamation mark will earn his approval. The first line quoted by Monboddo makes the point eloquently: "Wretch that I am! Alas! Why am I so?" (MP Box 22, fol. 2/12, p. 9). And the last two lines quoted - "May heaven so judge me as I judg'd my Master!/ And God so love me as I love his Race!" - prompt Monboddo to the rhetorical question "Can any thing be more sweetly simple, or more moving than these two last lines?" (p. 12).

For once, these two sets of criteria - formal unity, and emotional impact - are seen to complement each other, and to work to their mutual advantage rather than in opposite directions. Emotional vehemence serves to make the developments in the plot stand out more clearly; and the unity of the plot (leaving out of consideration the second catastrophe which Monboddo found so objectionable) provides a suitable framing device to contain the actors' empassioned apostrophes: Monboddo applauds "the Poet's Art who has raised Lady Randolph's Grief so high in this Scene that he might make the NEPTUNE or Change of Fortune in the next the more striking" (p. 9). Monboddo himself is happily aware that for once ancient and modern criticism are on common ground, in that Douglas, as well as "touching the Natural Feelings," is also "exactly
according to Rules, and must please the Judgement as much as it affects the Heart" (p. 9).

A comparison with Sophocles' Oedipus convinces Monboddo that the discovery in Douglas surpasses even that of the classical work. Two reasons are put forward: the Shepherd's story, informing Lady Randolph of the fate of her son, is "most wonderfull & most Affecting" (p. 11), whereas the Messenger's in Oedipus fulfils only the technical function of furthering the plot; and the Shepherd, unlike Sophocles' Messenger, displays a moral beneficence which evokes a suitable response in the sentimental playgoer, "that touches the Heart as much as any I have met with" (p.11).

The comparison with Sophocles, and the praise of the greater depth of characterization written into Home's Shepherd, recur in Monboddo's Of Poetry (MP 243), where Monboddo also puts forward two more grounds for preferring Home's discovery, which he believes to be "the finest Scene that ever was written" (p. 44). For one thing, reasons Monboddo, the fictional nature of the plot on which Douglas, "the best Tragedy in English" (p. 22), is based means that Lady Randolph's surprise when all is revealed is accompanied by a similar emotion on the part of the audience, whereas the story of Oedipus was common knowledge among the Athenians (pp. 43-45). This naive confusion of fictional and real emotion is to be expected in a literary climate which valued the display of artistic emotion in direct proportion to its depth and directness.
In the second place, Monboddo displays an aversion, which Dr. Johnson shared, to the dramatic treatment of any material which was morally suspect. This puts the revelations of patricide and incest in Oedipus into rather a bad light, and explains Monboddo's preference for the discovery, "full of Philanthropy" (p. 45), in Douglas. As well as being more wholesome, the denouement of Home's play is praised by Monboddo for being "not one but two Discoveries" (p. 45), not only revealing the continued existence of Lady Randolph's son, but identifying him as her husband's protector.

MP 243 contains, indeed, considerable comment on Douglas, most of which is subordinated to proving Monboddo's point that the capacity of poetry to portray a complexity, or succession, of events renders it the most elevated of art-forms. No amount of pictures, affirms Monboddo, depicting the series of incidents comprising Douglas, could prepare an audience for the Shepherd's revelations as thoroughly as poetic narration or a dramatic enactment (pp. 37-44).

To these beauties of form and sentiment, believes Monboddo, are superadded the prosodic virtues inherited from Milton. In Origin and Progress IV Douglas is characterized as "the best play, as it is now generally acknowledged to be, in the English language" (O&P, IV, 242). This modest claim is here backed up by Monboddo's concentrating on the play's composition in periods, and on the demands made on a player in reciting them with full attention to both syntactic and prosodic pauses. Once
again, the stress is on verse as recitation, rather than as printed; and Monboddo voices the opinion that "I doubt there are very few players now in Britain, that can speak, as they ought to be spoken, the first eight lines of this play" (O&P, IV, 242-43, n.), which he believes merit careful attention to the Miltonic sonority of their periods. Nor does Monboddo leave his observations on a general level, but takes the opportunity to note that this was a task for which Garrick was not equipped, with the result that he avoided performing in the play (O&P, IV, 241-42).

Monboddo was interested in any innovatory attempts to integrate classical dramatic techniques into English plays. He applauds, for instance, Gilbert West's rendition of Euripides's Iphigenia in Tauris into blank-verse hexameters interspersed with rhymed lyrics; and the work is indeed an honourable attempt to retain not only the content of the original, but also its variety of poetic forms. The sentiments expressed by West in his opening apologetics are markedly similar to Monboddo's own: he prefers the "simple native Majesty" of the ancient drama to the "glittering Theatrical Ornaments of modern Tragedy" (in Gilbert West, Odes of Pindar (1749) p. 132), and has studiously avoided the "one uniform Versification" of the former. He admits rhyme, "a modern Gothick Invention" (p. 132), as would Monboddo, as a fitting accompaniment to brief lyric excursions, but no further. As if to demonstrate even more his literary kinship with
Monboddo, he voices his admiration for Italian opera as an "exact Copy of the ancient Drama" (p. 133) and for Samson Agonistes as "a noble and exact Imitation of the Greek Tragedy" (p. 134). Little wonder, then, that Monboddo should include an example of West's pseudo-Grecian dialogue in his "English Prosody" in Origin and Progress II, declaring it to be "the best imitation of antient verse I have ever seen" (O&P, II, 393).

Another instigator of doomed attempts at classical dramaturgy, William Mason, at least earns Monboddo's gratitude: in MP 307, an exposition of the function of the ancient chorus inspired by L'Abbe Vatry's dissertations on the subject in the Mémoires de l'Academie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres (VIII (1733), 188-224), Monboddo notes the chorus's potential for providing a philosophical background to the action, and adds "The Choruses of Mr. Mason in the Elfrida and Caractacus deserves great praise; for they abound much in Mythological Philosophy" (MP 307, p. 187). Monboddo even judges Mason's opening soliloquy in the Elfrida to be more dramatically decorous than Euripides's prologues, being more organically linked with the plot (MP 307, p. 184).

Conclusion

Such, then, is an account of Monboddo's criticism of individual figures in English poetry. Monboddo's concern with the basic materials employed by the writers
he discusses - their vocabulary, versification and figurative language - coupled with his wide reading of classical literature serve to elevate his criticism from the level of the dilettantish observations of an off-duty law lord to that of a committed classical scholar. At the same time, of course, Monboddo is sufficiently a man of his time to assent to its penchant for the excesses of language and sentiment which typify its poetry. We have, for this reason, the more cause to be thankful that Monboddo has recorded in his poetic criticism his assessment of the poetic rationale which led to an admiration for Thomson, Home and Armstrong. Many eighteenth-century critics were ready to establish parallels between Georgian England and Augustan Rome on the social and political levels; few made so serious an effort to compare the English and Graeco-Roman tradition on linguistic and prosodic levels as Monboddo.
Part 2

Text and Notes
Textual Introduction

The part played by each of the following MSS in contributing to Monboddo's planned work on poetry is fully set out in Ch. 1 of Part 1.

MP 243 is dated Autumn 1789, and is part of the text for O&P VII.

MP 235 is also an integral part of the work on poetry; its dates by internal references to the post-1787 period (see MP 235, pp. 4 and 41); and was presumably completed before passages from it were included in O&P VI (see pp. 566-567).

MP 235 is a final form of material first set out in MP 236 - 240, and indeed incorporates passages from MP 237 (pp. 1 - 2, 28(11) - 28(11)(3)) and MP 238 (pp. 12, 18 - 24), as well as PB 16, 2 - 5. A 1794 watermark (MP 238, p. 20(1)) shows that Monboddo continued work on this MS after the publication of O&P VI.

MP 241 follows on from MP 235, and contains references to O&P V (MP 241, pp. 18(1), 25) dating from 1789 or after.

MP 309 was intended originally as an introduction to O&P IV (1787), and was later dropped from the volume as printed.

MP 232 was also part of the O&P IV on poetry, which was later altered so as to exclude the MS. It also takes in MP 242, pp. 3 - 4.

MP 227 dates from the 1760's, and is included not because it has any textual bearing on O&P but as an earlier form of Monboddo's thinking on poetry.

The MSS here transcribed are in the form of folio sheets, some in the hand of Monboddo himself, others in those of his scribes Kirkpatrick Williamson and William Robertson. In my
edited text passages are ascribed to a particular hand by means of a preceding M, KW or WR in square brackets. Changes of page or scribe in the course of a marginal insertion are recorded after the Apparatus Criticus.

The preceding "p.", and brackets where appropriate, are added to page numbers as written in the MSS; any other periods and letters accompanying main page references are in the original. This does not apply to the pagination of papers apart, which employ a variety of methods of pagination which have been standardized to a bracket unaccompanied by punctuation.

In my editorial practice I have sought to reconcile two sometimes divergent principles: to retain the "feel" of the original MS pages, and to present a transcription in which clarity is not sacrificed simply to retain non-essential elements of the written sheet. Hence quotation-marks at the second and subsequent line-openings of prose quotations are omitted, and words divided by the end of a line are rendered intact. Authorial instructions and symbols indicating that additional material is to be inserted from elsewhere in the MS (e.g. a paper apart) are omitted, as the Apparatus Criticus provides sufficient information concerning such insertions (although authorial instructions to take in material from a different MS are retained for the sake of intelligibility). Catch-words are omitted whenever a catch-word in the MS is positioned below the last complete word of a page; but where a last word not so positioned is repeated at the head of the following page, it is this second appearance of the word, not the first, which is omitted. Mistaken repetitions of words are emended, and noted in the Apparatus Criticus, as are mis-spellings so grave as to
obscure the author's meaning. Consistently eccentric spellings, such as Monboddo's persistent rendering of "length" as "lenght", are commented on at their first appearance.

All archaic spellings and abbreviations are retained, as are all capital letters. Monboddo's choice as to upper or lower case is quite inconsistent, that of his scribes less so; where the matter is in doubt (and such occasions are legion) silent editorial fiat has been resorted to.

Only such regularizations of letters, numerals and punctuation as are necessitated by the limitations of typographic reproduction are used. Superior letters are lowered, and periods and dashes under them regularized to a following period (except in names beginning "Mo.", where the period is omitted).

In general, dashes are regularized to a period or a hyphen as seems appropriate. The several varieties of ampersand and of bracket are rendered uniform.

In MP 235, Ch. 1, those symbols employed in identifying material to be incorporated in O&P which are situated in the left-hand margin have been transferred to the right-hand.

In Latin quotations, diphthongs are separated, becoming Ae and becoming ae. "a" is expanded to "que". In Greek quotations, breathings and iotas subscript are silently added and repositioned where necessary; and varieties of script derived from MS forms are replaced by their typographic equivalents.

The Apparatus Criticus records all alterations to the first drafts of a passage, numbered separately by chapters, as well as recording mis-spellings and unintentional repetitions. Additions to cancelled material are in the same state as the material to which they are added unless otherwise stated.
Editorial notes of a non-textual nature are located by superior letters, and are placed at the end of the entire text. Untraced references are marked "UR".

The titles of MSS are taken either from the head of the first page or from the concluding endorsement; preferably the former, since the latter is often an extended title serving as an index, and may on occasion have been written up to thirty years later than the original title.

**Symbols in Text and Apparatus Criticus**

- [p. 1] page 1 thus numbered in MS
- [p. (1)] page 1 unnumbered in MS
- [p. 2(1)] page 1 of a paper apart from page 2
- [p. 2(1)(3)] page 3 of a paper apart from a paper apart
- [ ] enclosing the conjectural filling of a gap in MS, or material added by editor to complete sense
- * * enclosing conjectural restoration of material lost through decay of MS
- [?] enclosing dubious readings
- -?- - illegible word
Symbols and Abbreviations in Apparatus Criticus

\^ \^ enclosing inserted material
< > enclosing cancelled material
(KW) \^ and <at> "and" (written by KW) cancelling "at"
| (written by previous writer)
|| new line
||| new paragraph
CS material cancelled through lack of space
(a)/(a) referring both to footnote reference in text and to footnote itself
|| centred heading
Of Poetry.

As the Principles of Poetry and all the Fine Arts, and indeed of all Arts and Sciences, are to be found in Philosophy, I will begin what I have to say of Poetry with the Philosophy of it; and I will join with the Philosophy of Poetry that of all the other fine Arts, as Aristotle has done, who in this Work is my Model as well as in what I have written on the Subject of Rhetoric. for I think it has happened very fortunately for all the Popular Arts such as Rhetoric & Poetry, that so great a Philosopher as Aristotle has descended from the Contemplation of God and Nature to treat of these Arts, and to give us the Philosophy of them, which no Man was so capable of giving.

That all the fine Arts, are Arts of imitation, it is impossible to deny. Nor indeed can we conceive that there can be such a thing as Statuary or Painting which is not the imitation of something. Nor can there be anything deserving the Name of Music, which is not imitative: for supposing the Melody, the harmony and the Rhythm ever so perfect, yet if it express nothing, and consequently has no Meaning, it may be an Art, as it is performed by Rule and Method, but it is certainly none of the fine Arts.

The first thing to be considered is, what it is these fine Arts imitate: for being imitative Arts, they must of necessity imitate something. Now the Subjects of imitation can only be of two kinds; Either they must be things perceived by the Sense or things perceived by the Intellect. for all the Objects of
our knowledge must be in one or other of these two Classes.

And first as to the Subjects of imitation which our Senses furnish. there are only two of them, which furnish Subjects for the fine Arts. Namely the sight and the hearing. By the sight we perceive the Subjects that are imitated by Statuary, and every kind of Sculpture and by Painting and also by Dancing or the Orchestic Art. And our Hearing furnishes us the Subject of Music Metre, and Rhythm of every kind.

But in these Subjects of imitation Must there not be Beauty. And I think that is absolutely necessary, otherwise the Arts, which imitate such Subjects would not be fine Arts. for let the Subject be ever so well imitated, if it has no beauty in itself, it cannot give us the pleasure which the fine Arts should give us, nor any other pleasure except that of mere imitation, by which we are enabled to say that the thing imitated or Represented, is like a thing we have seen or heard of. This, as Aristotle has observed is an Exercise of our reasoning faculty, by which we discover that this is that, as he expresses it; and as all knowledge naturally gives us pleasure, we are pleased with the Discovery. but it is a pleasure quite different from that which Beauty of the fine Arts give us.

The next thing to be considered is, of what kind this Beauty is, which we admire in the fine Arts? Is it that Beauty which we perceive in Natural Objects, such as Plants, Animals Landscapes, and Natural Sounds; Or is it a Beauty superior to any thing we see in Nature? And I say that the Beauty of the Fine Arts is of that kind; It is a Beauty of which the Artist conceives the Idea in his own Mind, & from thence it is called
the Ideall Beauty & the Artists tell you\textsuperscript{11} that if we only imitate the Beauties that are to be seen in Nature, however perfect the imitation may be, it is not a Work belonging to the fine Arts.

But it will be asked what is this Ideal Beauty, and how can we\textsuperscript{12} conceive that as all our Ideas are from Nature and the Material World, we should have any idea of the Beautifull or of any thing else, that is not derived from Nature?\textsuperscript{[p. 5]}

And here\textsuperscript{13} may be perceived the truth of what is said above that the Principles of all Arts and Sciences are to be found in Philosophy; for this Inquiry into that Beauty, which is essential to all the fine Arts, leads us necessarily into the Philosophy of Plato, which teaches us in conformity with the doctrine of our Sacred Books, that Man was once in a Much more perfect State, from which he is now fallen. In that State Plato tells us that we saw the $\text{T}o\,\text{k}a\lambda\alpha\nu\omega\nu\nu$ itself, of which the Corporeal things we see here, only participate in a small degree; that all we know of Beauty and of every thing else, is only the Rememiscence of what we knew in a former State, which is brought to our remembrance by the things we see here, the knowledge of which we acquire by our Senses and our Intellect operating upon the perceptions of Our Sense. In this way and this way only we can account for our having an idea of Beauty superior to any thing that is to be seen in Nature, being put in Mind of\textsuperscript{14} that superior Beauty with which we were conversant in our pre-existant State by the inferior Beauties we see here. It is however true, that the more beautifull the natural [p. 6.] Objects, we see, are, the more perfect will our Ideas of Beauty be. And Zeuxis the Painter was certainly in the right when in order to perfect his Idea of that
female Beauty which he was to give to his Helen, he desired that all the finest Virgins of Crotona should stand to him. But from these he certainly formed an Helen of more perfect Beauty than any of those Virgins, or I believe than all of them put together. for to the Beauty of every one of them he would add something of the Ideal Beauty, And more still of the Composition of them in one figure, in which his Art would be still more shown: for Composition in all Arts, is the thing of the greatest difficulty.

And thus it appears that the Ideal Beauty is not a mere Chimaera or fancifull thing, but a reality which has its foundation in the Nature of things and Philosophy.

From this Account I have given of the ideal Beauty we can easily account for the distinction which Artists make betwixt, a portrait and a Picture. A Portrait is an exact Copy [P. 7.] made of any thing such as it exists in Nature. And whether that Copy be made in Statuary, Sculpture or Painting, it is no more than a Portrait; And every Artist will at first sight distinguish it from a real Work of Art, in which the ideal Beauty is to be found. And in this way we distinguish an Antient Bust of an Emperor or an Empress, from the head of a God or Goddess.

Hitherto I have only spoken of the Beauty of outward forms, such as we perceive by our Senses. But there are Beauties of another kind which I mentioned, and of a much higher kind, which are perceived by our Intellect, I mean the Beauties of Mind, of Sentiment, Manners and Characters; the Expression of which I hold to be the chief Beauty of all the works of the fine Arts. These too are to be seen in Nature, but not in perfection, any more than the Beauty of the Outward form. To make therefore a Work of Art compleat there must be an Ideal Beauty of that
kind, without which I maintain there can be no single figure of
Man or Woman perfectly beautiful, and much less a [p. 8]
Composition of such figures.

Before I apply these Observations upon Imitation, and the
Beauty of the fine Arts, to Poetry, which is the proper Subject
of this Discourse, I will apply them to other fine Arts and
particularly to Painting. The Subjects of Painting are either
things inanimate such as Hills, Woods, Rivers and Fields, or it
is the Animal Life, or lastly it is the Actions of Men their
Manners, Sentiments and Passions. Now without the ideal Beauty
I say there is no Piece of Painting of any of the three kinds
that I have mentioned, which has any real Beauty or deserves the
name of a Picture.

Of the first Subject of Painting, I mentioned, is made what
we call a Landscape. Now I say if the Landscape is no more than
a Portrait, that is a Copy of a Rural Scene, such as it exists
in Nature, it is not the Beauty [p. 9] which the Art requires,
tho' it may be as fine a Landscape as is to be seen on Earth.
And accordingly a famous Landscape Painter whom I knew many
years ago, one Lambert in Covent Garden told me that he had
copied several Landscapes from the Life, which he thought very
fine; but they never answered in the Piece. By this I would not
be understood to mean that particular Objects, such as Trees,
Hills, and Rivers may not be copied from the Life, tho' even that
should not be done without giving these particular Objects
some touches of the Ideal Beauty so as to make them different
in some degree from what they really are. But the chief
Alteration, which a Skillful Painter will make upon these
Objects is in the order and Arrangement of them. And this will render the Painted Landscape very different from the real, and make it truly a work of Art.

The Painting of Animals and Groups of Animals, is nearly related to Landscape Painting, and is commonly a part of it: And here too there must be the ideal Beauty; for tho' a real Animal may stand to the Painter as well as a real Tree or Hill, (And I believe the Picture will be the better for that, as it will give truth and Nature to the figure), yet it must be the Genius of the Artist, and his idea of what is beautifull of the kind, that will give Beauty to the Figure and make it a picture. And this will be much more the case, where the Animals are thrown together into Groups, and various actions and Attitudes given to them: for there will enter there something of what may be called Manners and Characters, and a great deal of Passion the Strongest and most Violent.

The third Subject of Painting I mentioned, is Men and their Actions. And here we have Manners, Characters and Sentiments properly so called; And a Variety of Action, such as is not to be found in the Brute Creation And here more than in any other kind of Painting the Ideal Beauty of the highest kind is to be seen. Tho if we were to understand the Name that is given to this kind of Painting in its proper Sense, I mean History Painting, we should imagine it to be no more than the Representation of real Historical facts. Whereas such a Painting would not be a picture but a Portrait. By this I would not be understood to mean that the Subject of this kind of Painting may not be taken from History or real Life. So far from meaning
that I am of Opinion that the Picture will be the better for having such a Subject. Because it will be immediately understood by every Man who knows the Story; and it will have more truth and Nature in it than it could otherwise have. for Painters, even when the Subject is of their own invention choose for that reason to have living figures standing to them. But I say the Subject, tho' taken from History or real Life, must not be servilely copied: But there must be a certain ideal Beauty be given to each particular figure, and much more to the Combination or Composition of them, the Actions and Attitudes.

But besides all this, there is a Beauty of a yet higher kind, which belongs to this kind of Painting: And that is the Expression of Characters, Manners Sentiments and Passions: And in short of Mind. for I hold no Picture of this kind to be of any real Beauty, that does not paint the Mind as well as the Outward form.

The next Art I shall mention is Music, which is so much an imitative Art, that I think nothing deserves the name of Music if it imitates Nothing. It is no more than a Collection of Sounds diversified by Melody and Rhythm, which may give a certain pleasure to the Ear, but not a rational pleasure, as it has no meaning. At the same time there may be Art in the Composition, and nothing discordant or unharmonious. We may therefore call it since it has both Melody and Rhythm; but these alone don't make Music, unless they express or imitate something.

The next thing to be considered is, what it is that Music imitates. And in the first place it imitates Natural Sounds, such as Thunder, the Noise of Waters, or any low Murmuring Sound. 2dly. It imitates the Voice and Cries of certain
Animals: And there is a piece of Scotch Music called the Hen's March, which imitates the Cackling of a Hen when She lays an Egg. This to be sure, is a very low Subject of imitation; but I am more pleased with it, and think it deserves better the Name of Music than a great deal of Italian Music that I have heard.

But the chief Subject of Musical imitation is Manners, Sentiments and Passions, to which by Nature certain Tones are Appropriated; And by imitating these Tones Music either excites or allays these Sentiments and Passions. And as it is Sentiments and Passions that form the Character of every Man, it is evident that Music may be made not only an Art of great pleasure and delight, but also an Art most useful in forming the Characters of Men, particularly of the Young Men, who cannot so easily learn Virtue and a good Disposition of Mind by teaching and instruction; but as Music applies to their Sense of Hearing, and as all Children and young Men delight in Music they may be formed in that way to good habits and Dispositions, and by hearing Music often they will in some sort have the practice of Virtue.

As to the Beauty of Music it is altogether ideal; for there are no Sounds in Nature to be found of such regular Melody and Rhythm, and at the same time so various. There are some birds indeed that have some Melody and Rhythm in their Cries, such as the Cuckoo and the Cocketoo; but there is no variety or Rhythm such as is in what we call Music. The Tones of Passion too in our Species have something Musical in them: but they are certainly not so beautifull as when they are diversified and varied by the Melody & Rhythm of our Music, preserving at the same time the Natural tones of Passion.
I come now to speak of Poetry the finest of all the imitative Arts, as I shall afterwards show. But first it is proper that I should show what its Nature is, what it imitates and how.

And here I have the Assistance of Aristotle, who tho he have given us the Philosophy of all the fine Arts in general, by way of Introduction to his Treatise upon Poetry, has most accurately in that Treatise explained the Nature of Poetry in general, and of Tragedy in particular.

And first I think it is proper before I come to explain what Poetry is, to show what it is not, and to distinguish it from some things with which it is by Many confounded. And first it is not Versification, for Versification is nothing else but a Species of Stile, and can make no alteration as to the Nature of the Work, any more than if it were written in Prose. The same may be said of Splendid and figured Dictions, which are no more than Ornaments of Stile.

2dly As to the Matter of the Work, nothing of the Historical kind, whether in verse or Prose, is a Poem; first because it is not imitation, and secondly suppose it were imitation, it has not that beauty which poetical imitation must have, I mean the Ideal Beauty. for it is a mere Portrait, or copy, of what has had a real Existence. And whoever confounds History with Poetry, makes History a Romance, which, I think, may be a Poem tho' in Prose. I am therefore very much surprised that such a Scholar and Critic as Sir William Jones, in his Work upon Asiatic Poetry, should maintain that the Life of Tamerlane, written by a Persian Author in Verse, is a Poem.

Thirdly no matter of Art or Science, tho taught in Verse,
is a Poem; when it is taught in Prose no body gives it that Name: but if it be taught in Verse that is in the Stile of Poetry, it is in the Opinion of Many a Poem, tho' as I have [p. 17] observed it is impossible that the difference of Stile can alter the Nature of a Work. And therefore I pronounce without the least hesitation that the Georgics of Virgil tho' for the Versification and Diction one of the finest Works in the World, is not a Poem, for the same reason that Empedocles's Work upon Philosophy was no Poem in the Judgement of Aristotle, who says that it has nothing in common with Homer but the Versification; but from What he there says it appears that many at that time as well as in this gave the name of Poetry to whatever was written in Verse. But such Critics ought to know that antiently in Greece all writings of every kind were in Verse; And it is on Record who was the first Writer in Prose, Vizt. Pherecydes.

But tho' Historical Narrative or the teaching of any Art or Science whether in Verse or Prose, be not Poetry, what shall we say of Description? And I say the [p. 18] same of it, that I do of Landscape Painting: If it be not a mere transcript from Nature, but a Work of Imagination having that Ideal Beauty, which I hold to be essential to all the fine Arts, I say it is Poetry. Of this kind the finest Poetry I know is to be found in Thomson's Castle of Indolence, where we have described in the richest Language and finest Versification that I think can be in Rhyme, Scenes which certainly do not exist in Nature, but only in the Imagination of the Poet. And this makes a great difference betwixt his Descriptions in the Castle of Indolence and those in his Seasons, which are all of Natural Appearances not of
Scenes of fancy or Imagination. And there is another great difference betwixt the two \[35\] Works, that in the Seasons there is nothing else but Descriptions, \[36\] with some few Degressions: Whereas in the Castle of Indolence there is a Story, or \[37\] fable which goes thro' the whole Piece and ends with a very proper Catastrophe.

But I come now to \[p. 19\] Speak of what is the proper Subject of Poetry \[38\] and according to Aristotle the only Subject; And that is Actions proceeding from choice and deliberation, or in other Words the Actions of Intelligent Beings; And I say Actions in the plural Number; for one Action however great or noble it may be, Could \[39\] not make the Subject of a Poem. but there must be a Series of Actions, all connected together, \& \[40\] arising one from the other, and all tending to one Conclusion \[41\] or a catastrophe as it is called.

And here we may observe the excellency of this kind of Poetry above the one I mentioned last, namely descriptive Poetry, which by the great Poets such as Homer and Virgil, is only used as an accessary or an Ornament: And indeed by itself it is a very poor kind of Poetry compared with that of Which I am speaking; for the Subject of it must, according to the Account I have given of it, be a System. Now, as I have observed elsewhere \[42\] h Beauty consists in System, that is in order and Arrangement, and in mutual dependance and connection of the parts with one another: Nor must the System in this case be a \[43\] small one; but it must have a certain Magnitude \[44\] \[p. 20\] for as Aristotle tells us, the Beautiful consists of order and a certain size. It must not therefore he adds be too small, otherwise the View
of it is confused, and it is the next thing to indiscernable, so that we do not perceive the order and arrangement of the parts. Neither must it be too great, otherwise it cannot be comprehended in our Minds. (a). So that for that reason likewise we cannot perceive order and arrangement in it.

And here we may perceive the reason why Poetry, and particularly that Species of it of which I am now speaking must be a work of imagination, and have that Ideal Beauty, which I have mentioned so often as essential to Poetry: for there never existed in real Life, such a Series of events, as would form a good Comedy or even a farce, not to speak of an Heroic Poem [p. 21.] or a Tragedy.

And here we may see the truth of Aristotle's Observation (b) that Poetry is more Philosophical and of more value than History: for History, says he, gives you only the facts as they really happened. Whereas Poetry gives you them such as they ought to have been according to the rules of probability. The Subject therefore of History is particulars which often happen without any connection or dependance upon one another; Whereas the Subject of Poetry is Generals, which Philosophy always arranges in some order. At the same time he informs us that particular Actions such as really happened may be made the Subject of Poetry; for tho' many things do happen that are improbable, and have no connection one with another, yet it sometimes happens otherways: And then there is nothing to hinder such Action from being the Subject of [p. 22.] Poetry. (c) And I will add that if such a Subject

(a) Περὶ ποιητικῆς 45
(b) Ibid. Cap. 9.
(c) Περὶ ποιητικῆς 46 cap. 9.
can be found, it is better than a Subject wholly invented by the Poet; for as Aristotle has observed it is more a Probability, especially if it be a known Story, than any invented Subject: for what has really happened will readily be believed to be probable. At the same time Aristotle informs us that there were Tragedies in his time, of which the Subject was wholly invented. And he mentions one particularly composed by a Writer he calls Agathon (a). None however of that kind has come down to us; but we have one of our own, of which the Subject is wholly invented, and it is the best Tragedy in English. By this Account of it every body will know that I mean the Tragedy of Douglas, which I think is much the better Play for the Subject being invented by the Poet; for the fine Scene of the Discovery of the Son by the Mother is much the finer that the Story was not known: so that it is a Discovery to the Spectators as much as to the Mother. And it is a Discovery so conducted and coming out in so surprising a Manner, that it must have a wonderful effect upon a Man who had never heard of the Play. And accordingly I know that it had such an effect upon many of the Spectators when it was first acted. Now this is an Advantage that the Discovery has over the famous Discovery of the Oedipus, which was no Discovery at all to any of the Spectators in Athens, where the Story was so well known. And this justifies Aristotle’s Observation in the Chapter above quoted that Poets need not trouble themselves [p. 23] so much to seek for known Subjects; for, says he, even known Subjects may be known

(a). Ibid.
but to a few, and yet they will please all. At the same time
I think it is clear what Horace says that it is difficult to
invent a proper Subject for Tragedy (a) I will add farther,
that tho' the Subject may be a known Story and which has really
happened, yet the Poet must not take it just as it is set down
in History; for as I have observed there is no series of events
that really happened, which would make a good Subject of a Poem.
He must therefore add or take away Incidents & Circumstances,
and transpose others, giving them a different order and
Arrangement. for it is only in this way that he can make a
proper fable for his Piece. And I am perswaded that it is in
this way that Homer has treated the Subject both of his Iliad
and Odyssey. That the Principal facts in both really happened,
I cannot have the least doubt. for as to the Iliad who can
[p. 24] doubt that there was a Siege of Troy; that in the last
year of that Siege Agamemnon and Achilles quarrelled. And it
was very natural that he who was chief in Command should quarrel
with him, who was the bravest and had been of the greatest
Service to the common Cause. And the occasion of the Quarrel
also, as narrated by Homer, is very natural. I believe also
that the consequence of the Quarrel vizt. Achilles's
Secession from the Greek Army, which was very natural, did also
happen in fact, together with all the Misfortunes of the Greeks
that followed upon it. I believe also that when things came to
extremities Patroclus was sent out by Achilles with his Troops,

(a) See paper Apt. 54 [No paper apart exists.]
to save the Greek fleet and Army - that he was killed by Hector,
and that Achilles in revenge took the field and killed Hector.
And as to the Subject of the Odyssey I believe that Ulysses after
the taking of Troy, [p. 25] did in his way home Wander into the
several Countries mentioned by Homer - that at last he got home;
but found his house possessed by the Courtiers of his Wife who
were living upon his Estate and consuming it, and had formed
a design against the Life of his Son. In this Situation of
Affairs the wise Ulysses thought it prudent to disguise himself
as a Beggar, and by a Series of events, which make a plot as
well contrived as any to be found in any Tragedy or Comedy he
at last with the Assistance of his Son and two faithfull
Servants, destroyed all the Courtiers, and regained the
possession of his Estate and Kingdom. But these are only the
Principal facts in both Poems: And if to them Homer had not added
many others, and had not also taken away or changed likewise
many others, he never could have made two such Poems as the
Iliad or Odyssey. And there is one very capital fact in the
story of the Trojan War, which I think Herodotus has
proved that Homer has altered altogether. I mean the fact of
Helen's being carried to Troy by Paris, and not left in Egypt.
And this much with respect to the Management of the Subject
of the Action, where I think I have shewn that Horace has very
properly given us the Rule for the Subject of Poetry where he
has said Ex Noto fictum Carmen Sequar. That is you must Vary
the Known Story So much by adding taking away & altering
Circumstances So much as to give the plain history the
Appearance of Fable & in that way give it the Ideal Beauty,
which as I have Said no History closely copied can have.

The next thing to be considered is, who are to be the Actors in this Action. That they must be intelligent Beings, who act with Deliberation and Choice I have already determined. And it only remains to be considered Whether they are only to be Men, or Beings superior to Men. And I think it is certain that from a natural Sympathy with our Species Our human feelings are more affected by what Men such as ourselves do or Suffer than by what is done or suffered by Superior Beings. Homer however has made much use of Gods in both his Poems, and particularly in the Iliad. But We are to consider that Homer's Gods are indeed beings superior to Men ἄν μὲν μὲν ἀληθὴν θεών τε βοήθησιν. (a) But they have all the Passions of [p. 27] Men, and are liable to suffer as well as Men. But I do not so much approve of the Divine Persons who act in the Paradise Lost of Milton. They are much too exalted above Humanity to be brought upon the Scene or even into an Epic Poem. Even the Devils in Milton are more wicked than Men. And tho' they fight like Men, it is not as the Gods in Homer fight, that is upon Earth as Men fight, but in a Cubic Phalanx in the Air. Except therefore where Milton introduces his Devils as Speaking and Debating, I think they are not proper poetical Personages, but something above Humanity, whose doings or Sufferings cannot much move us.

Men therefore are the proper Actors in this Species of Poetry. And the next question to be considered is, What sort of Men these Actors are to be.

(a) Homer's Iliad in the Speech of Phoenix in the Book of the Embassy.
Aristotle (a) has divided Men into three Classes; those who are better Men than we; those who are worse; and those who are such Men as we; And compared with us these are all the Divisions of Men that are possible. The Actors in the higher Specieses of Poetry, such as the Epic and the Tragic, are Men superior to us, such as the Antients supposed their Heroes to be. The second kind of Men are according to Aristotle, the Subjects of Comedy; And are to be considered as ridiculous Characters; for such the Men were represented in the Ancient Comedy of Athens, which was the only Comedy Aristotle was acquainted with, the new Comedy not being then established. The third Class consisting of Men, such as those of the present Generation were the Characters represented in the new Comedy, such as that of Menander and his imitator Terence in Latin; in which the Characters are not ridiculous but the common Characters of the age. And accordingly in the Plays of Terence (for those of Menander are lost) there is hardly any thing to be found that can raise a Laugh. I will only further observe upon the Subject of Comedy that the Actions and Characters in it are not such as are proper to excite our admiration, as the Heroic Actions and Characters of the Epic and Tragic do. The Beauty therefore of such Pieces is in the contrivance of the Fable, And in the Characters, Manners & Moral of the Piece.

Thus I have explained one of the three things which Aristotle considers in Poetry and the other imitative Arts. And which he has expressed by three very short words, δ, ὧς, ὡς. By the first of these he means the Subjects of the imitation; By the second he means the Instruments or Ways by which the

(a) Poet. Cap. 268
imitation is performed: And these are very different in the
different Arts. for some imitate by Colours, as Painting does;
others by Stone or other such like Materials, such as [p. 30]
Statuary; and others by Words such as Poetry: With respect to
which the third thing mentioned by Aristotle is to be considered,
and that is how the imitation is to be performed; whether by
Narrative only, by Dialogue only or by Narrative & Dialogue
intermixed. (a). As a perfect Model of this last way of imitating
he proposes Homer, who certainly has intermixed the Narrative
and Dramatic most agreeably in his Poems; And therefore Aristotle
very properly commends him for speaking as little himself as
possible. (B) And indeed a Poem merely narrative, and even a
History without any Speeches or Dialogue in it, is but a dull
performance.

As Aristotle has told us that Poetry imitates by Words,
I think it is evident that he considers a Composition in Prose
if it be imitative as Poetry: And indeed he has said so in
Express Words. for he has told us (Chap 1) that the $\eta$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\omicron\otaupsilon\varsigma$
by which he denotes, as the Etymology of the Word Expresses,
all Composition in Words, imitates $\tau\omicron\upsilon\omicron\otaupsilon\varsigma$ $\psi\omicron\alpha\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\nu$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\omicron\otaupsilon$ $\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\rho\omicron\alpha\omicron\varsigma$; Any Romance therefore or Novel, in Prose, is a Poem
according to Aristotle’s Definition of Poetry. 

There is one way of imitating Which is mentioned by Aristotle
but which I have not yet taken notice of. Aristotle says it was

(a) Post. cap. 3.

(B) Ibid. Cap. 24.
without either Music or Words. This was a great Art \([p. 31]\)
Among the Antients, and was called \(\text{δραματικός}\), being an Art of imitation among them as much as Poetry and Music. Lucian in his Treatise upon Dancing\(^6\) tells us that at first the Actors upon the Roman Stage both acted, that is gesticulated and Spoke. But they found this too laborious. And therefore they laid aside the Speaking altogether, and expressed the meaning of the Words only by their Gestures. And from thence they were called Pantomimes. And this in later times under the Emperors became the favourite entertainment of the Roman People. But the Separation of the Action from the Speaking began under the Commonwealth as Livy has informed us, for he has told us\(^7\) that Livius Andronicus, one of the first among the Romans, who composed a regular Dramatic Piece and who acted his own Plays as the first Dramatic Poets did among the Romans, and also \([p. 32]\) among the Greeks as Aristotle informs us, \((a)\), being once very much fatigued with both Acting and Speaking requested that the people would permit him to employ another to speak, which accordingly they did. And thus for some time both Speaking and Acting went on, tho' performed by different persons; but at last the Speaking was altogether laid aside, and only the Acting practiced. In Modern times Pantomimical Entertainments have been practiced; but they differ from the Antient in this respect that tho' our Pantomimes\(^8\) express by our gestures, Actions Sentiments and

\((a)\) in Rhetorica.\(^5\)
Passions, it is mere mimicking, such as we see practiced sometimes in private conversation, but without Rhythm, that is without having the Gestures performed in a certain Ratio of the different Actions to one another. Now that was not the case of the Antient Pantomimes [p. 33.] whose Motions were commensurated to one another in Length or Shortness, as much as the Motion of the Voice was in the pronunciation of their Verses: For otherways this way of imitation could Not Have been called by Aristotle οἱμαλτζουμενος ἐνθομος. It is true that there is Music playing while our Pantomimes act; And the Music may be supposed to be in some sort suited to the Subject of the action; but from what I have seen of this kind of Acting, it does not appear to me that the Action is adjusted to the Rhythm of the Music, Whereas we are sure that there was a Rhythm in the Antient Pantomimes. And they had a Notation of it as well as of the Rhythm of Music, as I have elsewhere Observed from a Passage of Plato. It is very true that Aristotle in his first Chapter says that the Dancing or Pantomime Art imitated without Harmony that was their name for Music ὀμα της ἑνθομος. But the Antients in their common Speech used [p. 34.] Rhythm as well as Melody, without any accompanying Music. And it appears they did so in their Pantomime Entertainments; for as in some of their Entertainments they joined all the three Mimetic Arts vizt. Poetry, Music, and Pantomime, so they practiced them
separately. Thus as Aristotle tells us (a), their Auletic and Citharistic, that is their Music upon the flute and upon the Cithera, were without Words or imitation by Gesture. And even in the Entertainments such as Tragedy, in which all the Arts of Imitation were joined, there was plain Speaking without either Music or Pantomimery. (b)

And thus I think I have sufficiently explained the Nature of Poetry and shown that it is a Mimetic Art, as well as the Others I have Mentioned. And I think I have Sufficiently distinguished it from History and Portrait Painting: for I have Shown that it is the Ideas of our Mind imitated and expressed by Words, not any thing which actually [p. 35] exists in Nature. It is therefore as much an imitative Art as the Orchestic or Pantomime Art was among the Antients, which imitated only the Sentiments and Passions in the Minds of the Actors, not any thing external. & as Poetry in like manner imitates only the Imaginations of the Mind, every Work of the Poeticall kind is very properly Said to be a Work of Imagination.

I come now to show as I promised that Poetry is the finest of all the Mimetic Arts finer than any of the other three Painting, Music or Pantomimery. for in the first place it comprehends the operations of our chief faculty, I mean Intellect, much more perfectly than can be expressed by any of the other three Arts. for in Poetry there may be Speeches, as

(a) Poetic. Cap. 1.
(b.) Ibidem
fine as any of Demosthenes; And accordingly both in Homer and our own Milton we have very many fine Speeches. In the other Arts, tho' there may be a great deal of passion expressed, Sentiments too and Manners, there cannot be much reasoning or Argument.

2dly. Poetry can be joined either with [p. 36.] Music or with the Action of the Pantomime. As to Music I believe in Very Antient times the two Arts were never separated. And it is so in Italy at this day, tho from What I have observed, it does appear that they were sometimes separated in Antient Greece, particularly in their performances upon the Flute and the Cithera. But in other Entertainments such as their Tragedy, they were very happily joined at least in some parts of the Piece, And must have produced a Very great effect. Now this is a Remarkable advantage over Painting or Statuary which must always stand by themselves; And cannot be joined with any other of the three Arts. And Poetry tho' it be not Sett to Musick yet if the Verses be well composed & well read, they please the Ear very much, nor do I know any thing in English that gives me So much pleasure as the Verses of Milton well pronounced. But the Pleasure of Greek Verse read by an Antient Greek must have been very much greater. for besides the So much greater Variety & Beauty of the Articulation, it had Melody & Rhythm, both which our Language wants.

But 3rdly. The greatest Advantage of all that Poetry has over the other Arts is, that it represents a Succession of Events one after another. In this respect its advantage over Painting or Statuary is Manifest; for both these Arts are confined to an instant of time. And it is also [p. 37.]
Superior to Music in this respect that Music may express a Succession of Sentiments and Passions, but not of Events. And it is by Events in Poetry properly succeeding one another, that our Passions are moved than by any thing else. Pantomimery is the Art of all others, which comes nearest to Poetry in this respect; for as Aristotle tells us (a), it imitates Actions as well as Sentiments and Passions. But actions and Events cannot be so well expressed with all their Circumstances, as they are by Words. And as Aristotle has observed, Actions are related in Poetry which happen not only at different times, but in different Places at the same time, which cannot be represented by any other, of the Mimetic Arts. And this is an Advantage which Aristotle has observed, that Epic Poetry particularly has over Tragedy. (b).

To be convinced how much Sentiment & passion are excited by a Succession of Events or different Events happening at the same time, let us consider that there is a progress in every thing in Nature, & that it is by Degrees that the Mind is wrought up to any great pitch of feeling or Emotion. Now a Picture finds the Mind quite unprepared in that Way, it is therefore only the Object by itself which the Picture presents that can move the Mind, unless the Spectator knows the Story & can recollect Some of the Events that happen'd before the Event exhibited, but such recollection will be very weak.

(a) Poet. Cap. 1.
(b.) Ibid. Cap. 24.
compared with the description of these preceding Events in the Narrative poem, or represented upon the Stage in the Tragic Drama.

I cannot illustrate this better than by the example of the fine discovery I mentioned in the Douglas. As a Discovery is an Incident most Striking and therefore one of the best Subjects either of Poetry or Painting, I think out of that Discovery in the Douglas there might be three Pictures made; one of Lady Randolph, when the Jewels were given to her with the Crest of the family of Douglas upon them, and which She must have immediately known to have been the Jewels which She put into the basket with her infant; in consequence of which Discovery She comes upon the Stage prepared to hear from the Shepherd all the particulars of the loss of her dear Child. Of this Subject I think one Picture might be made: Another of her violent Agitation when She learned from the Shepherd that the Basket in which her Child was come ashore, and when She asked the Question, Was he alive? And a third Picture might be made of her extatic joy, when She learned from the Shepherd that her Son was still alive, and that very young Man, whom She had admired so much under the name of Norval. In each of these Pictures a Connoisseur might admire the beauty of the figure of Lady Randolph, if She was well painted. And he might also think that passion was very well expressed in her Countenance and Action. But if he did not know the Story he could admire nothing else: nor could not be much moved by the appearance of Passion in the Lady without knowing the Cause of it. But suppose the Story had been told him, and that he was
acquainted from the beginning with the particulars here mentioned, which immediately preceded the Discovery, I would ask the reader whether it was possible that he could be as much moved as a Man who saw the whole represented upon the Stage, or even read it in his Closet; for there is a Succession [p. 41] of Events represented there, which makes the discovery come out in the Most surprising and affecting Manner, And at the same time very naturally which is the greatest beauty that any discovery or any Incident in a Play can have. Before the Scene of the Discovery, the Reader or Spectator is informed that Lady Randolph had lost her beloved Son by her beloved Husband Douglas; And She lamented his Loss the more that She imputed it to herself. She supposed too, and indeed She could not suppose otherwise that he was lost together with his Nurse in crossing a River that lay in her way, when it was in a flood. While She is in this disposition of Mind the Incident happened of her then husband Lord Randolph being attacked by a Band of Ruffians; And having escaped by a Young Shepherd of the name of Norval, whom he produces to Lady Randolph, and desires her to acknowledge him [p. 42.] as the Saviour of her husband's Life. Then follows a Conversation with the Shepherd, which makes Lady Randolph admire him exceedingly. And after he and her husband are gone She in Discourse with her Confident, after praising the Young Man Very much, very naturally compares her own Situation with the Situation of the Mother of Norval, who was a young Man such as her Son might have been if he had been then alive. And here we have these beautifull Lines.

"How blessed the Mother of yon gallant Norval [i]"
She for a living husband bore her pains,
And heard him bless her when a man was born;
She nurs'd her smiling infant on her breast;
Tended the child, and rear'd the pleasing boy;
She, with affection's triumph, saw the youth
In grace and comeliness surpass his peers:]

After this Conversation betwixt her and her Confident
She goes off the Stage. There come in the Servants with an old Man, a Prisoner, whom they had seized, and found about him those Jewels abovementioned, which, the Confident carried to her friend, who immediately knew them to be Jewels belonging to the family of Douglas, and which She had put into the basket with her Son. Upon this Discovery She immediately comes upon the Stage in the full conviction that She was to hear from this old Man all the particulars of the loss of her beloved Son. And indeed in this Situation of things it is impossible that She or any reader or Spectator not acquainted with the Story, could believe otherwise. This makes the Discovery exceedingly surprising. And it comes out so gradually by questions which Lady Randolph puts to the old Shepherd, that instead of being assured of her Sons being alive She is confirmed in the opinion which She had so long entertained of his being lost.
At last however the truth comes clearly out As much to the Surprise of the Reader or Spectator, as of the Mother, that he was not only alive, but was that Very Young Man, whom She had admired so much. Such a Scene well acted or even read, must produce emotions in the Spectator or Reader, such as not one of the Pictures I have mentioned, nor all of them put
together could produce: for, as I have observed, they could hardly have any effect at all without the Spectator being informed of the preceding Events, which prepared the Reader or the Spectators in the Theatre for this wonderfull discovery. But how could he be so well informed as by the preceding Scenes of this play so well written. And it is impossible he could learn from any picture, or so well, from Any information as from the Scene itself, by what degrees the Discovery came out; which taken altogether, with what precedes it, and the Exultations of the Mother that follow the Discovery, 116 I will venture to say is the finest Scene that ever was written: And it exceeds the famous Discovery in the Oedipus 117, so much admired by the Antient Critics, not only in the respect I have mentioned, of its being a Discovery to the Spectators as much as to the Mother, 118 [p. 45.] but likewise in this respect that the Discovery in the Aedipus comes out by a Messenger from 119 Corinth, who has no Character at all, whereas the Character of the old Shepherd, by whom the Discovery in Douglas comes out, is most Amiable. And further the Discovery in the Aedipus is of a thing most Shockingly unnatural, such as that of a Man having killed his father and Married his Mother, Whereas the Discovery in the Douglas is full of Philanthropy, representing to us a Mother who recovered her beloved Child, that She had long given up for lost, and with this additional Circumstance of joy, that at the same time She discovered him to be alive She found that he was the Gallant Norvall 120 She had admired so much. This is a Circumstance, wonderfully well contrived by the Poet, And makes the discovery not one but two Discoveries: for the Mother
not only discovers that her Son is alive, but is that brave Youth who saved the Life of her husband. Of such a double discovery, there is no Example in any play Antient *or* Modern that I can recollect; for tho' there be discoveries of two Persons, each to one another, as in the Electra, yet the Discovery there is only of the Existence of the Persons their Birth and Relation to one another; but no discovery of their Characters or Qualities. And in this respect likewise the Discovery in the Douglas is preferable to every discovery in any other Play Antient or Modern[121][p. 46][M] And with the rapturous Joy & exultation of Lady Randolph So much augmented by this additionall Discovery[122], the Scene most naturally concludes. Tantum Series Juncturaq pollent. For Composition is principall in all the Arts, & without a Composition & Series of Events, there cannot, as I have Observed, be a Poem.
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Having thus explain'd the Nature of Poetry, & Shewn the Rank which it holds among the fine Arts, I come now to treat of the Stile of it, which is properly the Subject of this Work, & as Verse is almost always the Stile of Poetry, I think it is proper first to explain what Verse is before I say anything of Poeticall Diction. And as in treating of all Arts, we should begin with what is most perfect in the Art, because in that way we can best judge of what is good or what is faulty or Defective, in the Works of the Art that are less perfect, for that reason I will first explain the Nature of the ancient Greek & Roman Verse, before I speak of Verse in Modern Languages.

That the ancient Verse is formed by Rhythm or Quantity as it [is] commonly called tho' I think not properly, must be known to every Man who has the least tincture of Classicall Learning. The Word denotes the Ration which different motions or parts of the same motion have to one another, with respect to Continuance or Duration. The perception of this Ratio, gives pleasure to the ingenious Mind & to every Mind who has any Sense of Beauty, which necessarily consists of certain Ratios & proportions. It is a Word which we have very properly borrowed from the Greek Language, & I think the Romans among many other terms of Art which they took from the Greeks (a) should also have taken this,

(a) As the Romans had none of the fine Arts before they became
instead of using the Generick Word Numerus, & our Word Quantity by which we express the Rhythm of Language, is also a Word much too generall applying to every thing having parts or dimensions of any kind.

The Subject therefor of Rhythm is Motion. What Motion consider'd Philosophically is, does not belong to a Work of this kind to enquire. I consider it therefor as an Object of Sense & not of Science, & as Such it is percived by three Senses. The Sight the hearing & the Touch (here take in from paper marked 1. 237.⁹ pag. 1. beginning with the Words. The Subjects therefor of Rhythm. down to these Words at the foot of pag. 2. Which constitutes this Rhythm).

[IP 237]

[p. 1] The Subjects therefor of Rhythm are Things Visible Audible, & Tangible. What is percived by the Sight only without either the Hearing or Touch, is called by Aristotle έυθμος μνήμος or έυθμος ψιλος. This is the Rhythm of Dancing which was among the Greeks an Art of Imitation as well as Poetry & Musick, & of which as I have Observed elsewhere⁫ they appear to have had a Notation as well as of Musick. The Rhythm of Motion perceived acquainted with Greeks, So they had no Names for them, but having gott the Arts from the Greeks they very naturally gave them Greek Names, Such as Rhetorica, Musica, Grammatica. Rythmus they also took from the Greeks, at the time Quinctilian wrote, but not when Cicero wrote, who constantly uses in place of it the word Numerus. Even the Word Periodus they had not in Cicero's Days but expressed it by Severall Words Such as Circuitus, Ambitus. & c.⁷
by the Ear, that is of Sound, is of two kinds. for it is either of sound without Words, or of Sound with Words. The first may be called by the Generall Name of Music, of which Rhythm among the antients was accounted the principall part tho' it be not accompany'd with Melody nor reduced to an Art, & therefor does not please the Ear. The other is either Poetry or measured Prose, or as it ought rather to be called Numerous Prose. The third & last kind of Rhythm which is perceived by the Touch has no particular Name, & is of the lowest Species of Rhythm. It is therefor not the Subject of any of the fine Arts, tho' it may be usefull in Science particularly in Medicine.

From this Definition of Rhythm it is Evident that it belongs to a higher Genus, viz. Number, without which there is no Ratio or proportion, Order or Regularity in the Universe, & therefor the Pythagoreans Said & Said rightly that all consisted of Numbers, & that \( \theta\alpha\sigma\varepsilon\alpha\theta\mu\omega\sigma \) & Aristotle properly calls the Rhythm of Speech, \( \alpha\gamma\iota\omega\nu\sigma\tau\alpha\rho\iota\eta\varsigma\varsigma\alpha\beta\iota\theta\mu\omega\sigma^d \). Lib. 3. Rhetor: Cap. 8. To explain what higher Genus Number belongs to would be going farther into the first Philosophy than our Subject requires & 2dly. It is evident that to constitute Rhythm more than One Motion is necessary, for of One thing there can be no ratio or proportion.

The Rhythm I propose to treat of here is the Rhythm of Language, or the Rhythm of the Motion of the Voice in Pronunciation of Articulate Sounds, Which constitutes this Rhythm \([MP 235] \) marking the ratio that those Sounds have to one another with respect to Lenght or Shortness. Before we proceed further in this Enquiry it will be proper to
make a Distinction which many do not make, betwixt the Rhythm & the prosody of the learned Languages. There are many who value themselves much upon their knowledge of Prosody, Who do not so much as know what the Word means. For they think it denotes the Quantity or length & Shortness of the Syllables, whereas it has nothing to do with that, but relates to a thing quite different. viz. The musical Tones which the Greeks & Latins gave to the Syllables of their Words, which made their Language truely melodious, & is therefor very properly called by the Halicarnassian the Melody of the Language.  

The Latins have a Word composed in the Same manner as the Greek Word νόμισμα & denoting precisely the same thing. I mean the Word Accentus, Which I believe some People are So ignorant as to imagine that it means what we call Accent, but which was So entirely unknown to the Greeks & Romans that they had not so much as a Name for it.

Those who have not Studied the History & Philosophy of Man, are Surprized that whole Nations should have spoken with both Melody & Rhythm making a kind of Recitativo of their common Speech. But they ought to consider that Singing is Naturall to Man as well as to some birds, whereas Language is So far from being naturall to Man, that it is a Work of the greatest Art, & most difficult Invention (if it was invented by Man) of all the Arts we practise. For Setting aside the Grammatical Art, even Articulation, which is only the material of Language, is of itself not only of difficult invention, but so difficult in the practise, requiring So many different Positions & Actions of the Organs of Pronounciation, that nothing but continued practise from our Infancy can make it easy for us. And therefor as I have
Observed elsewhere Language is the most wonderfull of all the
Arts we have invented, as we have produced not only the Art, but
furnish'd the Materials of it, whereas in the other Arts we practise,
Nature has given us the Materialls

If therefor there ever was a Naturall State of Man, & if he
did not come into this World practising all those Arts that he
know practises, It is evident that he did not in his Naturall
State Speak; but he sung, for having a Voice [p. 5.] capable
of Variety of Tones, & being naturally pleased with those Tones
put together tho' in the most rude & artless manner, he would
make Some kind of Musick with his Voice that is he would Sing,
or if we will not believe that Instinct would direct him to do
that, we may Suppose as Lucretius does that he learnt it by
imitating the Birds (a)

Further History informs every man who Studies it in the grand
& comprehensive View of the history of the Species, that
Language & the race of Men came from the South & East. Now the
People there are much more musicall than in the North & West,
where they appear to have almost quite lost those musicall Talents
which they brought with them from the South & East, & the further
North they have gone the more they have lost of those Talents, So
that as Lemnius the Danish Missionary among the Laplanders,
informs us, these People, tho' undoubtedly they came from a

(a) This Notion of Lucretius was confirmed to me by what the
Wild Girl whom I saw in France told me: for She said the Music
in her Country was an imitation of the singing of Birds.
Country far to the East (a)\textsuperscript{34} could hardly be taught the common Church Tunes. But there is a Southern & Eastern Nation, with which \textsuperscript{p. 6} we are pretty well acquainted, I mean the Chinese, who retain the Musicall Genius of their Country So much, that they have a much greater Variety of Musicall Accents upon their Syllables than the Greeks had. For the same Monosyllable among them by being differently accented signifies 9 or 10 different things, so that their Language consisting of no more than 330 Words, Serves all the purposes of a highly civilized Life. I knew a Man One Mr Bevin\textsuperscript{1} who had been two & thirty years in China, having been Sent thither by the East India Cy when a Boy, in order that by learning the Language he might qualify himself to be their factor at Canton. He was So Obliging as to lett me hear him Speak Some Chinese, and as far as I could Observe their Tones did not rise so high as the acute Accents of the Greeks, but the Notes were very much divided & the intervalls very\textsuperscript{37} small, So that the Musick of their Language resembled in that respect the Singing of Birds. Whether they did not vary their Monosyllables by pronouncing them longer or Shorter I forgott to ask him, but I think it certain that as Rhythme is an essentiall part of Musick, they could not have had So much Music in their Language without Rhythme & I am persuaded that they distinguish in that way the Sense of several of their monosyllables as we know the Greeks

(a). This is evident from the Language they Speak which is now known with great certainty to have come\textsuperscript{35} from a very remote Country in the East lying betwixt the Euxine & Caspian Seas.\textsuperscript{36}
distinguished some of their words by the length or shortness of the syllables.\textsuperscript{38} And upon the whole the Chinese language is the greatest phænomenon of the language kind, that is to be found in this earth. For it is a language without any of the three arts of\textsuperscript{39} derivation, composition, & flection, without \( [p. 7.]\) one or other or all of which I should have thought it impossible to have form'd a language. Then they continue still in the infancy of articulation, for their language consists wholly of monosyllables. Now I think there can be no doubt that when men first began to form a language of art\textsuperscript{40} they would articulate single\textsuperscript{41} syllables by themselves, before they learned to join them together in words of severall syllables, for there must be a progress in all arts from what is simplest & easiest, to what is compound & more difficult \( [p. 7. (1)]\)

The first words therefore were as simple as possible, being only monosyllables\textsuperscript{42} \( [p. (7.)]\) and there I think it is natural to suppose that they would stop a while, and by giving tones and rhythm to those syllables express\textsuperscript{44} their wants and\textsuperscript{45} desires and so keep up intercourse with one another. In this state I imagine the language remained for some time even in egypt where I suppose it to have been first invented. And while it was in that state it found its way to china, with other egyptian arts, and particularly, hieraglyphical writing, which m de guignes has shown came from egypt to china. See vol. 34 of the memoires of the french academy.\textsuperscript{m} The chinese, who I believe, are as dr warburton has said,\textsuperscript{n} a dull un inventive people have preserved both the language, and the writing of the egyptians, as they got them. But in egypt\textsuperscript{46} I do not believe that either of\textsuperscript{47} these
Arts continued long in so infantine a State. That Alphabetical Characters were invented there I think there can be no doubt, and also the three great Arts of Language, Derivation, Composition and Flection. When they have got so far in the Art of Language Words of many Syllables became absolutely necessary; The Tones and Rhythms of the Monosyllables were nevertheless still preserved. And in this Manner was formed such a Language as the Greek, which it is now discovered, was the Antient Language of Egypt. Thus was compleated the most wonderfull of all human Arts, by which about five Millions of Words were so connected together, as to be comprehended in the Memory and readily used. And at the same time pronounced with a beautifull Variety of Melody & Rhythm.

But to return to musicall Accents, of the Chinese Language. The Question is Whether they first learned to Articulate their Monosyllable, & then learn'd those musicall Notes by which they distinguish them One from another, or Whether they first practised Musick & then learned Articulation. And it appears to me very much more probably, that having first Sung whether by Instinct or having learned it from the Birds, & after that having learned from some nation with which they had an Intercourse, to articulate a few Sounds they still continued to Sing and as it was very naturall join'd their musicall tones to the articulate Sounds [p. 8.] & so formed a Musicall Language, & at the same time Supply'd the Defects of their very Scanty Articulation.

We are very much obliged to the Halicarnassian for explaining So accurately as he has done the Nature of the Greek Accents. He is the only Author as far as I know, that has done So, & but
for the Account he has given of them, I might have thought them as much without Rule & as little Musicall as the Chinese Accents. But the Halicarnassian has told us that they rise to a fifth, & every Syllable of the Word has either a Grave Accent, an Acute, or both which is called a Circumflex, & this is all the Variety which the Nature of the thing will admitt. But this Variety is not without Rule. And I know an English Scholar, who, if you give him the Accentuation of any One Word, he will tell you how all its Derivatives & all its different flections are to be accented. I thought the Passage in the Halicarnassian of such importance, that I have given a Translation of it at full length which I very Seldom do, and he makes the matter so clear, tho' a good deal removed from common Apprehension, that no Man who understands the Language & has learnt the first principles [p. 9] of Musick, can have any doubt in the Matter.

The Reader will be Surprised when I tell him that a Nation we reckon barbarous - the Iroquois of north America have accents Such as the Greeks had, & Speak at this Day both with Melody & Rhythm. But my Information comes from a Man who was three years in the Country & is a Man of Sense & Knowledge His name is Dr Moyes very well known in Several parts of Great Britain where he has given Lectures upon Natural Philosophy. And his report is the more to be trusted that he is a Musician, & his Sense of hearing I believe is the more acute, for his having lost in his early Infancy the Sense of Seeing. He Says their Acute Accent does not rise commonly above the Greek Acute Accent, that is to a fifth, but sometimes when they are warm in Speaking they Start to an Octave. Their Rhythm is exactly Such as that of the Greeks, the long Syllable being to the Short in the Ratio of 2 to 1. (145. T.)
If therefore no Language ever was Spoken by a Whole Nation with Melody & Rhythm, those who have heard the Chinese speak in that way must have been mistaken, or willingly imposed upon us, Dr Moyes must have lyed concerning the Iroquois for he could not have been mistaken & So must the Halicarnassian in what he has told us with So much Accuracy concerning the Greek Accents.

But these Testimonys are all rejected by some people, singly for this reason that they have no Idea of any People Speaking in that way, & they hold it to be impossible that there should be any Beauty in Speaking or in any other Art of which they have no Idea.

I will not pretend to enlarge the Ideas of Such men, or make them less fond of themselves. But if they will not be convinced by facts that are told them I think they should be convinced by the testimony of their own Senses. Let them listen to that common Bird the Cuckow, & they will find that he articulates his Name as distinctly as they can do, & gives to his Pronounciation both Melody & Rhythm, for he falls a third from the first to the last Syllable & at the same time makes it longer than the first.

The Cocketoo pronounces his name of three Syllables, in the same way but whether he rises higher or not so high as the Cuckow, I cannot tell. Now is there any absurdity or impossibility in supposing that a Musical Nation such as the Greeks certainly were, should do what we see the Cuckoo does, join to their articulation both Melody & Rhythm. Nor should we be surprised that the Greeks practiced an Art that we cannot practice, and indeed can hardly have an idea of. for it would have been the same with their Statuary had not the Monuments of these Arts come down to us, without which we should not have had so much as an idea of the Grace and
beauty of such Figures as the Apollo of Belvidere or the Venus of Medicis. But the Melody of their Speech has not come down to us, except in the Accurate description, which the Halicarnassian has given us. Neither has their Music come down to us, except by the account which Antient Writers have given us of it. And for the same reason I hold, that we can have no perfect Idea of it, any more than of the Melody of their Speech. So that all we know with any certainty of their Music is, that as it proceeded by much smaller intervals than our music, we must suppose it to be more refined. And as we know that they cultivated and practiced it more than any other Art, we may reasonably suppose that they carried it to greater perfection than any other Art.

What makes many So Incredulous as to the Melody of the antient Languages, is that they Suppose the musick of those Languages to be Such as our Vocall or Instrumentall Musick, & they imagine that Greek or Latin was Spoken like the Recitativo of the Italian Opera. But tho' that Musick be liker to Speech than any other Musick we have, & So far resembles the Melody of the antient Languages, yet it differs from that Melody in this Material point, that the Notes of the Recitativo are like the Notes of our other Musick, distinct & Separate from One another, & not running into One another, whereas in the Melody of antient Speech the Tones were continued & join'd together without any Sensible Intervall betwixt them. For the Antients divided Musick into two kinds. The first they called *Diastematoikos*, in which the Notes were divided in the manner I have mention'd So that the Ear perceived an Intervall betwixt them. The other was *Duskel* that is continued, or *Ev Dusel* as they Expressed it, or proceeding
any

Now this is the true Melody of Speech for the Tones join together as the Syllables do upon which they are laid, where as if they were distinguish'd from One another, & if the Voice should rise or fall at once to a fifth, or even to a lesser Intervall, it would be truely chanting or Singing, & the Syllables upon which the Accents were laid, would appear to be divided, as much as they are by a Child when he learns to Spell & put Syllables together in a Word.

Before I leave this Subject, I must Observe, that in a degenerate Nation among the first Arts that are lost is the Melody of Language. In modern Greece they have lost both the Melody & Rhythme of their Language. And the Language of the Philosophers of India commonly called the Shanscript tho' the Grammar of it (a most wonderfull Grammar it is) be preserved among the Bramins, who also Speak it among themselves, yet the Melody of it is lost in Common Use, but the Bramins preserve the Knowledge of it likewise, & use it when they read their Sacred Book the Vedam, in which the Tones are mark'd as in our Greek Books. The Nations that migrated from the East & South to the North have also as I have Observed lost the Melody of their Language, which I think may partly be ascribed to their Climate which has not only Shrivel'd & Contracted their Bodies, but has more or less impaired all their Senses. And So much for the Melody of Language.

As to the Rhythme every Man who has the least Tincture of Classickall Learning has at least Some Idea of it (for he must have heard of long & Short Syllables) tho' he may not be able to
define it, nor have any Practice of it in his own Language, nor in the learned Languages, not even in reading their verse, as I shall shew afterwards. Who therefore deny the Existence of the Melody of those Languages, because he has no Practice of it, may for the same reason deny the Existence of their Rhythm.

The Rhythm of Language (for of that kind of Rhythm only, I speak) consists of the Ratio of Syllables to one another in point of Length or Shortness. These Syllables agreeably mix'd together make what we call Verse or numerous Prose.

From this Definition it is apparent that Rhythm has nothing to do with the Elevation or Depression of the Voice in Musicall Cadence & therefore is quite distinct from the Melody of Language. Every Man who knows any thing of Musick will readily make the Distinction betwixt the two. But there is this difference betwixt Musick & Language, that Musick cannot be without both Melody & Rhythm, but Language may be without either, tho' not a perfect or compleat Language, but if a Language has Melody & Rhythm, it agrees with Musick in this particular, that its Rhythm is of more consequence than its Melody. For Rhythm as the Antients Say is every thing in Musick, & in Language of the Rhythm as I have Said, Verse is composed & numerous Prose.

But an Agreeable Melody, as the Halicarnassian has told us, is part of the Beauty of Composition in Prose as well as Verse, & I am persuaded that there was a Beauty in the Orations pronounced by Demosthenes with all the Variety of Rhythm & Melody, & all that Grace of Action in which he excelled so much, such as No Man now living can have any Idea of. Men I know who have a high Opinion of their own Taste & Judgement
& who are many in Number, in the Age in which we live, will be very angry with me for declaring such an Opinion. But let me ask them, whether would they have had any Idea of the Excellency of the Antients in other Arts such as their Sculpture, Architecture, & the Grammar of their Language, if Monuments of these had not come down to us. Now of the Melody & Rhythm of their Language there are no Monuments, any more than of their Musick, & for the same reason I say that we can have no idea of their Excellency in that Art, which we are Sure they cultivated more than any other, & for that reason I think we may presume excelled more in it than in any other.

Cap [2]

In the Preceeding Chapter I have shown what Rythm & Melody of Language are & the Difference betwixt the two. I have also shown that the Greek and Latin had both Melody & Rhythm [p. 16] And that there is One Language Still living that has them both. I have also endeavour'd to prove that all Languages originally had both. And I am now to explain the Rhythm of antient Verse.

The Rhythm of Language consists, as I have Said, of the Ratio of Syllables to One another in respect of their Lenght, that is the time we employ in pronouncing them. The Perception of this ratio gives us pleasure, as we are form'd by Nature to delight in every thing that is Orderly & regular & tending to form a System, which is the Object & the only Object that Intellect contemplates. There can be no Syllable without a Vowel & Sometimes a Vowel by itself makes a Syllable, it is the Vowel therefor which only makes a Syllable short or long, not the
Consonants which by themselves have no Sound. The Vowells therefor must not be of equall Lenght, but Some must be long & Some Short, or to express it more accurately the same Vowel must be Sometimes long & Sometimes Short otherwise there would not be that variety in the Lenght of the Syllables which the Beauty of every Art requires. And the Ratio of the long Vowel to the short must be fixed & determined otherwise there would be no Art or Science in the Case & accordingly it is fixed to be as 2 to 1 [p. 17] But a Short Vowell may be made long by two or more consonants following it in the same Syllable, & So retarding the Pronounciation which necessarily makes the time the Voice employs in the Pronounciation longer, & consequently makes the Vowel & the Syllable long. There are other ways by which a Short Vowell is made long, but these it is unnecessary here to mention. I shall only add that in the same way a Short Vowell is made long, a long Vowell is made longer. But that is not attended in the composition of Verse tho' it must have an Effect upon the ear.

The Greeks mark two of their Vowels by a different Character when they are long, & I wish they had distinguished in the Writing all their Vowels in the same way. Tho' I think the old Latin way of marking the long Vowel was Still better. for they wrote the Vowell double thus aa & in that way express accurately the Nature of the long Vowel & how it differs from the Short & I think there is reason to believe from the figure of the Greek Omega that the Greeks marked their long Vowells in the same way. And if I am not mistaken there are old Greek monuments Still extant where the long Vowels are So marked. It is an Error I think in the Greek Grammarians to reckon Seven Vowells, because they have
happened to mark two of them when long by a distinct Character. They might as well make the number ten, as every one of the Vowels may be & is pronounced long as well as $\epsilon$ & $o$.

What reason there may be why the same Vowel should be long in one Syllable & short in another, or whether it be not a thing nearly arbitrary, it is not my Business here to enquire. But if it were not so the Rhythm of the Language as I have Observed would be very defective, & there would be a Monotony in the Pronunciation very disagreeable.

As the lesser number is naturally the Measure of the Greater, so the Short Vowel or Syllable is made the measure of the long, and we call it a Time & we Say that the Short Syllable is One time & the long is two, & in this way we measure a Verse very properly, saying that it consists of so many times. For as all Quantity is the Time taken up in the Pronunciation of Vowels & Syllables, Art & Method required that it should be divided & numbered. 

A Verse is not only divided into Syllables, but into what is called Feet which is a Composition of 2 or more Syllables, & it is a more proper Division of a Verse than into Syllables, which are only a Division of the Articulation or Spelling of the Verse, whereas the Division into feet is a division of what is proper to Verse, viz. The Ratios of which it is composed, for every foot containing at least two Syllables, must of necessity contain the ratio these two Syllables have to one another with respect to Quantity, & it must contain at least two of the Times of which the Verse is composed.

One foot may consist of more Syllables than another & yet be of the same time. This is the Case of the Dactyle & the Spondee, for tho' the Dactyle has 3 Syllables & the Spondee
only two, they contain each of them no more than 14 four times. But the 15 greater number of Syllables in the Dactyle, makes the Motion of it quicker & more Voluble than of the Spondee, as is evident if we compare an hexameter Verse all of Dactyles except p. 20 the last foot, with a Line all of Spondees. Thus for example, Virgill has very well described the rapid motion of a horse by this Dactylic Line Quadrupedante putrem & c and Homer as happily the tumbling of a Stone down a hill by the same kind of Verse. αντε τειτα και more happily Still by contrasting it with the preceding Line in which he has described the painful Labour of rolling the Stone up the Hill in a Verse consisting mostly of Spondees.16 & vowels gaping upon One another. λασφαυδων & c. But tho' every Man's Ear is Sensible of the Difference that Dactyles make in the flow of the Verse,17 very few I believe know the reason of it which is, that in the Dactyle there is more motion in the same time, for the Action of the Organs18 in the pronunciation of every Syllable is a Motion, So that in the Pronunciation of the Dactyle there are three motions for two only in the pronunciation of the Spondee tho' the time of both feet be the same. Now where p. 21. there is more Motion in the same time, there the motion must needs be quicker. for 19 Much Motion in a Short time is the Definition given by Aristotle as I remember of Quick Motion.6

I come now to explain more particularly the Rhythm of Antient Verse or Metre as it may be called in the proper Sense of the Word. And as hexameter was the first Verse used both in Greece & Rome, & as all shorter Verse may be consider'd as portions or Sections of it, I shall confine my Observations to the hexameter,
believing that they will apply more or less to every kind of Greek or Latin Verse.

The Hexameter or Heroic Verse as it is called is composed of Dactyles & Spondees, alltogether Six in Number, consequently it consists of 24 times. The Dactyles & Spondees tho' equal each to the other in time, are different as I have observed in Number of Syllables, which makes a most agreeable Variety both in the same Verse & in different Verses. A Verse all of dactyles cannot be, but there are two Examples & no more in Homer of Verses all of Spondees, which move indeed very heavily. A Verse all of Dactyles except the last moves as we have seen very rapidly, & therefore is only proper for describing certain things. But a Verse in which the Dactyles & Spondees are intermixed, has an Agreeable temperate flow, & is suited to every Subject.

But Dactyles & Spondees cannot be indifferently in every part of the Verse. For the last foot must be a Spondee & the penult ought to be a Dactyle, which makes a very agreeable Variety. for the Spondee gives a firm Base to the Verse, & stops as it were the rapid flow of the Dactyle with which it is very well contrasted. There are however hexameter Verses used by the best Poets, which have a Spondee in place of a Dactyle in the penult foot & which are therefore called Spondaic. But they flow very unpleasantly & I hold them not to be genuine Hexameters, tho' they be used sometimes by Poetical Licence or perhaps for the sake of Variety, the reason I imagine why Milton in his Paradise lost has this Line

Burnt after him to the bottomless Pit
which is no more an English Hexamer, than the Spondaic Verse is a Greek or Latin Hexamer
The next thing I am to consider in the antient hexameter Verse, is the Stops or breaks in it. If there were none of these but a constant flow without any Stop, there could be no Rhythme in it because there would be no parts which we could compare with one another so as to discover their Similitude or Dissimilitude. In Water dropping there may be Rhythme, as Cicero Says, but there can be none in a Torrent. Let us therefore consider the Divisions in an Antient hexameter Verse. The first and minutest is the Division into Syllables. This makes a very Small Stop as we pronounce the Language, but as the Antients pronounced it I am persuaded, the Intervall betwixt Syllables was more sensible, for as they compared the Syllables together in respect of Lenght & Shortness, their Ear would have a more distinct Perception of each of them.

The next Stop to be considered is that which makes the Distinction, betwixt Words, & which as the Sense absolutely requires it, must be much greater than the preceding. If the Words & Syllables were the same in Number that is if all the words of the Line were Monosyllables, then the Stops would be both too great & too many & the Verse would run like a Shallow Stream chatting among Pebbles. There is not nor I think can there be such a Line in Greek or Latin, but Milton has One that comes very near it.

Him first, him last, him Midst & w'out End which may express very well what he meant, but it is certainly a very rough unmusical Line. The great defect of our Language is its having so many Monosyllables & Some of them of very harsh Sound, such as two in the Line from Milton above quoted viz. first & midst, which makes it very difficult to compose in English
numerous flowing Verse. Of this Defect Milton appears to have been very Sensible, & he has endeavour'd to remedy it as much as possible by using foreign Words when he could do it with propriety, & by compounding the Words of his own Language. I will give but one Instance out of many that might be given. It is where he compares the host of fallen Angells lying prostrate upon the Lake of fire & Brimston to Leaves Strew'd upon a Brook.

Thick as Autumal Leaves & c

Here is a very vulgar Image which he has raised wonderfully by his Language & Versification where may Observe that the foreign name of the Place in Italy besides giving a flow to the Verse which no English Word could give it, makes the Image more Striking especially to those who have Seen Vallombrosa, & as Poetry is not of an Abstract, but Sensuall Nature as Milton somewhere Says, & therefore it delights in realising things by naming Places & Persons. There is also another foreign word, of several Syllables which he has introduced into this passage vizt. Etrurian; as also the effect of realizing the Image. The Reader will also Observe that he has made the word Embower, which very well expresses the thick Shade which those Trees of Vallombrosa make over head. (a)

The next Division to be Observed of the antient hexameter is into Feet, and I am perwaded that as the Antients pronounced

(a) [No footnote.]
their Verse, there was a Stop there as well as betwixt Syllables & Words. This is not the Case as we pronounce the Antient Verse, but that it was So as the Antients pronounced it, is to me evident from the following Considerations. (Here take in what is in the Pocket Book N. 16. p. 2d.)

All antient Verse as I have Observed\(^3\) was measured by the\(^2\) Times first of the Syllables & then of the Feet. As to the Syllables the Ear of the Antients perceived that One Syllable was equall in Lenght to another or double. Now this the Ear could not [p. 3] have perceived, if there had not been a Stop in the pronounciation, as there most certainly is betwixt the two Syllables. for Suppose a continued flow of the Voice in pronouncing the two, it is impossible that the Ear could perceive either equality or inequality in the Sound of the One compared with the other. In like manner the Ear must perceive that the Hexameter Verse must consist of Six feet equall to one another in Time, otherwise it can have no perception of the Rhytme of antient Verse. Now the Ear can no more perceive the Equality of the feet without Some pause [p. 4] betwixt them, any mor than of the Syllables, & this Division of the feet they both perceived by their Ear, & marked by a motion [p. 4(1)] of their foot or hand,\(^3\) When the foot began they lifted up their foot or hand. And hence it was that the beginning of a foot was called \(\gamma\). And when the foot ended they let down their foot or hand, And this was called \(\beta\). Thus they beat time to their Verse as well as to their Music. And in this way I understand Horace, when he says

\[\text{Legitimumque sonum digitis callemus et auro.}\]
It is true indeed that our Ear has no such perception, & the Reason is plain viz. That we do not pronounce the antient Verse by the time of Syllables & feet but by the ictusses or Thumps of our Accents, resembling the Beating of a Drum, not the Rhythm of Musick or antient Verse, which consisted of Sounds longer or shorter whereas our Poetry is made not by Sounds, but by the Intervals betwixt Sound, marked by our Accents.

I shall only add that as the hexameter Line was divided into so many feet all equal in time which made the Rhythm of the Verse, if the Ears of the Antients did not perceive & mark that Division, it was with respect to them a Line indivisible & in which therefore they could perceive no Rhythm.

The fourth stop I shall mention appears to be an extraordinary one for it is a stop not at the end of a foot, but in the middle of a foot at the same time it is the greatest & most perceptible stop in the whole Verse, and there is not one of them but sometimes two or three of them in one Verse. The stop I mean is well known to those who have studied the antient Verse under the name of Caesura, so called because it cuts or breaks the Verse (See No. 1.(B) p. 9. about the Middle of the Paper.). See also the last three pages.

The common Caesura as I have observed is upon the fifth half foot, or , as it is called, but Virgill has diversify'd his Verse agreeably by making it sometimes oftner I think than any other Poet Greek or Latin upon the Seventh half foot, or , as it is called.
As in these two Lines immediately following one another

Quidve dolens regina Deum -

Insignem Pietate Virum, -n

There may be as many Caesuras as there are residuous Syllable of the foot whether it be the first Second third or fourthe. In this Line of Virgill. Musa mihi Causas memora.⁰ There are three Caesuras all following after the first Second & third foot. But these make too many⁴⁷ Cutts or breaks in the Verse, which make it run unpleasantly, especially when it is contrasted with the two Lines above quoted which follow it, & in each of⁴⁸ which there is but one Caesura. [p. 28(11)(1)]

But what is the Reason for this Stop of the Voice at every Caesura. For that⁴⁹ not only we make such a Stop, but that the Antients made such a Stop, is Evident from a Treatise which Varro wrote giving a Reason for it. This treatise is unfortunately lost & only the Title of it preserved in Aulus Gellius.⁵ I have asked the Question of Severall Men of Letters but I have found none hitherto that has⁵⁰ So much as attempted to answer the Question, & I know One man very eminent in the learned World who because he cannot Solve the Difficulty denies the Fact, & Says that to pause at the Caesura, is an Error in reading the hexameter Verse. tho' it was, as it appears, an Error of Varro, & I presume of all the Romans at the time he wrote. It may appear presumptious in me, to pretend to solve a Difficulty, that So many Men of Learning have not so much as attempted to Solve, I will however propose my Conjecture, which I hope will appear Something more than a Conjecture to the candid Reader, who is not vain enough to disdain being instructed in Quantity,
upon the knowledge [p. 28(11)(2)] of which so many people particularly in England value themselves so much. And

In the first place it is to be observed that the first Syllable of every foot of an hexameter Verse must be long Syllable. Now as the Antients pronounced their Verse by Quantity there was necessarily twice as much time employ'd in pronouncing a long Syllable, as in pronouncing a Short, the ratio of long to Short being as 2 to 1. And even as we pronounce the antient Verse by Accent we dwell longer upon a long Syllable even if it be not accented than upon a Short, especially if it be long by position for then by the two Consonants following the pronunciation is necessarily retarded, even tho' we do not attend to the length or Shortness of the Vowel.

2o As the Caesura never is but where the last Syllable of a Word is the first Syllable of a foot, there must necessarily be first a Lenghtening of the Sound of the Voice upon the first Syllable of the foot, & 2o the Sense requires a Stop at the end of the Word, as it is by that Stop, that Words are distinguish'd from one another. Now these two together make a pause of the Voice that is remarkable, & greater than any other pause in the Verse except what is made either, by the division of [p. 28(11)(3)] the Sense into Periods or members of Periods or by the conclusion of the Verse. And thus I think I have Solved the grand difficulty how there should be a Stop in the middle of a foot, & this when the Sense does not at all require it.

Varro's Work as reported to us by Aulus Gellius related only to the Caesura or pause upon the fifth half foot, which I believe was the only Caesura known or practised in his
time, but it applies equally to the ἐπούμερος or pause upon
the Seventh half foot, which Virgill has used so much, & thereby
diversify'd his Verse most agreeably. for if the Caesura was
allways to be in the same part of the Verse, it would give
a tedious Uniformity to the antient hexameter like that of the
french long Verse. And where the pause is delay'd so long as
to the Seventh half foot, it gives a majestickflow to the Verse
whereas if the break be after the first foot or if it be often
repeated as in the Line Musa mihi Causas & c. there is no dignity
or Majesty in the Verse.

The fifth Stop is a most naturall One, for it
is at the End of the Verse, without which there would be no
Verse. As it makes a great Pause it naturally lenghtens the
last Syllable of the Verse, which otherwise would be Short, for
the same reason that the Caesura.

These are all the Stops in the Verse in which the Rhythme
is concerned, the other Stops which the Sense may require if
the Verse be composed in Periods or Members of Periods, belong
not to the Rhythme, nor indeed to the Poeticall Art so much
as to the Rhetoricall. I shall therefor only Say that as Periods
are a beauty in Verse as well as Prose Composition [p. 26.]
I think the Verse is not improperly cut by Members of Periods,
& as the Stop at the End of the Verse is much longer than any
of the other Stops I have mention'd, I think it may be very
properly Shortend (here take in from p. 12 about the End of
No. 1. beginning at Letter A.

making the Sense of the Line run into the
following, which has two Advantages; for it both Shortens the
Pause, that the Connection of the Sense may not be lost, & it preserves the Period if there be any. This is a Beauty of Homer's Versification which the Halicarnassian has commended, & indeed if in this way we can join the Beautys of both Poeticall & Prose Composition, it must make the finest thing that is to be made of Words. Of Homer's Composition of this kind Dionysius has given us an Example in the passage I have quoted. Horace too has practised the same thing very much both in his Odes & in his Satires & Epistles. And particularly there is One of his Odes. Lib: 4th Ode 5th in which we have Sundry Stanzas composed in both ways. But those which run the Lines into One another please my Ear more than those that do not. And this is not only a Beauty in the Greek & Latin Hexameter, but also in Milton's Hexameter, it is in my Opinion a very great beauty & which distinguishes it in an eminent Degree above the Rhyming Verse.

From what has been Said I think it is Evident that antient Verse read in the Antient manner must have been one of the finest things of the kind that it is possible to imagine. For first there was a Rhythm of Sound continued not of Intervalls of Sound, which as I shall shew make our Versification during certain times & which times have to One another & to the whole Verse a determinate Ratio. These times are not So run together as to appear to make but One time, but they are beautifully diversify'd by those Stops & pauses I have mention'd, which gives to the antient Verse that Variety without which there is no Beauty in the Works of Art.
30. The Sounds So continued with So much regularity & Variety are the finest we can [p. 29] conceive to be utter'd by the human Mouth. For such are the Greek & Latin Words, & particularly the Greek. That language abounds more than any other I know with diphthongs which very much Swell the Sound of a Language, & give to the Vocal Sounds a kind of harmony, as I have else where observed. Then the Words are almost all 65 with the Exception of some connecting particles, Polysyllables, the Sound of which is agreeably diversify'd by aspirate soft & midle Letters, & none of them terminated as in Latin with Mute Consonants, which Shut the Mouth, & prevent the Words from joining pleasantly together. Further the many different 66 Flections & terminations of Words, give 67 a wonderfull Variety to the ancient Verse Further Still the various Arrangement of the Words which the Art of the learned Languages permitts, enabled the Poet to range his Words, So as to make them Sound agreeably. In this Art I think Virgill has excelled all the Greek & Latin Poets, and indeed his Verse is rather too artificiall for a Narrative or didactive Poem, but he has not by the [p. 30] Transpositions, tho' many of them 68 So Violent as to deserve the name of Hyperbatons, Obscured the Sense but in 69 Some instances he has conveyed it more Strongly. For Such is the Beauty of these learned Languages, that what we would call an Unnaturall Order of the Words, not only improves the Sound but gives a proper Emphasis to the Meaning, as I think I have Shewn in what I have written upon the Stile of Demosthenes. And lastly the Accents give a most agreeable Variety of Tones to the Verse, which join'd with the Rhythm must have made the most agreeable Composition that it is possible to imagine
It was this Pleasure which Verse gave to the Ear & the facility which the flexible Genius of the Greek afforded of writing it in that Language, that made the first writings in Greece to be all in Verse, & it is upon Record who was the first Writer in Prose. One Pherecydes And in later times long Didactick Works such as Lucretius's De Rerum Natura & Virgill's Georgicks were written in Verse for the same reason. And I am perswaded that Horace took the trouble to put the common Words of the Language into Verse in his Satires & Epistles. *p. 31* meerly for the pleasure that the Rhythme gave his Readers. For he does not pretend that his Diction was poetick on the contrary he tells you that

- Sic prius Ordine Verbium Posterius facias, praeponeas
ultima primis Erit Sermo merus.

But if the antient Verse read as the antients read it gave So much pleasure to their learned Ears, how much greater must it have given when it was Sung as Homers Verses were by the Rhapsodists. This was a pleasure of which we can have no Idea (I must repeat it again, tho' again I should give Offense) unless we could conceive the Effect of Such Musick as theirs join'd with the Rhythme & Melody of their Language. For their Musick was diastematiek as well as ours, but then it was So Simple as to accomodate itself perfectly to the Melody & Rhythm of the Words, only raising the Tones of the Accents higher, & Separating them more from one another So as to make them more perceptible, but doing no Such Violence either to the Accents or Rhythm, as the Halicarnassian tells us was done in later times by the Musick of the Theatre *p. 32.* But allways raising
a high Note upon the acute Accent, never upon the Grave, & never making a long Note of a Short Syllable. In Short it must have been very like that most precious remain of the antient Musick: - the Recitativo of the Italian Opera, with this materiall difference however that as the Italians have not in their Language either Melody or Rhythme, there could not be that perfect agreement betwixt the Musick & the Words as in the recitations of the Rhapsodists, and yet it is certain that the Words pronounced in Recitativo, are rather better understood than when plainly spoken: - Now as the two Sister Arts ought never to be disjoin'd (& they never are in Italy at this day) the most perfect Musick I hold to be that which agrees best with the Words & makes them perfectly understood.

What I have Said hitherto of the antient Verse is to be understood of it as read by the Antients. But what shall we Say of it as read by us. And I say that it is Verse very different. But to explain this must be the Work of another Chapter.

[33.]

From what I have Said of antient Rhythm, which I have Shewn is perceived by the Ear measuring the time of Syllables & feet, & comparing them together, So as to discover the Ratio they have to one another, It is Evident that we have no practise of Such Mensuration, nor is our Ear form'd to a Rhythm of that kind. We perceive indeed that One Syllable is longer than another, for we have long & Short Syllables in our own language, but we do not know the ratio of the long to the Short, and indeed
by far the greater part of our Syllables are neither long nor
Short, at least we perceive no Difference among them in that respect.
It is therefore evident that in our own Language we perceive
no Rhythm made by long & Short Syllables. But in reading our
Verse, we perceive that there are certain Elevations of the
Voice by which we pronounce One Syllable louder than another, & betwixt these Elevations of the Voice which we call
Accents we perceive certain Intervals which are equal to one
another, or perhaps double. The Rhythm therefor of our Verse
is not properly Speaking a Rhythm of Sound but of the Intervals
of Sound. For our Ear measures no Sound, but only marks the
Intervals betwixt the Severall Accents, which are Sounds indeed
but of which we have no Measure & cannot Say whether they be long
or Short. Our Verse therefore may fittly be compared to the
beating of a Drum, where we only perceive the Intervals betwixt
the Strokes but no length or Shortness of Sound. There is this
difference indeed betwixt the beatings of the Drum and the
intervals betwixt our accented Syllables that there may be
no Sound at all betwixt the beatings of the Drum, whereas the
intervals betwixt our Accented Syllables is filled up by other
Syllables not accented. But of the length of these we have no
measure, and the only Rhythm we perceive is that of the Intervals
betwixt the accented Syllables. In the beating of a Drum betwixt
two loud Strokes they often throw in lower Strokes And then
the Rhythm of a Drum is precisely the same with the Rhythm of our
Verses, in which we perceive as little of the length or shortness
of Sound, as in the Thumps upon a Drum; Where we only perceive
a Rhythm of Intervals, but not of Sounds. This I have explained
at more length in the second Volume of this Work where I have
given an English prosody, which I must hold to be good till
Some body gives a better.

But the Question at present is not how we read our own
Verse but how we read the Antient. And I say negatively that we
do not read it as the Antients did by the Rhythm of [p. 35]
long & Short Syllables, of which as I have Said we have no practice,
nor are our Ears form'd to Such a Rhythm So that I am persuaded,
if we were to hear an Antient read it in that way, it would be
disagreeable to us, as far as I am able to judge from Experiments
of that kind that I have made myself & heard others make. And
I appeal to every one who reads an Antient Verse, whether he
gives any Attention to the lenght or Shortness of the Syllables,
or compares them in that respect with One another.

The Question then is by what other Rule do we read it?
And I say we read it as we read our own, nor is there any
thing more naturall than that not being able to read it as the
Antients did, we should read it as we do our own, & indeed I
think it is impossible that we can read it otherwise. We make
therefor of it a Rhythm of Intervalls, not of Sounds continued
for certain times. In short we read it by what we call Accent.

But how are those Accents to be laid upon the Several
Syllables? [p. 36]

That they are not to be laid as the Accents are which make
our English Hexameter Verse, that is with One unaccented
Syllable betwixt the Accented, is Evident. We must therefor
Seek for Some other Rule.

But is the Quantity of the Syllable the Rule for accenting
the antient Verse & do we always Accent the long Syllable &
never the Short? That this is not the Case is Evident from Fact & Observation, & we need go no farther to be convinced of this than the first Line of Virgill's first Elogue, where there are three Short Syllables that we Accent & two long that we do not accent. This shows that in our reading the Antient Verse, Quantity & Accent are quite distinct & that by making a Syllable louder we do not make it longer. And it is the same in our own Language. Nay by Accenting a long Syllable, we Sometimes make it short. Thus Oat is undoubtedly a long Syllable, but when we compound it with the Word Meal & accent it, we make it Short, & pronounce it as if it were Otmeal. In the same manner Vine is a long Syllable but in its Derivative Vintage, or its compound Vinyard, being accented it becomes Short. And indeed the Violence of our Accents is Such, that they have a naturall Tendency rather to Shorten a Syllable than lenghten it or preserve it long. And even in reading the Latin Verse, when we mark a long Syllable by accenting it we rather make it short than long. Thus in pronouncing Tityre the first word of the first Elogue in Virgil by Accenting the first Syllable we make it short rather than long. The Question therefor Still remains unanswered, - By what rule we Accent Latin Verse, & there is another Question that I think should be consider'd how it comes that a manner of reading the antient Verse, so different from the way in which the Antients read it should never the less please us So much.

These are Questions of some Curiosity, & yet I don't know that any thing has been written upon the Subject nor have I found any of the Scholars in England, the most learned in what
they call Prosody, that have so much as attempted to give me a Solution of them. As to the Second, it may be answer'd (tho' I think it not a good Answer) as Cicero answers a similar Question concerning the Numbers of their Prose.\textsuperscript{b} That it is Sufficient we know that these Numbers please\textsuperscript{23} us & we ought not to deny the fact tho' we cannot give a Reason for it. But as to the first if we cannot answer it, we must confess that we read the antient Verse without any \textsuperscript{[p. 38.]} Art or Science of any kind, & that we are not only pleased we know not why, but act without knowing by what Rule or principle, in Short that we are Shamefully\textsuperscript{24} Ignorant of the Prosody of Antient Verse.

\textbf{Cap. [4]}

Before I proceed to Answer either of the Questions Stated in the preceding Chapter, I think it is not improper to enquire into the Origine of our Accents, & how we come to pronounce both our Verse & Prose, in a manner so different from the antient Pronounciation. For that the Antients had no practice of our Accents I think is evident from the Silence of all the Antient Grammarians, who speak much of the Pronunciation of their Language by Rhythm & Musicall tones but not a Word of what we call Accent, which, however if it had been used by them must have made a very materiall part of the Pronounciation of their Language, as well of ours. But I say further that they \textsuperscript{[p. 39]} did not know what it was, nor had not So much as a name for\textsuperscript{1} it. for the Latin\textsuperscript{2} Word Accentus, from which our Word is taken, is exactly the same with the Greek ἅκατον being the same Composition of Words
Signifying the Same thing, & it will not be Said that the Greeks had any Word which could denote what we call Accent. And the Reason why neither they nor the Latins had any such thing appears to me Evident. By the Rhythm & Musical tones of their Syllables, there was nothing like a Monotony in their languages, but on the contrary they must have been much more varied in their Sound than any of our Modern Languages pronounced with Accent, which as I shall shew afterwards was introduced to prevent a Monotony. Now to have Superinduced our Accents would not only have been Superfluous, but it would have incumber'd & overloaded the pronunciation of the Language. But if we could suppose such a Superfluous addition to the Pronunciation of their Language it must have been governed by some Rule, for we cannot suppose that in a Language of Art every Man would be at liberty to sound any Syllable of a Word loud or soft as he thought proper; This is not the case even in our Language And much less could it be so in Languages such as the Greek and Roman, of so much greater Art than ours. Now we have not only no Rules given us by the Greek and Roman Grammarians for laying such Accents as ours upon Syllables, but they have not so much as a Name for them. The fact therefore I think is certain that by loud & soft they only distinguish'd their Words or the whole tenor of their Speech; but as to their Syllables, they were Sufficiently distinguish'd from one Another by Melody & Rhythm. But Melody & Rhythm the I believe them to have been Originally, in all Languages except two viz. the Chinese & the Iroquois. That being the Case it was proper that in the other Languages Something should
be introduced to avoid a Monotony. And indeed it was necessary, for a Man must have form'd his Ear to Musick & practised it a good deal to be able to pronounce any number of Words or even Syllables together with a perfect Monotony. And what way then is he to vary his Voice, & the most natural way & which we see practised by the Animals to make one Syllable of a Word of Severall Syllables louder than another.

If this were only a Conjecture, I think it must be allow'd to be a probable One, but it is verify'd by Fact & Observation. The Greeks have lost both the Melody & Rhytme of their Language but they supply the place of them by Accents such as ours which they lay upon the Syllables marked in the Greek Books with an Acute Accent, in place of the Musical tone belonging to that accent. Thus in place of they make an English Word\textsuperscript{11} of it, & Say Anthropos, neglecting all together the quantity of the penult Syllable, & accenting in our Manner, the first Syllable because it happens to be marked with an acute Accent in the Greek Books. Now as I believe that the Goths had originally in their Language Melody & Rhytme as well as the Greeks, they have lost as the Greeks have done & now\textsuperscript{13} all the Severall Gothic Nations of Europe accent their Language in the same way; the English I believe more Violently than any of them, & even the Icelanders among whom the Gothic Language is preserved in the greatest purity, use the same Accents, as I am well informed by a learned Gentleman\textsuperscript{a} a Native of that Island.

The French as I have observed elsewhere\textsuperscript{b} have no Accents but their Language is a Dialect of the Latin and not of the Gothic. But even they do not speak with a perfect Monotony;
for tho' they have neither the Greek Accents nor such an Accent as ours: for they vary their Pronunciation by Tones of Passion expressing Anger, Grief, Compassion or the like. And they ask a Question in a different tone from that in which they affirm or narrate. N.E. This is a Mistake. for the French have accents as well as we: but not so Violent as ours, nor distinguishing so much the different Syllables as we do; but that they should have none is impossible: for as they have not Musicall Tones upon their Syllables, if they had not Accents such as we have, they would speak in a perfect Monotony; but the fact is that they never pronounce two Syllables together any more than we do without accenting one of them.15

Having thus accounted for the Origine of a Pronunciation which however naturall it may appear to us was utterly unknown to Greeks & Romans, & having also shewn that, as we have lost Rhythme, as well as the Melody (which I believe allways go together in Language as well as in Musick) of our own language, it was necessary that we should pronounce the learned Languages in the only way we have learned to pronounce, that is by Accent. I come now to Shew in answer to the first Question, How we apply our Accents to the reading of antient Hexameter Verse  

But before I go to this, I think it is proper to Observe that the distinction I have made betwixt Accent and Quantity in the learned Languages, and betwixt our Accent, And the Antient Accent and Quantity will appear to many of my Readers even tho' they be Scholars, new and extraordinary; for Dr Bentley, one of the greatest Scholars that has been in England in this Century, and who was supposed to be particularly learned in what
is called Prosody in his Preface to his Edi. of Terence, and appears to me to have confounded both Antient Accent and Quantity, with our Accents. In the first page of this Preface, where he describes the ιγκυς and Θεςις abovementioned, he has these Words in explaining a passage in Terentianus Maurus.

"Ictus, Percussio dicitur; quia Tibicen, dum Rhythmum et tempus moderabatur, ter in Trimetro, quater in Tetrametro, solum pede feriebat. ιγκυς autem, sive elevatio, appellatur; quod in iisdem Syllabis, quibus Tibicen pedem accommodabat Actor Vocem acuebat ac tollebat. In Thesi autem sunt ceterae Syllabae quae ictu destitutae, minus idcirco [p. 42.(2)] auduntur." From these words I think it is plain that he makes the Actor, when he began the Pronunciation of the foot, or of the Dipod, if the Line was so divided, to raise his Voice so as to sound the Syllable louder, which he seems to understand to be the same thing with laying an Acute Accent upon the Syllable; And indeed thro' this whole Preface, it does not appear that he had any idea that the Greek and Latin Accents were Musical Tones: Nor has he any where made the distinction betwixt the Quantity of the Syllable and either our Accent or the Antient Accent. In this way he has given us an Edition of Terence with Accents marked upon certain Syllables. But whether he means by those Accents to express the acute Accents of the Latins, the Quantity of the Syllable, or Accents such as ours, I cannot well tell. That he does not lay the Accents always upon the long Syllable is evident from the way in which he has marked many of those Accents. [p. 42.(3)] And I should think he rather meant our way of pronouncing the Verses by which we lay the Accent upon short Syllables as well as long.
And in the first place tho' we do not always accent the long Syllables & very often accent the Short, yet there are certain Cases in which we allways accent the long Syllable & do not accent the Short, & as in So far our Accentuation agrees with the antient Quantity I think it is proper to begin with such Cases.

And 1mo. It is a generall Rule (Here take in what follows from the top of p. 18, of No. 238 21 22 toward the End of the Paper,) down to p. 24 near the End.

[p. 238] in Reading both antient Verse & prose that if the penult Syllable of a Word of three or more Syllables be long it must be accented, but if it be Short it must not be accented. If we pronounce otherwise we not only shock the Ears of those who have Studied the antient Rhythme, & disfigure the Verse alltogether, but we confound the Sense, for it is by the Quantity of that Syllable, that the Conjugations of Verbs & the Cases of Nouns are distinguish'd from one another. As in the Verbs Docere & Legere, & in the Nominative feminine & ablative feminine of the Adjective Idem. But this Rule applys only to Words of three or more Syllables. for if the Word is a Disyllable, as we don't accent the last Syllable of a Latin Word for a reason I have given elsewhere, d we allways accent the first of the two Syllables whether long or Short, & if it be a Monosyllable, we accent it or not, just as it happens to please our Ear.

Another thing in [p. 19] which our Accenting agrees with the antient Quantity, & which therefor I make my second Rule, is that the first Syllable of the Dactyle in the penult foot being allways a long Syllable is allways accented, for as I have
Observed the Nature of the Verse requires that the grave & Stable Spondee in the End of the Verse should be preceded by the quick & Voluble Dactyle, & the only way we can make the distinction betwixt the two feet is by pronouncing the Dactyle in the way I have mention'd.

My third rule also agrees with the antient Quantity; for the first Syllable of the concluding Spondee must allways be accented, but the last not for the Reason above mention'd. Unless where the Verse is concluded with a Monosyllable as in this Verse of Virgill. Ut Vetulus Bos & procumbit humi Bos. where both the Syllables of the Spondee are accented, but such Verses are rare, & they have an unpleasant Cadence tho' very proper to express the thing Signify'd by them.

In these particulars & in no other as far as I have Observed do our Accents agree with the antient Quantity. And I come now to mention the Rules of Pronounciation which arise from the Nature of our Accents, & the way we read our own Verse which has nothing to do with Quantity but is pronounced altogether by Accent. By what rule this is done in our different kinds of Verse I have explain'd in the 2d Volume of the Origine of Language, where I have given the only System that has hitherto been given of English Prosody & which I must hold to be a good One till a better be given. & the first is that we never accent two Syllables immediately following one another unless in a particular Case Such as that above mention'd. The reason of which is that otherwise our Accents would not Sufficiently distinguish our Syllables from one another, And indeed as we pronounce our English, if both Syllables were accented,
that is sounded equally loud, neither of them could be said to be accented; because as our Accents are an elevation of the Voice, upon one Syllable more than another, if the following Syllable is not sounded lower, the preceding Syllable is not accented in our Sense of the Word: The Examples therefore I have given from Latin Verse of the two last Syllables of the Verse being both sounded equally loud, must be understood as an exception from the General Rule as the termination of a Verse by a Monosyllable is\(^\text{32}\) very uncommon in Antient Verse.\(^\text{33}\) & for a like reason I believe it was that the Antients never acuted two Syllables in the same Word for there is a Resemblance betwixt our Accent & the acute Accent of the Antients, that they were both Elevations of the Voice, the One in Musicall cadence, the other only in Loudness.

The Second Rule arising from the Nature of our Accents is. That they cannot go farther back than the 3d Syllable, So that where ever there are three Syllables together\(^\text{34}\) One must be accented. \[p. 20(1)\] We\(^\text{35}\) cannot therefore pronounce three Syllables with a perfect Monotony. That many Syllables cannot be pronounced in that way, except by Men, who have studied and practiced Music, I think is certain; but more than three might certainly be so pronounced even by Men not skilled in Music: And accordingly we know that in Greek, tho' there were severall Syllables in a Word one of them only was pronounced with an acute Accent, and all the rest with a grave Accent; that is all with the same Tone. I hold therefore that it is only custom and our habit of accenting every third Syllable, not the Nature of the thing, that has made us incapable of pronouncing three
The reason of which seems to be that by the Ictus upon the accented Syllable the Voice cannot be longer Suspended than for two Syllables more but must be let fall again upon the third. In consequence of this rule we must sometimes make an Exception to the Rule above mentioned of not accented the last Syllable of a Latin Word, as in the Second Line of the Enéid. *Pro fugus Lavinæque Venit.* where if we did not accent gus, there would be three Syllables together without an Accent.

From this Second Rule there necessarily follows a third. That betwixt our Accents there never can be a greater intervall than of two Unaccented Syllables. So that the antient hexameter Verse as we read it consists of accented Syllables with one or at most two unaccented Syllables betwixt them. And here we may observe a resemblance betwixt our Accented Syllables & two unaccented interposed betwixt them, & the antient Dactyle & also betwixt the antient Spondee & our Accented Syllables & only One unaccented interposed, for the motion is quicker when two are interposed that is there is more motion in the same time, than when One only is interposed. And the Difference may be illustrated in this way. Suppose a Stamp with the foot upon the floor, then two Short Steps or trips, & then another Stamp. This we may conceive to take up no more time than if there were only One Stop betwixt the two Stamps. And for the Truth of this I appeal to the ear. Whether there be not as much time Spent in pronouncing Bans Sub Teg in the first Line of Virgill as in pronouncing Tegmine fa-, & if so the Intervall betwixt the Accented in both
Cases is the same.

But it will be asked by what rule are these accented Syllables with one Unaccented or two unaccented betwixt them, intermixed. This Question I answer by Asking another. By what rule when the Hexameters were read by Quantity, were the Spondees & Dactyles intermix'd in the first four feet of the Verse. And I say that the Answer to both is the same. viz. That the time of the pronunciation in the one Case & the Intervall in the other being the same, the measure of the Verse is preserved and at the same time an agreeable Variety produced.

Another Question may be asked whether as there are Six feet made by the Quantity in the Heroic Verse, there are as many Accented Syllables. And here the Uniformity is not so perfect as in the antient way of reading for tho there be commonly Six Accented Syllables, there are Sometimes Seven. And this difference is produced by the difference of the number of Syllables in the hexameter Verse, which as I have Said is from 13 to 17. for when the Number is 17. as in the Dactylick Verses, then there are 7. Accented Syllables. On the other hand when it is a Spondaick Verse which I hold not to be a Genuine hexameter Verse, & accordingly there are but two of them in both Homer's poems, the accented Syllables are only five.

These are the Rules for our Pronunciation of the antient Hexameters agreeing as well as can be expected with the Antient, if we consider how different the Rhythm of the antient Verse as they read it, is from the Rhythm of it as we read it. The antient Rhythm is a Rhythm of Sounds continued differing in Lenght. Our Rhythm is a Rhythm of Intervalls or of Sounds
discontinued & recommenced, but the Intervalls mark'd by Sounds interposed betwixt the Accented Syllables, but which are not distinguish'd by their Lenght any more than the Accented Syllables, so that they are to be consider'd as So many Dotts in a blank Space. And thus much in Answer to the first Question

As to the Second How it comes that a manner of pronouncing So different from the antient should nevertheless give us So much pleasure, I do not answer as Cicero does that we can give no Account of this Pleasure, for tho' that be true of near Sensuall Pleasure it is not true of the pleasure of the Mind tho' perceived by the Senses. Now the Beauty of Versification is a pleasure of that kind. as therefor it is the Mind & the Mind only that perceives Beauty in the Objects of Sense or in any other Object, there must be some reason why it perceives Beauty in one Object & Deformity in another. Now the Reason why the Mind perceives Beauty in the antient Verse even as we read it, is that there is Uniformity in it & Variety too tho' not So much as in the Antient. Now uniformity & Variety constitute Beauty, & what is beautiful must necessarily please. But it [p. 24.] cannot please So much, both for the Reason I have mention'd & for this reason That as we read the antient Verse it wants One Stop or rather discrimination which I am perswaded was perceptible to an Antient Ear, I mean a discrimination betwixt the feet for as all the feet were of equall time, their Ears must have perceived that equality & consequently marked the distinction betwixt the feet & perceived when one began & another ended. And this I believe to be what Horace means when he says Legitimunque Sonum digito callemus
et aure. So that it appears they beat Time to their Verses, as we do to our Musick. From what has been said, I think I can now answer the question how it comes that the Antient Verse read as we read it, by what we call Accent, that is the way in which we read our own, yet gives us pleasure: And the reason is, that as the Antients perceived in their Verse a continuation of Sound of an equal length in each the six feet, of which their Hexameter consisted, so we perceive an equality in the several Intervals betwixt our Accented Syllables, with a Variety too of one or sometimes two Syllables, filling up that Interval. And these Intervals are equal to the Number of feet in the Antient Verse, where the verse is not Spondaic, which I hold not to be a genuine Heroic Verse; And there is only one exception to this Rule, when the Verse consists of five Dactyles with only the last foot a Spondee. And then there are seven accented Syllables according to our Pronunciation. The pleasure which the Antient Heroic Verse gives us is by perceiving a certain Number of Intervals, of the same Length: The Case would be the same if upon a Drum he were to beat six Strokes and then Stop as we do at the end of the Verse, and begin again with other six strokes and so go on. And the only Difference betwixt the two Cases, is, that we fill up the intervals with sounds but less loud than the accented Syllable, and which are considered as having no length at all. But we might make the different Strokes of the Drum loud as we do our Accents, and throw in betwixt the loud Strokes, one or two low ones: And this I think would make the Resemblance very Compleat so compleat that I think there would be no Difference but that which the Pronunciation of the
Syllables much more pleasant no doubt in Greek and Latin, tho not always in English, would make, and the Sense and Sentiment of the Words. Nor should the English Reader be offended with Comparing his Language, which has neither Melody nor Rhythm in it, to the beating of a Drum.

It may be objected that the Intervals, betwixt the Accented Syllables in reading the Antient Verse are not equal; because the Interval, which is filled up with two unaccented Syllables must be longer than that which is filled up as only with one. To which I answer first that if it were so, still the Ear would perceive a Ratio of two to One betwixt the two Intervals. if we suppose the Interval of the one to be double of the other. But 2dly. I say, that the Interval is the same. For we sound our Accented Syllable with so much Vehemence, that we obscure and very much shorten the Pronunciation of the two unaccented Syllables which follow. And pass over them so quickly that the Halt of the Voice is not longer upon both of them than it would be upon one. This we may observe in every word accented in that Manner; such as Melody, Mummery, and the word Syllable itself. 69

I will conclude 70 this Subject of antient Rhythm & our manner of Reading it, wt Observing that from what I have Said I think it is apparent that 71 we have not neither Art Science nor practice of Quantity. This I am affraid will give much Offense to some English Scholars who have Spent a great deal of time at School in the Study of Quantity, & Value themselves upon the Knowledge of it. But the thing is true. For 72 As to the practice it must be allow'd that in reading
Verse or Prose, we do not at all mark the time of the Syllable, but only Accent it. Nor do our Accents coincide always with the long Syllable but as often [p. 43] with the Short. And as to Art or Science in the Matter, can any Man give a Reason why the same Vowel is long in one Word & Short in another. or why in the Same Word as it is differently compounded it is both long & Short. As for example in the Word **fidus** compounded with the praeposition **in**, the Vowel I. preserves the same Quantity as in the Originall Word, & is long, but compound the Originall with the praeposition **per**, & it becomes Short I can give a Reason why a Vowel is long by Position, & also why a Syllable otherwise short becomes long by the halt at the End of the Verse or the Stop produced by the Caesura, I can also account why two Vowells join'd together & forming that compounded Sound we call a Diphthong should be long. But how it should happen that the same simple Vowell should be long in Some Words & Short in others (Setting aside the Cases abovementioned, I cannot Account, nor do I believe the Antients themselves could. for there are many things in Language by their Nature so arbitrary, that no Art or Science can Subject them to any Rule [p. 44.] Whether the Division of the human Voice into So many different Sounds, denoting first our Wants & feelings & then our Ideas (a) be an Invention of Man, or whether as I rather think, he was not first taught the Elements of it, by some superior Intelligences, it is certain that Articulation only (not to Speak of Gramar) is in

(a) [No footnote.]
itself a most wonderfull Art, requiring so many different Positions & Actions of the Organs of pronunciation, that tho
we knew the Science of it we could not learn the practice of it as we do of other Arts, by applying to it a few hours every Day for Some years, but we must practise it from our infancy for many years almost every Moment of the Day while we are awake. But Supposing the Elements of Speech to have been revealed to Man, yet as Providence does nothing in Vain, it would be left to Man to do what he could do without revelation namely to perfect the Art.
For it was by cultivating Arts & Sciences that Man was destined to recover from his fallen State, & become an Intellectual Creature in Actuality, where as by his fall he was only capable of Intellect & Science, as Aristotle has defined him. The first Languages, therefore, would certainly be very rude & imperfect, defective in Articulation, wanting even Some of the Vocall Sounds, & many Consonants, and altho' they might have Words Sufficient to express all the Wants of their rude Life, yet they had little or no Connection with one another, So that things most intimately connected, were expressed by Words quite different. And accordingly there are Languages yet extant which have all these Defects. As to Melody & Rhythm, I have no doubt, as I have Said, but that the first Languages were Musicall, but then it was a very rude Musick governed by no Rules of Art.
The tones therefor of their Syllables, would be like those of the Chinese, perceptible indeed by the Ear, but of which Art could give no Account, & as Rhythm is essentiall to Musick even the most barbarous, they would pronounce Some Syllables longer than others, but without any determinate Ratio of the
long to the Short. Then came art & Science & apply'd themselves to Language as the first Art in human Life without which No other Art or Science of any Value could have been invented, nor civill Society establish'd [p. 46.] so that the purpose for which Man is in this Life never could have been answer'd. Art then would first improve the Articulation of the Language by Supplying all the Vocal Sounds & Consonants which it wanted. Then it would by means of those three wonderfull Arts of Derivation, Composition & Flections, contrive to multiply the Words So much, without creating many, as to make them sufficient for the purposes of the most artificiall Life, & at the same time connect them So much together, as to make them be comprehended in the Memory to the number of 5 Millions (which they say is the number of words in Latin) & if So the Number in Greek must be much greater) & readily used. And as to the Melody of the Language, Art would regulate it so that the acute Accent that is the highest Note should not be above a certain height, that it should not be too frequent never above One in One Word, & that from the Lowest to the highest Note of this Musick of Language the progress should be by Slides not by Starts. And as to Rhythm it would fix the Ratio of the long Syllable to the Short, So that there would be measure and Rule in the Rhythm as well as in the Melody of Speech. [p. 47]

Thus far Art could go in forming the beautifull Melody & Rhythm of the Greek Language. It could give Measure to the Melody by limiting the Ascent of the highest Note & it could give harmony to the Rhythm by ascertaining the ratio of the long Syllable to the Short, But it could do nothing more. It
could not by any Rule or Theorem of Art or Science, ascertain the
Syllable of the Word upon which the acute Accent was to be laid, nor
what Syllable in any Word was to be long or Short (except in
the Cases above mentioned). This was only to be done by
arbitrary Custom or by the Authority of leading Men in the
Society, whose pronunciation would be a Law to others.

From what has been said it must be evident that to
determine by what rule any one Syllable of a Word
is acuted, or made longer than another is a vain Attempt. It was not
from the beginning a matter of Art or Science, nor has it ever
been endeavoured by any Critick or Grammairian. It is as vain
an Attempt as if a person of great Leisure among us, & who did
not know how to employ his time better was to try to make an
Art of our Accents. He might discover what [p. 48.] is very true,
that there is not variety enough in our Accents, & that we too
often draw back the Accent to the antepenult Syllable, by which
means we Obscure the pronunciation of the other two (Such is the
Violence of our Accents) & make the Word not fit for our
hexameter Verse. But he never could determine by what rule the
first Syllable was to be accented rather than the last or middle.

To know therefore what Syllables of a Word are to be acuted
or lengthened is only to know a Matter of Fact to be learned
from the use of Antient Authors. It is true that from this use
certain Rules may be formed with many Exceptions, but these
Rules have no foundation in the Nature of things, So that it is
Still true what I have said that there is neither Art nor Science
in the matter.

This being the Case the Question is whether the Accents &
Quantity of Syllables\textsuperscript{94} ought to be so much studied as they are in the English Schools & whether the time of the Scholars might not be very much better employ'd. As to the study of the accents it is become quite useless, since the English gave [p. 49] over reading Greek by the accent as the modern Greeks do that is by an accent such as we use in English. And yet I know a great Greek Scholar\textsuperscript{1} in England who bestow'd so much time upon the accents at School, that when he left it, he told me that if he gott the accentuation of a primitive word\textsuperscript{96}, he could have given you that of all its derivatives & flections. For this it would appear there is some rule which I do not know nor shall ever know, but it seems from what I observed above concerning the word \textit{bide}\textsuperscript{97} that there is in this respect a difference between accent & quantity. As to quantity I think I have shewn clearly that we make no use of it at all\textsuperscript{98} either in reading verse or prose, but read both by accent. It is true we sometimes accent the long syllable, & that makes it necessary that we should have some knowledge of quantity, tho' we have no practice of it.\textsuperscript{99} But\textsuperscript{100} with regard to prose I have shewn in the 2d volume of this work\textsuperscript{m} that if we know the quantity of\textsuperscript{101} a word of three or more syllables, we can make no error in reading prose,\textsuperscript{102} as to verse there are some other things to be observed in reading it which I have taken notice of above. But all this [p. 50] a boy may learn by only\textsuperscript{103} hearing his master read & imitating his reading, without making any formal study of quantity. In short he may learn the accents of Greek & Latin, as he learns the accents of his own language that is by use.

In answer to this I know it will be said, that tho' what I
recommend might be sufficient to make them read Greek or Latin Verse properly, it will not be sufficient to teach them to make such Verse, for which purpose they must learn the Quantity of every Syllable of every Word they use. For this a formall Study of Quantity is necessary, without which they never could go thro' the two tasks of making Verses that are prescribed them every week, & we should not hear those fine Epigrams of their own composing which they repeat upon a certain Day every Year in Westminster School.

But what I say to all this is That I never could approve of so much time being spent by the Boys in making Verses, which might be [p. 51.] otherwise much better employed. first because if the Boy has not a naturall Genius for Poetry, those Verses he is forced to make, will never make a Poet of him, & 2o because Writing Latin Verse or even Prose, is almost quite out of fashion, and accordingly nothing of the Poetick kind in Latin of any great Value has been produced of that kind in England of late, tho' we have had from Italy where I am told the Task of making Verses is not prescribed to Boys, Some very good Latin Poems, particularly One upon the Subject of Sir Isaac Newtons Astronomy; in as good Verse I think as that of Lucretius. And there is published at Verona in a Translation of Hesiod which I have likewise seen into very good Latin Hexameter Verse.

But if the English Schoolmasters will insist upon their Scholars writing Latin Verses, I think [p. 52] they should be such as Tzetzes writes in his Chiliad. For it appears that as Early as the Time when he lived which was in the 12th Century, the Greeks had begun to lose their Prosody & in place of their
Musicall tones upon Syllables to adopt Accents Such as ours. This Tzetzes condemns very much, but he complies so far with the Vulgar taste as to write his Chiliads in a kind of Trochaic Verse made by Accents such as ours & which are now Universally Used in Greece. Verses of this kind will Supersede the Necessity of any formall Study of Quantity, & at the same time answer all the purpose which I think their making Verses can Serve that is to give them a great Stock of Poeticall Words & Phrases, which may be of Use to them if they chuse to write Verses in their own Language.

I have Said that Lads at School may employ their time much better than in making Verses. I will explain this at some length before I conclude [p. 53.]

The first thing our Infants are taught is to read, & the principall thing our Children should be taught at School is to read whatever they read, whether Greek Latin or English, well & as Shakespear Says With good Accent & with good Discretion. Upon this must depend their being good Speakers in Publick, and if some Attention is not given to it, they will not speak agreeably in private Company. For there is an Art not only of publick Speaking but of Conversation, in which we ought not to Speak too high or too Low, too quick or too Slow & with proper Variations of tone Suitable to the Subjects of which we talk. I find it is a very generall Complaint agt the publick Schools in England, that this essentiall part of Education is very much neglected, & I my self have known Lads come from these Schools who Spoke So rapidly & inarticulately as scarcely to be intelligible. And as to publick Speaking, I think I may Venture to Affirm that
there is no publick Education at present that can form an Orator. The greatest Speaker we have at present was formed by his domestick Education much in the same way that the Duke of Wharton was taught by his father as I have related elsewhere. And it is One Obligation among others which the Nation owes to the late Lord Chattam, his having bestowed so much pains upon the Education of his Son. A Bad pronunciation learned by a Child in the Nursery is not easily got free of, & therefore Quintilian directs that Parents should be careful in the choice of a Nurse, but when a child was grown up, & came to be taught to Speak & read Men of the greatest Genius even Poets were employ'd to form their Pronunciation. Os tenerum &c. But if instead of that Lads at school are allow'd not only to talk among themselves in that rapid way which they affect for the same reason that Waiters in Taverns & Inns affect it, namely to be thought Smart & clever, but in their publick appearances in School when they repeat or recite any thing, are allow'd to Speak in the same manner, & this continued for 7 or 8 years till they are Men of 17 or 18 years of age. [p. 55.] they must form a habit of Speaking which it is hardly possible they ever can get free of, & I am persuaded if the School Education in England had been as ill conducted 50 or 60 years ago, as it is now, we should not have had such Speakers as the late Lord Chattam or My Lord Mansfield, or the present Lord Chancellor, Thurlow.

The English Schoolmasters are the more inexcusable for neglecting this so important part of Education, that there is nothing their Scholars are more capable of learning. For a Boy of 9 or 10 years of Age incapable of learning any Art or Science,
may learn to read or Speak anything he understands as well as it is possible for him to do, that is as well as his naturall faculties I mean his Look, his Voice, & his feelings will permitt. And the reason is that he learns not by Precept or Teaching, but by Example & Imitation. Now in that way we learn more easily at that time of Life than at any other. But the Master who gives the Example must himself read & Speak well, & must have those Qualities of Body & Mind which fit him to do both properly. And above all he must have a Sense of what is gracefull decent & becoming, without which, as I have observed, there can be no Excellence in any Art, & it was for this reason no doubt that Poets among the Romans were employ'd to teach Children to read, because without that Sense in a high Degree it was impossible they could excell in their Art, or indeed deserve the name of a Poet. Being thus qualified he should read or Speak over & over again to his Boy, what he would have him learn, then he should make him repeat it, correcting his pronunciation of any word that may be faulty Observing where he does not vary the Tone properly or where he does not vary it at all when it should be Varied, and above all taking Notice that he pronounce a Period or long Sentence, So as to connect the beginning with the End. For in this consists the great Beauty of Speaking & indeed the clearness & perspicuity of it. for a Period of any length ill Spoken is not intelligible. Another capitall part of this teaching is to make the Scholar distinguish the Tone of Speaking from that of talking, & talking from prating. If our Speakers in Parliament were taught to make this Distinction, we should not hear the Debates there
disgraced as they are with the name of conversation. for the Publick Ear can make the distinction betwixt Loqui & Dicere as well as the Critick. Having thus practised in private under his master, he should be produced in Public, before the whole School or a greater Audience if it can be conveniently gott together. And there the young Orator should learn to know the whole Compass of his Voice, how far it can goe without Screaming, & without being incapable of making the proper changes that the Sense or Sentiment may require.

For the Subject of these Exhibitions I would not have Plays, not even the plays of Terence for I would not have our Scholar bred a Player but an Orator. And there is only One piece of the Dramaticall kind that I would allow for an Exercise. It is the Dialogue betwixt Horace & Damasippus, Sat. [II. iii] the best thing in my Opinion that Horace ever wrote which a gentleman told me he saw exhibited at Oxford. One Lad speaking the part of Horace, & another that of Damasippus, & he [p. 58] told me it was very well perform'd by the young Gentleman & a great Entertainment for the Audience. The Subjects therefore I think should be Greek & Latin Orations, & particularly the Orations of Demosthenes. Which if he could learn to pronounce with all the Graces of Action & Elocution, he would be very near perfect in what Demosthenes reckon'd, the first, the Second & the third Quality of an Orator, I mean Action, under which the Antients comprehended not only the Gesture of the Body but the Management of the Voice, the Look & Countenance in Short the whole Deportment. In English the best Orations we have are the Speeches in the Paradise lost particularly those of the Second
Book. These our young Scholar should Study diligently, & if he can learn to pronounce them properly, marking the Verse & at the same [time] preserving the Period there is nothing in English that he cannot read. In short I know no Exercise of the Reading kind that will tend so much to form a Speaker as the reading of the Periods of Demosthenes and the Verses of Milton. But these Exercises I have mention'd ought to be among the last he performs at School. Long before [p. 59] they are so far advanced, & while they are yet only learning the Elements of Greek and Latin, they should be made to repeat their Lessons articulately & distinctly, & not to run them over so hastily as they commonly do, & then Sit down to make way for another. This may be necessary when the same Master has many Scholars, but I say no Master ought to have more Scholars than he can properly teach. If that cannot be helped the only remedy is a private tutor if the Parents can afford that expense, & thus the Publick & private Education will be join'd together, which I hold to be very proper for I think the one is defective without the other. The Education at a publick School, excites an Emulation in the Scholars, which must be their chief Motive to Application. For a Boy cannot be Supposed to Study for the Love of Knowledge, or from any Conviction of its Utility, & besides a Boy at a publick Schoole enters as it were into the World, & he may there make acquaintances, & friendships which may be very usefull to him thro' Life. On the other hand a private Tutor is necessary to attend to the private Studys of Boys, especially during the School Vacations when if they are not look'd after they [p. 60] may forgett a great part of what they have learned at School, he may be usefull also in Supplying
the Defects of the Master arising from want of Knowledge, Negligence or as I have Observed his having too many Scholars. But if the Morals of the Boys are So much corrupted as it is said in Some of the publick Schools in England, I would not hesitate in preferring the most private Education to an Education at one of these Schools, & I shall only Say One thing further upon this Subject, that nothing is more worthy of the Attention of the Government & Legislature than to prevent the Children of the People of the first rank in the Country, who are to furnish Men to govern both in Peace & War, from being corrupted at so early a period of Life & So made Useless if not mischievous to their Country.

Hinc [derivata clades] in Patriam populumque fluxit. But if the Morals of the Boys are preserved, I am very Clearly of Opinion that an Education in a Public School is the best if not the only Education by which an Orator can be formed. And if the Education is conducted by Able Masters in the way I propose, I have no doubt that from such a School there would come forth Speakers upon whose Lips, as Milton says, Honour and Attention would wait.

But it is not Words and the Speaking of them, not even Classical Learning, that is only to be learned at School. But some Science also must be taught there: And particularly I would recommend the Elements of Geometry, which I call the A.B.C. of Science: Arithmetic also should be taught. And they should read some parts of History, and Should Learn something of Geography & Chronology without which History cannot be understood. I would have them even at School begin the Study
of Philosophy, and among other Words, which they learn there I would not have them neglect the Study of five Capital Words, Vizt. Genus, Species, Difference, Proper, Peculiar, And Accidental, upon which Porphyry the Philosopher has written an excellent Treatise to which he has given the name of Introduction. And indeed it is the best Introduction to Philosophy that ever was written. And I think it was not unworthy of a Commentary upon it, written by Ammonius Hermeias. And which I would also recommend to the Study of the Young Scholar. The next Step in Philosophy is to the Categories, that wonderfull Division of the University of things, which came from the School of Pythagoras to Greece. But that may be delayed till they go to the University, where Philosophy ought to be their Principal Study. But besides what I have mentioned as proper to be studied at School, there are several other things mentioned by Milton in his Tractate upon Education, which is a grand and noble plan of Education, and Shows as much as anything this Author has written, the extent of his Genius and Learning. He says that in his time nothing was more wanted than a Good plan of Education; And I am sure, if it was so much wanted then, it is not less wanted now.
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Of the Task of Making Verses prescribed to the Boys - Of the School Education in England - Of the
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English Verse, not made by Quantity, but by what we call Accent — Of the difference of our Accents from the Antient Accents — In our Language, as there is no melody neither is there Rhythm — All Languages originally had both Melody and Rhythm — How these were lost, explained — In place of the Melody, such Accents as ours succeeded. — This proved by the example of the Modern Greeks, who have lost both the Melody and Rhythm of their Language — This depravation of the Greek Language came on by degrees — Of the Chilias of Tzetzes — The Grammar of the Language not so soon lost as the pronunciation —

That our Verse is not made like the Greek and Latin, by Quantity, that is by long and short Syllables, is well known to every Scholar. It is true indeed that we have in English some Syllables longer than others: But we have not so many of them in proportion to the Short, to make Verse; and indeed by far the greater part of our Syllables are all of the same length: and either short or long as we please to call them. Besides, those that I allow to be long, have not that ratio to the short, which long Syllables in the learned languages have; that is the ratio of two to one; Nor indeed have they any determined Ratio. Now without Ratio there can be no such thing as Rhythm,
such as makes the Antient Verse; for it is by perceiving Ratio in one sound to another, that we have the idea of Rhythm in Sounds\(^7\). It is therefore not by the Rhythm of long and short Syllables, that our\(^6\) Verse is made, but by what we call Accent.

That this Accent is very different from what the Antients called Accent, is also well known to the Scholar; for their Accents were Musical Tones, which they put upon the several Syllables, and which made what they called the Melody of their Language. Whereas our Accents are nothing more than the Elevation of the Voice upon a Syllable, without changing the Tone of the Voice; or in other Words,\(^9\) [p. 3] the Syllable accented\(^10\) is sounded louder than the other Syllables of the Word.

And here we may observe that as the Antients had\(^11\) Melody in their Language, so it was necessary that they should also have Rhythm, for there is no melody or Music of any kind without Rhythm; And therefore as we have no Melody in our Language, it is very natural that neither\(^12\) should we have Rhythm.

That Music is more Natural to Man than Speech And that Men Sung before they learned to articulate, which is a Very artificial Operation, and not at all Natural to Man,\(^13\) I have elsewhere observed.\(^a\) And accordingly the first languages, which I am persuadecame from the East and the South, were all Musical. And we know with great certainty that the Shanscrit Language and the Chinese, the most antient Languages in the World, are both Musical. How\([p. 4]\) those Languages ceased to be Musical, I have elsewhere shewn,\(^b\) and have given, I think, a Sufficient reason why in place of Musical Tones were substituted Accents such as we use: for as it was impossible to Speak in perfect Monotony,
when they laid aside the Musical Modulation, they used a Method of varying the Voice natural enough indeed but altogether without Art, I mean by sounding one Syllable of the Word louder than another: And when the Melody of the Language was thus lost, it was very natural that the Rhythm also should be lost (for these two, as I have observed, always go together,) and that the Language should become altogether unmusical.

That this should be [p. 5] the case of a degenerated Nation, who have lost the Arts which were practiced by their Ancestors, is very natural to suppose, if there were no proof of it by facts. But in that way likewise it is clearly proved by the example of the Modern Greeks, who are as much degenerated from their Ancestors in Language as in other Arts. And accordingly they have not only lost the Grammar of their Language, but also the pronunciation of it; for in place of the Antient Accents, they use such Accents as we do, observing however the Notation of the Accents in the Greek Books, and pronouncing much in the same way, as they did in England about 40. or 50. years ago. And as Rhythm and Melody cannot be separated having lost the Melody of their Language, they have lost also the Rhythm, and pronounce without the least regard to long or short Syllables.

This Depravation of the Sound of the Greek Language did not come on as may be supposed at once, but came on by degrees. When Taetzes composed his Chiliads, which was in the [12th] Century, they were beginning to make Verse as we do, not by Quantity, but by what we call Accent. And accordingly his Verses, which he calls οικον πολιτικον, and which may be translated Vulgar Verses, are composed in that way, tho, he
regrets that the Antient Versification was laid aside. And when
the Rhythm of the Language was disused, I think it is natural to
suppose, that there was very little, if any, of the Melody p. 7
remaining, and that even then the Greeks pronounced pretty much
as they do now; tho' it appears that they still preserved much
more of the Grammar of their Language.

Chap. 2.

That all our verse is formed by Accents, and a certain
Number of Syllables in each Line - The Accents form feet of three
kinds, Jambic, Trochaic and Anapaestic - Milton has not used the
Anapaestic - of the use of Rhyme in English Verse, by which it
is distinguished into blank and Rhyming Verse - Two things which
distinguish the blank Verse from the Rhyme; the Stops in the
blank Verse, and the running of the Verses into one another -
The Stops necessary to make Rhythm in the Antient Verse as well
as the English; And without the Verses running into one another, a most tedious composition in English Verse - Three
Stops in the Antient Verse - One of these the Stop by the
Caesuras - Two of these the most remarkable - There may be too
many Caesura's in a Verse - Of the Stop at the end of the Antient
Verse - Of the Stop in the Verse, at the end of Words - This too
frequent in English, which consists so much of Monosyllables -
Milton has remedied this defect as much as he could - The Stop
too great in the Antient Verse, when the Stop at the [p. 6(1)]
end of the word concurs at the Stop at the end of the foot. -
The English Blank Verse no Stop but what the Sense requires -
but this Stop very various - This exemplified from Milton - Sometimes no Stop, a beauty as it is a Variety - Of the Stop at the end of the Verse in English blank Verse - This must be very small when the Lines run into one another - In that case the Lines should conclude with some Emphatical Word - The Lines in Antient Verse should for the greater part run into one another - Example of this from Virgil - Examples of another kind from Horace, and also from Virgil. Reasons why English Verse cannot be so beautifull as the Antient - The Number of Syllables in the Antient Verse different, which makes a beautifull Variety in them, and makes them fit to express Quicker or Slower Motion.

In the preceeding Chapter I have shown that our Verse is not made by Quantity like the Antient Verse, but by what we call Accent; so that instead of the Music of the Antient Verse, formed by the Rhythm of long & short Syllables, we use a kind of thumping or beating, not unlike that of a Drum. And it is these Accents with a certain Number of Syllables for each line, which compose our Verse. It now remains to be explained how these Accents are to be arranged in our Verse and what Variety of Verse the different arrangement of these Accents makes.

But this I have already done in my second Volume Book 3d. Chap. 8., where I have shown that there are three different kinds of feet, as they may be called in our English Verse, to which I have given the Antient Names of Jambic, Trochaic and Anapaestic; And of these, with the Variety of long and Short Verses, all our English Poetry of every kind is composed. See also the last Chapters of the Second Book, of the same Volume; where I have accurately explain'd all the different kinds of Rhythm, & shown
the Difference betwixt all those several kinds, and what the
Antients called Accent. — It may here be observed that tho
Milton has very much varied the measure of his Verse by the
use of Jambics and Trochaics, & by mixing together long & Short
Verses, more I think than any other of our poets, yet there is
[p. 10.] One of the three feet I have mentioned, which I have
not observed that he uses at all, I mean the Anapaestic, tho
from the Examples I have given of it in the eighth Chapter
abovequoted, I think it makes a variety not disagreeable in our
versification.

But besides the Variety of our Accents, by which Our
Versification is distinguished, as I have elsewhere observed,
from that of any other Nation in Europe, and also the variety
of long and Short Verses, the use of Rhyme has introduced a great
difference in our Poetry, by which it is distinguished into blank
and Rhyming Verse. I will begin with explaining the Nature of
the first.

Our blank Verse, besides the Accents, which it has in common
with all the English Verse, and besides the Variety of long and
Short Verse, has two things, which distinguish it, more than
any thing else, from [p. 11] Our Rhyming Verse. And these are
the Stops or Pauses in the Verse, and the running of the Verses
into one another, that is connecting them by the Sense with one
Another. And these I think are both great beauties of our Poetry.
for as to the first, there can be nothing beautifull in Sound,
where the Ear does not perceive some stop or Interval, but all
is flowing like a Torrent not like Water dropping, to use a
Simile of Cicero. It is, a Species of Rhythm, without which


there could not have been any Rhythm in the Antient Verse; for besides the Stops that I shall mention there is, as I have shown elsewhere, a pause, very small, I believe, betwixt the feet; And 2dly as to the English Verse if the Sense of the different Verses was not connected together, it would be a Composition of most tedious Uniformity; for it would be a Composition of Sentence of 10, or any smaller determinate Number of Syllables. [p. 12.]

In the Antient Verse they have commonly three Stops or Pauses in each Verse. The first is the short pause, as I have observed betwixt the feet. That there must be such a pause however short, I think is evident; for the Antient Verse was not only made but pronounced by the Rhythm of Long and short Syllables, and these divided into feet. Now if there had not been a Stop, by which each foot was distinguished from an other, there could not have been a Rhythm of those feet, but one continued flow, in which the Ear would perceive no stop or interval and consequently no Rhythm, for there can be no Rhythm without Stops by which one part of the Sound is distinguished. The second is a greater pause made by the Caesura, And which is varied according to the different stops of that kind in the Verse, of which two are the most remarkable, Vizt. the Pentamimeris Caesura, or the Stop immediately after the fifth half foot, and the Hephthemimeris Caesura, that is the Stop after the seventh half foot, by which as I have observed, Virgil has most beautifully varied his Versification. These Caesuras are a great beauty to Latin Verse. And where they are wanting the Verse is rough and unpleasant, as in that Verse of Virgil, which I have quoted elsewhere,

Hinc atque hinc glomerantur Oreades, illa pharetram.
The reason of this so considerable Stop made by
the Caesura, is twofold; first the Stop abovementioned at the
end of the preceding foot, and 2dly. the Stop at the end of the
Word, only filled up by a single Monosyllable^{21} which both
together, make a considerable Stop. And it is in this way that I
solve the Problem upon which Varro thought it worth his while to
write a Treatise. [{p. (12.)}]

At the same time I think there may be too many of these
Stops. [{p. 13.}] (for there is a measure in every thing,) as in
this line of Virgil,

Musa mihi causas memora; quo^{22} numine laeso.\textsuperscript{f}

where there are no less than three Caesuras And the Stop of the
3d Caesura is made greater by the Stop which the sense requires^{23}.

Besides these Stops in the Verse, there is necessarily^{24} a
Stop at the end of it; for if it be true, as I think it is,
that the Antients marked by a small Pause of the Voice the end of
every foot of the Verse, the Stop must have been much greater
at the end of the last foot concluding the Verse; for even we stop
there in our way of reading it; and this even when^{25} the Sense
of the Line runs into the other Line, yet the conclusion of the
Verse must be marked by some stop; but it must not be a^{26} great one,
otherwise the Sense will not be apprehended. Yet it is so great
that it makes the last Syllable of the verse long, tho' by nature
short; in the same Manner as the Caesura makes the last Syllable
of the Word long, tho' otherwise short.

In counting these pauses or breaks in the Antient Verse^{27}
I have not reckoned the Stops, which necessarily must be at the
end of every Word, and even of [{p. 14} every Syllable; because
these are not peculiar to Verse, but are common to all Speech.
The Stop by Syllables is hardly perceptible tho there necessarily
must be one, as there is a change of the position and action of
the Organs of Speech, which cannot be without some little interval
or pause. The Stop at the end of Words is much greater, being
necessary for understanding the Sense of the Composition. But
this Stop may be too frequent, which is the case if there be
many Monosyllables in the Line. And that is the great defect
of our English Verse, which cannot have the same flow that the use
of so many Polysyllables gives to the Greek and Latin Verse.
And therefore there is nothing that gives a greater flow to
our Verse, than Polysyllables taken from the learned Languages,
or from any of the Modern Languages derived from them, such as
the Italian [p. 15.] This Milton very well understood, and
accordingly has taken every Opportunity of adorning his Verse
in that way, as in that fine Simile in the first Book of the
Paradise Lost,
"Thick as autumnal leaves, that strow the Brooks
"Of Vallumbrosa, where the Etrurian Shades
"High overarched, embower 5
Where if we compare the first Line with the Second, we find
in the first but one word that is not a Monosyllable, that is the
word Autumnal, a Word taken from the Latin. Whereas in the
Second Line, we have that beautifull Italian Name of a Valley,
Vallumbrosa, a Word of four Syllables, and in the name of the
Nation, which he has put into the same Line there are likewise
four Syllables which makes the Sound of this Second Line, much
more flowing and Agreeable than the [p. 16.] Sound of the first.
And in the third line, having no foreign words, that he could use he has made the best of the English by compounding them which is the case of the words *overarched* and *embower*.

And here it may be proper to observe that the two stops, the one made by the conclusion of the foot, and the other by the Conclusion of the word, make together too great a stop or interval of the sound, which deforms the verse, and makes it very unpleasant to the ear as in this line.

* Aurea carmina scribis, Jule, optime vatum* \(^{h}\) (a) 

As to our English Blank verse, it has\(^{31}\) no caesura; and only one of the three pauses \([p. 17.]\) which, I have said, are to be found in the ancient verse, and that is the stop, which the sense requires. But of this stop there is a great variety and which I think one of\(^{32}\) the greatest beauties of this kind of verse; for the stop may be upon any of the feet of the verse; for example in the first five lines of the Paradise Lost the stop in the first line,\(^{33}\) which the sense requires, is upon the syllable -dience of the word *obedience*, that is upon the fourth or penult foot of the verse. The pause in the second verse is upon the third foot. In the third line the pause is, in like manner,\(^{34}\) upon the third foot. In the fourth verse the pause is in the middle of the third foot; and in the fifth verse it is in the middle of the second foot. This I think must be allowed \([p. 18.]\) to be a beautifull variety, and the more so, that it coincides perfectly with the sense, as will appear by the following example either in prose or verse.

\( (a) \) See Vossius's Latin Grammar\(^{h}\) upon the Subject of Metre, in which there are other Examples of the same kind given.\(^{29}\)
perfectly with the Sense. At the same time as there can be no
perfect beauty in any Composition either in prose or Verse, without
Variety, there may be a beautifull Line without any pause, such as
that of Milton where he concludes his Account of the eloquence
of Belial, with this Line,
"And in persuasive accents thus began".

Besides the Stops in the Verse, there must be necessarily
some Stop of the Voice at the end of the Line, even where the
Sense runs into the next Line; otherwise the Verse would not
be marked. And so pronounced would be no better than mere
prose. But the Stop must be very short, otherwise the Sense will
be marred: [p. 18.(1)] And that the Stop may not be improper,
the Verse should be concluded with some word, upon which an
emphasis would be laid in common Speaking. for where there
is such an Emphasis, there is always some little Stop of the
Voice. and I observe it is a fault, which often occurs in
Shakespeare's blank Verse, that an Emphatical word at the end of
the Line is often wanting. (a). It must however be acknowledged
that it is a Matter of some difficulty to read such Verse well; for
the Verses must be so pronounced that both the Verse shall be
marked, and the Sense carried on; but when so read it gives to
Poetry one of the greatest beauties of Prose writing; I mean
composition in Periods. (b).

(a) See what I have said upon this Subject, Vol. 5. p. 468.
(b) See what the Halicarnassian has said upon this Subject,
whose words I have translated in Vol. 5. p. 465,
It is in this way, that Milton \(^{44}\) in the Paradise Lost has made the finest periods in English, \(^{45}\) such as that of Satan's Speech, with which he opens the Council in the Pandemonium,

"Me tho' just right & c. \(^{19}\)

Where you have all the roundness of the period with the Sense as much collected in the end of it as in any period in prose; and with Parentheses, which when properly thrown in, and not too long I hold to be one of the greatest Beauties of Composition. And I am not sure but the small Stop abovementioned at the end of the Line, gives an Agreeable Variety to the Composition, and makes the period please the Ear more than if it were not in Verse. And I think the antient Verse is much the better for the Lines \(^{47}\) running into one another. for if the Sense should terminate with each Line I should think a Composition with so many Stops recurring regularly at the same interval, not at all agreeable. The full Stop therefore at the end of a Line should only be when there is a transition to some other Subject. This makes Virgil's composition in the beginning of the Aeneid \(^{48}\) very beautifull; \(^{49}\) where he goes on for seven Lines connected together both by the Sense and the Syntax, till he comes to the eight Line, in which he proposes the Subject. Musa mihi causas memora & c. And the same Composition is in the beginning of the Georgics \(^{50}\) -- Some of Horace's verses I have observed have not that Beauty; but the Sense is concluded by the Verse as regularly as in our Rhyming Verse. Of this kind he has two Stanzas as in the fifth Ode of the fourth Book, where there are eight Lines together each of which concludes the Sense.

The Lines are

Tutus bos etenim prata \(^1\) prata \(^{1}\) perambulat, & c. \(^{m}\)
And there is a whole Ode in the same Book, Ode 7th. composed in distichs of Long & Short Verse, where the Sense in by far the greater part of them is concluded with the distich. And of the same kind is the 10th. of the Epodes. And there are in Virgil's 4th Eclogue Seven Lines in the beginning of the same kind.

Besides the want of variety in such Composition there is not a flow in those Lines, such as pleases my Ear. But tho' Milton has undoubtedly made the best blank Verse in English yet it cannot be compared to the Antient Greek or Latin Verse; for in the first place the greatest part of the Words of English growth are monosyllables, which for the Reason I have mentioned cannot make sweet flowing Verse. 2dly The English words are crowded with Consonants and many of them terminated not only with Mute Consonants which is not the case of any Word in Greek, but with aspirated Mutes; And lastly the feet in English consist only of two Syllables, whereas the feet of the Hexameter verse in Greek and Latin consist either of two or three Syllables, that are either Spondees or Dactyles, which makes a most agreeable Variety in their Verse, and gives them a difference of the Number of Syllables in each Hexameter Verse, from twelve or thirteen, to Seventeen: By which means they are able to compose such Verses as

\[ \text{\textit{Quadrupedante putrem sonitu quatit ungula campum}} \]

By which Lines when we compare them with Spondaic Lines of twelve Syllables or thirteen if the fifth foot be a Dactyle such as we may perceive how much better quick Motion is expressed by the
Lines I have quoted, than by Spondaic Lines: for quick Motion is more Motion in the same time. Now the time of all heroic Verse in Greek and Latin is the same. But where there are more Syllables in one Verse than in another, the pronunciation of every Syllable being a Motion, there must be more Motion in the same time.

[p. 21.(1)]

Chapt. 3.

We got the use of Rhyme from the Arabians — but it was not invented by them — The invention of the Indians, as well as Numerical Cyphers — The Antient Goths and Celts did not use Rhyme — A Stop, at the end of every Rhyming Verse, necessary — The Voice must dwell upon the Rhyming words, otherwise the Rhyme could not be perceived — There must be a Stop in the Sense as well as the Sound — This makes the Composition most tediously Uniform — An Example from Mr. Pope — Milton's Judgement of Rhyming Poetry — The more to be trusted to that he practiced Rhyming Poetry and in long Verses, as well as Poetry in blank Verse — Dr. Johnston's Judgement of Rhyming Poetry very different from Milton's — In long works Rhyme intolerable — Mr. Pope has given Examples of such Works — The Sentiments and Diction in Mr. Pope's writings commendable — Of the Bondage of Rhyme — Milton himself has submitted to that bondage in his Sonnets — The effect of such a [p. 21.(2)] bondage upon the Writer — Milton was young, when he wrote Rhyming Verse — It was the fashion then, and particularly in Italy where Milton travelled — Milton the best English Poet in Rhyming Verse — particularly in his short Rhyming Verse — Examples
of that from the Comus, and the Allegro¹. — The Change of measure in those short Verses has a wonderfull effect — Of the mixture of long & Short Rhyming Verses by Milton, and of the Variety of his Rhymes — An Uncommon Versification in the beginning of his L'Allegro, and Il Penseroso. — A Beautifull little Poem by Milton upon the May Morning — Milton has made the proper use of Rhyme — and a Variety in his Rhyming Poetry, not to be matched except in Dryden's Ode in St Cecilias Day — Milton's use of Rhyme, shows that it is not an improper Ornament in certain Poetical works — used by Homer in his Similes, but not in Narrative or Argument — must not be carried thro' a long work — Eulogium of Milton — He has written the best Heroic Poem of Modern times — His Comus, a most pleasurable Piece and at the same time Moral — Difference in that respect betwixt it and the Beggar's Opera — His Samsøn Agonistes the best Specimen of Antient Tragedy — If the Choruses of it² were well set to Music,³ would do much honour to the English Nation — Lycidas also a fine poem of Milton's. — An imitation of an Elogue of Virgil's — The Stile of Virgil in his Elogues his best Stile — Milton has written Verses in Italian⁴ Greek, and Latin⁵ six Italian Sonnettes preserved to us — was highly esteemed in Italy and very much praised by the learned Men there even for his knowledge of the Italian Tongue — His Authority in Italian Words and Phrases quoted in the Academy of Crusca at this day — Of his Greek Verses we have but few — His Latin Poems more numerous — His Elegy Ad Carolum Diodatum, as fine as any thing of the kind that [p. 21.5] is to be found — passage from it quoted — His Pastoral Lamentation upon his Friend Carolus Diodatus very fine — An
imitation of two pastorals of Virgil, but not at all Servile -
The greatest part of his Latin Poems, written from the age of
16. to 20 - Yet very good - A Wonderfull knowledge of Mythology
in them - His Epigrams upon the Gunpowder plot excellent -
Of the Prose writings of Milton - As he has made his Verse so
like Prose he must write plain Prose well - His Prose stile not
fashionable at present - but not the Worse for that - Of the
Learning of Milton - Wonderfull, taking in every thing that was
to be known - Greek, Latin, Italian, and Hebrew. - He had studied
also the Antient Philosophy - Conclusion of the Eulogium upon
upon Milton⁶ [p. (21.)]

I come now to Speak of Our Rhyming Verse called Metre by those
who do not understand the meaning of the Word.⁷ This Ornament
of our Poetry, as many think it, we got as I have observed [p. (22)]
elsewhere⁸ from the Arabs (a). But they do not appear to have
invented it, any more than the notation of Numbers by Cyphers, (⁹
which we likewise got from the Arabians and accordingly called them
Arabian Cyphers,)¹⁰ but which they certainly got from the Indians;
for I have seen some Indian Poems in the Shanscrit Language
published by Mr Wilkins,¹¹ which are in Rhyme. That the use
of Rhyme in Europe was no older than our intercourse with the
Arabians is evident from this, that the Antient Goths and Celts

(a) The Greeks also got their Rhymes which they now use,
from the same people. See a [p. 23] MS. note in Vol. 4. of
Origin of Language p. 102 and I think it is not unlikely that we
got it at second hand from the Greeks.⁸
did not as I am well informed use it, for they formed their Verses by the Number of Syllables, and a certain similarity of the sound of Letters and Syllables in the Line, but not at the end of it, and which may be called Alliterations.

In all Rhyming Poetry there must of necessity be a Stop at the end of the Verse; for the Voice must rest for some considerable time upon the last Syllable, otherwise the jingle of the like endings could not be perceived; And as such a Stop would be improper, and make the Composition hardly intelligible, if the Sense did not require it, therefore this Composition in Rhyming Verse is all in Sentences or Members of Sentences of a determinate Number of Syllables. And there is besides another stop [p. 23] in our long Rhyming Verse, which is about the middle of it; for it appears that as the Voice is to rest at the end of the Verse, it divides the Stage, and makes a Stop, a less Stop indeed, in the Middle. That this is the case of the French long Rhyming Verse is acknowledged by every Man who can read it. And all their Writers who treat of their Poetry acknowledge that it is absolutely necessary. Now tho the Stop in our English Rhyming Verse be not so much marked as in the French, yet that there is a Stop, every man who reads it I think must acknowledge. I will give for an example some of the finest Lines, which I think Mr. Pope ever wrote; and I think a most tender Subject his filial piety to his Mother [p. 24.]

"Me may the pious office long engage,
"To rock the Cradle of reposing age:
"With lenient Arts extend a Mother's breath
"Make Languour smile, and smooth the bed of death."
Here the reader will observe a Stop about the middle of each Line, tho' the Sense require none: but on the contrary Words are disjoined by the Stop which by the Syntax are necessarily joined; Such as, Office, and, long engage; in the first Line: In the second Line Craddle, is disjoined from that with which it is necessarily joined in the Syntax, reposing Age. Here therefore we have a composition in Sentences of 10. Syllables, with a pause even in the middle of them and a constant jingle at the end of every distich; than which I think it is impossible to conceive any composition more teadously uniform or more disgusting to a Man who has formed his Taste of Composition upon the Study of the Antient Greek and Roman Writers in Prose and in Verse. Whilst we had no learning but what we got from the Arabs, it was no wonder that we used the Rhyming Poetry, which they taught us. But after the revival of Greek learning, it is surprising that it should have continued so long in fashion. (a).

Milton, whose Learning and Taste no Man can doubt, who is himself a Scholar and a Man of Taste, has given his Opinion of Rhyming Verse in a short but excellent Preface to his Paradise Lost. And his Judgement is the more to be trusted to in this Matter, that he has written a good deal in Rhyme as well as in blank Verse; and even in long Rhyming Verse; for the Shepherd in his Comus has spoken a good deal in that verse; and there is a Vacation exercise of his, at College, all in the same.

(a) See what I have said in Vol. 5 p. 467. of our Rhyming Verse.
Verse (a); besides an Epitaph on Shakespear, and two Copies of Verses upon the University Carrier, to be seen in the same collection. (b). And there are some Psalms, which he has translated in the same long Rhyming Verse. And he has written Sonnets, Seventeen in English and six in Italian, where there are Quadruple and Triple Rhymes in the same Stanza. His Opinion of Rhyme is "That it is no necessary adjunct or true Ornament of Poem or good Verse, in longer works especially, but the invention of a barbarous age, to set off wretched matter [p. 27] And lame Metre". He says further of it, "That it is a thing of itself, to all Judicious ears trivial and of no true musical delight; which consists only in apt numbers, fit quantity of Syllables, and the sense variously drawn out from one verse into another; not in the jingling sound of like endings; a fault avoided by the learned Antients both in poetry and all good Oratory."

This so respectable Authority I think I can venture to set against the Opinion of Dr Johnson who esteemed no English Poetry that was not in Rhyme; for as he wrote nothing in blank Verse, and was to himself the Standard of perfection in every thing, he set no value upon any thing written in that Verse. It is to be observed that Milton condemns [p. 28] the use of Rhyme particularly in long Works. And indeed the translation of eight & forty Books of heroic poetry in Rhyming Verse, and what

(a). p. 4. of Vol. 2d. of his smaller Poems Printed at Glasgow in 1772.

(b). p. 26 & following.
I think still more extraordinary, a Philosophical Poem by the same Author, I mean the Essay on Man, are such works that I wonder how any Man who has formed his Taste of writing upon the Study of the Antient Authors can have patience to read them.

By this Censure of Mr. Pope I would not be understood to condemn his Writings altogether, in which I acknowledge there are great Beauties both of Sentiment and Diction, of which I think I have given a very good Specimen in the passage from him abovequoted. But it is that jingle of like endings as Milton very properly calls it, which [p. 29.] he has carried on thro' such long works, and which has given such a tedious and disgusting Uniformity to his Stile, as must be very offensive to an Ear accustomed to the Variety of Antient Composition.

In the end of this Preface Milton speaks of the bondage of Rhyme; and indeed it is such that I wonder any Man of a free Spirit, not to speak of Taste or Learning, can submit to it. The Stanza Verse, in which Spencer's Faery Queen, and Mr. Thomson's Castle of Indolence are written, consists of Nine Lines, of which four Rhyme together, Vizt. the Second, fourth, fifth and Seventh. And there are three that Rhyme together, Vizt the Sixth, eight and Ninth, and there is one dis- [p. 30.] tich Rhyme, of the first and third Lines (a). Milton has submitted to a bondage even greater than this; for his Sonnets consist of 14. Lines, of which there are two Quadruple Rhymes, and three distich Rhymes mixed.

(a) See what I have further said of this kind of Verse in Vol. 2. p 397.
together not at Random, but in a certain Order, and at stated intervals; Now it is impossible, but that such a Servitude to the Rhyme must as Milton has said in the Preface above quoted, "constrain Poets to express many things otherwise, and for the most part worse, than otherwise they would have expressed them." And it may be added, to omit many things which otherwise they would not have omitted, because they cannot find a Rhyme for them.  

That a man who was so great a Scholar and of so free a Spirit as Milton, should have subjugated himself to such a bondage, I could not have believed, if we had not evidence of it incontestible. But he was Young when he wrote those Rhyming Poems; And Rhyming Poetry was then the fashion; and particularly the Sonnet was very common at that time in Italy where Milton travelled. And at this day the Improvisatoris in Italy speak their extemporary Verses in what they call the Octavo Rime, which is just the Stanza of Spencer & Thomson wanting only the Alexandrine Line. But when he became old, he wrote nothing in Rhyme, and as we have seen very much condemned the use of it.

Milton I hold to be the best Rhyming Poet in English as well as the best Writer in blank Verse, particularly in his short Rhyming Verses; for his long have that defect which all such Verse must have, and which makes the French long Rhyming Verse the worst I ever read, I mean the regular Stop in the middle of the Verse. But in his short Verses he is admirable; And there is a Song in the Comus which I think is the best Anacreontic piece of Poetry that ever was written,

By dimpled brook & fountain brim
[The wood-nymphs decked with daisies trim,
Their merry wakes and pastimes keep;
What hath night to do with sleep?
Nacht hath better sweets to prove,
Venus now wakes, and wakens Love.]² [p. 32]

And there is another Song in the same Piece³⁵ of a very
different kind, addressed to Echo, which he puts into the mouth
of the Lady

"Sweet Echo, sweetest Nymph that livest unseen
["Within thy airy shell
"By slow Meander's margent green,
"And in the violet-embroidered vale
"Where the love-torn nightingale
"Nightly to thee her sad song mourneth well.]⁶

And in short all the Poetry of that kind in the Comus, has that
Doric Sweetness in them, which Sir Henry Wotton in his Letter
to the Author prefixed to the Comus, has observed, and Says
very truely that it is, ipsa Mollites. And what I admire very
much in his short Rhyming Verses is the change of the Measure
from the Jambic as I call it, to the Trochaic, and vice versa.
Thus in the beginning of the Song of Comus abovementioned, he
begins in the Jambic, which as I have observed is a graver [p. 33]
Measure than the Trochaic.

"The Star, that bids the Shepherd fold,
"Now the top of Heaven doth hold¹

And so he goes on³⁶ describing the time of the night till he
comes to excite his followers to riot and debauchery. Then he
says
Mean while welcome joy & feast,
Midnight shout & revelry,
Tipsy Dance and Jollity;
Braid your locks with rosy twine
Dropping odours, dropping wine. j

And so he goes on. And there is the same Change of Measure in the 37 Allegro where after giving the Geneology of Euphrosyne in Jambics he changes the Measure, and invites her to be of the party in Trochaics

Haste thee nymph & bring with thee
Jest and youthfull Jollity,
Quips and Cranks and wanton wiles,
Rods and becks and wreathed Smiles,
Such as hang on Hebe's Cheek,
And love to live in dimple Sleek
Sport that wrinkled care derides
And Laughter holding both his Sides [p. 34.]
Come and trip it, as ye go,
On the light fantastic toe. k

Here the Words may be said to Dance, as well as the Persons they describe. And it makes a kind of Poetry which the Greeks call Orchestic, such as some of the Odes of Pindar, and all the Dythyrambic were (a), but of which Milton has given us the only Specimen that we have in English. 39

And he has given a Variety to his Rhyming Verse not only by

(a) See 38 Vol. 2d. p. 419.
disjoining the Rhymes and making them alternate, and sometimes at a greater distance, and also by changing the Measure of the Verse, but by mixing together long and Short Verses, and in a way which seems quite irregular, but which I think very beautifull. for the Great fault of all Rhyming Verse is its tedious uniformity and the want of that Variety, without which there can be Nothing beautifull in the Works of Art. In the Lady's Song abovementioned, in the Comus, You have long and Short Verses both of different lengths, Some of the long longer than others, and some of the Short shorter than others, with Alternate Rhymes too, and the Song concluded with [p. 35] this beautifull longest Line of all,

"And give resounding Grace to all Heaven's Harmonies."

He begins both his Allegro, and Penseroso with a Species of Verse which I find no where else. It is mixed of short and long Verses; the first and fourth Verse Rhyme to one another; And betwixt them is interjected a Rhyming Distich consisting of a Short and a long Verse, And of the next six Lines, the first and Sixth Line Rhyme to one another. And betwixt them are interjected two Rhyming Distichs.

I will only mention one small Poem of his more, upon the May Morning, beginning with four long Verses, then going to short Trochaics, and then concluding with two long Verses in Jambics.

Now the bright Morning Star, days harbinger
Comes dancing from the East, and brings with her [p. 35]
"The flowery May, who from her Green lap throws
"The yellow Cowslip & the pale Primrose
"Hail bounteous May; that dost inspire
"Mirth and Youth, and Warm desire;
"Woods and Groves are of thy dressing,
"Hill and Dale doth boast thy blessing -
"Thus we salute thee with our early song,
"And welcome thee, and wish thee long."

Thus it appears that Milton has made the proper use of Rhyme, not in long works, but in Songs, or Short Poems, consisting for the greater part of short Verses, and of unequal lengths, mixed together with great Variety of Rhymes; and with Numbers wonderfully suited to the Subjects he expresses. And in this Respect there is nothing that can be compared to him in English, unless it be One Single Poem of Mr Dryden's I mean the Ode on St Cecilia's day.

It is this use that Milton has made of Rhyme, which has convinced me that in Songs or little pleasurable Pieces of Poetry, it is not at all an improper Ornament. It certainly was used as an ornament by Homer, who has a good Number of Rhyming Hemistichs. But as I have observed elsewhere, it is only in the Ornamental parts of his Poem, such as Similes, where the fable or business of the Poem stands still as Aristotle has remarked, not in narrative or Argument. And some even of the Antient Orators have used it, one particularly Isocrates, who I think has used it too much. Now if these Authors writing in a Language which had both Melody and Rhythm, Ornaments that we entirely want, and had besides Words of much sweeter Sound, and which they could arrange in so many more different ways than we can, used the Ornament of like endings, it would be hard if we should be restrained from using it, providing we do it sparingly and discreetly, and not make one perpetual
Jingle, terminating Lines always of equal Length and of the
same measure run thro the whole composition.

I cannot conclude these Observations upon's Milton's Poetry,
without giving my Opinion, however different from that of Dr
Johnson and his Admirers, that Milton is not only the best Versifier
that we have in English both of blank and Rhyming Verse, but that
he has produced the best Poetical Pieces, both [p. 39] for Matter
and Stile, of any Man in Britain, and for any thing I know, any
Man in Modern times. He has written the best Epic Poem I mean
the Paradise Lost, (for I do not reckon the Paradise regained an
Epic Poem but a Dialogue betwixt our Saviour and Satan the Subject of which is taken from the Gospels; for it wants that
Action which constitutes the Fable, and is absolutely necessary
to every Heroic Poem,) that has been written since the days of
Augustus Caesar. His Comus, if it were to be exhibited with all
the Decorations of Scenery Machinery Music and Dancing, and if
Players were to be found, that could wield as I call it, the
Language of Milton, I think as I have said elsewhere it
would be a Representation worthy of the stage of Athens; nor do
I know that they had anything upon that Stage, so pleasurable,
and at the same time so Moral. [p. 40]

It is the Morality of the Piece which makes the great difference
betwixt the Comus and another very celebrated piece upon the
English Stage, the Beggar's Opera, which no doubt is a very
pleasurable piece, tho I think not so much calculated to please
Men of refined Taste as the Comus, but it is not at all Moral,
and it is said to have produced very bad effects upon the Manners
of the people. Then there is his Samson Agonistes, which I
think is the best imitation of Attic Tragedy that has been in Modern times. The Catastrophe of it is as fine as any to be found in any Antient Tragedy. And if the Choruses could be well set to Music, and properly spoken, it would be an entertainment that would do much honour [p. 41.] to the English Nation, and I hope for that reason it will be performed.

There is a fourth Piece of his, that I think has likewise a great deal of Merit, it is his Lycidas, a pastoral Monody upon the death of a friend of his who was drowned. In it Milton has very well imitated the Stile of Virgil in his Bucolics, particularly in the fifth, which contains a Lamentation upon the death of Daphnis and concludes with his Apotheosis; And Milton concludes his lamentation over Lycidas with something of the same kind.

Now it is the Stile of Virgil in his Eclogues, that Horace has so justly praised;

Virgilio admuerit Molle atque facetum

Virgilio admuerint gaudentes rure Camoena

And indeed I think it is the [p. 42]

best stile that Virgil has written, much better than the Stile of either his Georgics or Aeneid. This Piece of Milton is in long Rhyming Verse, much longer than any other piece that he has written in that Verse: but then the long Verses are intermixed with shorter and there is a wonderfull Variety of Rhymes in it, the two Lines that Rhyme having often interjected betwixt them two other Lines, which have no other Rhyming to them. And the
piece would not have been the worse in my opinion if there had been more of them. (a) [M]

Besides his English Poems he has written Italian, Greek, & Latin Verses. Of the Italian we have preserved but six Sonnetts, & Some Verses which he calls a Canzione. Whether they be well written or no. I am not a Judge, as I do not understand the Language, but we know that he was highly esteem'd in Italy, of which Some Monuments are Still remaining. There are Verses in [p. 43.] his Praise both in Latin & Italian written by learned Men of Italy, prefix'd to the Collection of his Latin Poems, & there is a Letter in Latin from a Florentine Nobleman who calls himself Carolus Datus which celebrates him as One of the most Extraordinary Men that ever lived, both with respect to his Mind & his person. In these pieces he is praised for his Knowledge of many Languages & of the Italian among the rest, & it was assured by a Gentleman Who had been in Italy that at this Day his Authority for Italian Words & Phrases is quoted in the Academy of Crusco.

Of his Greek Verses we have very few, but enow to shew that he could write the Language: & that he understood it as well if not better than any man now living, I think cannot be doubted.

Of his Latin Poems there is a considerable Number, and among

(a) See what I have written in a Separate paper upon the Castle of Indolence of Mr Thomson, where I think I have shown that some [p. 43.] of his Stanzas would be as good Poetry without any Rhyme at all.
others 7. Elegies all good, & particularly the first addressed to his friend Carolus Diodatus, which I will Sett against any thing of the Elegiack kind, antient or modern. There are in it two Verses upon the Subject of Ovid's Exile as well composed as any thing can be in Latin -

O utinam Vates nunquam graviora tulisset
Ille Tonitano flebilis exul Agro.

His Description also of the Situation of London with respect to the Thames, I [p. 44.] think very pretty

Me tenet Urbs reflua quam Thamesis alluit Unda
Meque nec invitum Patria dulcis habet.

His description too of the Park of London is very fine & of the Ladies to be seen there whose form was Such

Quae possuit Senium vell reparare Iovis

And thro' the whole Epistle there is as Sweet an Elegiac flow as can well be imagin'd.

There is a pastorall Lamentation upon the Death of this friend of his Deodatus entitled Epitaphium Damonis, which may be said to be also an Imitation of Virgill's fifth Eilogue, & he has taken from the eight, the use of an Intercalary Line returning at certain intervals. But neither his Imitations from Virgill in his Pastoralls nor from Homer in his Paradise lost are by any means Servile, much less are they translations such as many of the Passages are which Virgill has taken from Homer

The greater part of his Latin Poems were written when he was very young, from the Age of 16 to 20 yet both the Language & Versification are very good & I Observe in them a wonderfull
knowledge of antient Mythology without which I think it is impossible that Poetry can be much Ornamented. His epigrams too upon the Gunpowder Plot are excellent, & better than any thing of the kind that is now written in the Schools of England tho' there be no Poetickall Exercise there which they practise more. And So much for the Poetry of Milton.

As to his Prose writings, I have Spoken of them at pretty great length in Severall parts of this Work and I will only repeat here an Observation I have already made (a) That I think it is impossible that a Man who has Succeeded So well in making Verse like to Prose, should not have written plain prose well. It is true that his Prose Stile is generally disliked at present, being very unlike what is written in this Age. But that I hold to be no small part of its praise.

As to his Learning, it was amazing, as great as his Italian friends make it to be, Comprehending not only Greek Latin & Italian, but also Hebrew Learning. And he appears to have Studied at the University very diligently, the antient Philosophy, which was then the only Philosophy known, & still in my Opinion the only Philosophy worth being known. In a College Exercise of his which I have mention'd he shews that he had Studied the Categories of Aristotle for he introduces Ens there whom he not improperly calls the Father of the Predicaments. And it appears that he had also Study'd the Philosophy of Plato, for he has written Some Latin Verses upon the Ideas of Plato. p. 152. And in his Tractate on Education he shews that he had Study'd the Locrian Remnants as he calls the fragments of Pythagorean Philosophy that have been preserved, & which I hold

(a) [No footnote.]
contain a very valuable part of the antient Philosophy. In short I do not believe that there is another\textsuperscript{78} Example of so much Genius & Learning being united in One Man. Horace makes it a Doubt whether Genius or Learning be most necessary to make a Poet (see the Verses)\textsuperscript{2} Milton has join'd both in an eminent Degree\textsuperscript{79} [KW]

Lastly\textsuperscript{80} I think Milton as a Writer and as\textsuperscript{81} a Man of Genius and Learning is the greatest boast not only of England but of Modern times. And therefore I hold that those who have the regard they ought to have for the honour of England, will not think\textsuperscript{82} this digression, long as it is,\textsuperscript{83} in praise of such an Author, improper.

I will conclude with some general Observations upon the Sound of Language: which may serve as a Summary or Epitome of all that I have said upon the Subject in this and other parts of my Works.

Language consists of Syllables, (for I speak not of Letters, or Elemental Sounds,\textsuperscript{84} as I suppose the Language already formed by Articulation) [p. 47] of Words, and of Sentences. And I am to enquire concerning the different Sounds belonging to each of these;\textsuperscript{85} for I lay it down, as a Proposition, that cannot be contraverted, that no Language is spoken with a perfect Monotony, that is without any Variation of the Sound; And we are now to enquire what these Variations are in the three parts of Language I have mentioned. As to Syllables, in the pronunciation of them, there can be only three differences, for either one Syllable may be sounded louder than another; or it may be longer than another; or it may have a Musical Tone, by which it is distinguished from
other Syllables. The first of these ways is the most obvious, and the most natural way, of distinguishing Syllables from one another. And indeed it was necessary, where the Syllables were not distinguished by the Tones of the Voice; for then they must be all pronounced in the same way; and the whole Speech would be a perfect Monotony; which is contrary to Nature and not practiced by any people. I hold therefore that all Nations even the most barbarous distinguish their Syllables by sounding one louder than another. And we know that in this way the Celts and Goths our Ancestors pronounced their Syllables: And it is from them that we derive this pronunciation; which is so prevalent in the English Language that we do not pronounce two Syllables together, without accenting the one more than the other.

The Second way I mentioned of distinguishing Syllables belongs only to Nations, which have cultivated Music, and applied it to Language. I hold therefore that no barbarous nation has that way of varying the Sound of their Syllables. There are many of them no doubt that have Musical Tones, which at certain times they apply to their Language. But it is to the whole tenor of their discourse that they apply them, not to particular Syllables as the Greeks and Romans did; so that they have no accents, such as the Antients had, that is Syllabic Tones, by which the Syllables were distinguished from one another, and in that way a Monotony avoided. To have added to the Musical Tones, such Accents as ours, would have incumbered their Language, and as I have observed spoiled the Music of it.

The third Variation, which I have observed belonging to Syllables is that of long and short. This I hold to be a
Variation belonging to all Languages; nor indeed could we conceive a Language of which all the Syllables were precisely of the same length. But the difference betwixt the learned Languages and the barbarous is this, that in the learned Languages by long and Short Syllables being artfully joined together, a Rhythm is produced; which makes Poetry in those Languages; and gives delight to the Mind, which perceives the Relation of the long and short Syllables to one another; which is in the Ratio of two to one. But where the Syllables are not commensurated to one another in that way, tho' some Syllables may be longer than others, which is the Case in English, no System can be made of them, and consequently no Poetry in that way. [p. 50]

In this way I have explained the three ways and the only Ways, in which the Sound of the Syllables can be varied; and from what I have said, I think it is easy to Acct how the Greeks having lost their Learning and the Music of their Language, should Substitute in place of it that original and Natural Way of distinguishing Sounds by loudness or Softness; which is become so prevalent among them, that it has not only destroyed their Accents, or the Melody of their Language, but also the Rhythm or Quantity, as we call it, that is the distinction of long or Short Syllables, to which as I have said they give no regard, but mind only what we call the accent of Syllables; which they regulate by the Marks, which their forefathers put upon their Syllables for distinguishing their Accents or Musical Tones.

Here the Reader will observe that I have said nothing of the difference of the Sound of Syllables produced by the Greater or lesser Number of Consonants in them, or the Quality of those
Consonants considered as Mute, aspirated or liquid; because that belongs to Articulation [p. 51.] of which, as I have said, I am not here speaking — And this may suffice for the Variation of the Sound of Syllables.

The next thing to be considered is the Sound of Words. And the most obvious difference in their Sound is made by the length or shortness of them; that is the Number of Syllables, of which they consist. In all the Languages that are now Spoken there are Words both of one Syllable, and of more than one, the Chinese Language only excepted, which has this peculiarity, that it consists altogether of Monosyllables. The learned Languages such as the Greek and Latin, and particularly the Greek have words of Many Syllables which they form by Composition: They have at the same time Monosyllables; And indeed the Structure of the Language would be imperfect, if there were no Monosyllables in it, any more than Polysyllables in the Chinese. And this mixture of Polysyllables and Monosyllables in the learned Languages gives a beautifull Variety to the Sound, at the same time that these long compounded Words convey the Sense better, than [p. 52.] if it was to be divided among many Words. In the Modern Languages which are not formed by so much Art, as the Antient, there are too Many Monosyllables; which give a rough and as it were a hopping sound to the Language, and destroy that Smooth flow, which is the great beauty of Language. This is produced in English chiefly by the Want of that great Art of Language in the learned Languages gives a beautifull Variety to the Sound, at the same time that these long compounded Words convey the Sense better, than [p. 52.] if it was to be divided among many Words. In the Modern Languages which are not formed by so much Art, as the Antient, there are too Many Monosyllables; which give a rough and as it were a hopping sound to the Language, and destroy that Smooth flow, which is the great beauty of Language. This is produced in English chiefly by the Want of that great Art of Language analogy, by which the Greeks and Latins formed Declensions and Conjugations, and in that Way by flections & terminations expressed many circumstances of the Thing, and its
relations to other things, which in English we are obliged to express by many ill sounding Monosyllables; So that not only Words are unnecessarily multiplied, but the Sound of the Language made much worse. Whereas by the Analogy of Greek & Latin the Sound of the Words is lengthened, and agreeably varied.

There is another thing, which Varies the Sounds of Words, which cannot vary the Sounds of Syllables. It is this, that Words have sense and meaning, which Syllables have not, and often convey [p. 53] to the Mind Ideas, which move our Sentiments and feelings very much. Now in the pronunciation of such Words, the Sound will be varied by the affections of the Speaker, and made very different from the Sound of other Words: And to vary the Sound properly upon such Words, is a great beauty of Speaking.

I come now to the Sound of Sentences, the last thing I mentioned relating to the Sound of Language. By Sentences we convey our thoughts to one another, and intimate our wants and desires; for Words express our Ideas only; but when Ideas are joined together, which they are by words in Sentences, then we form what is called Discourse, and Exercise the discursive faculty of the Mind, as it is called, by Philosophers. As Sentences comprehend both Syllables and Words, there must be in them all the Variation and all the Beauty of Sound, which can be found in Language.

The most beautifull composition of Words in Sentences, is in Periods; in which besides the beauty of the Sound of Syllables and Words, properly joined together, there is a connection and agreement betwixt the several Members of the
period, [p. 54.\textsuperscript{a}] which gives great pleasure to the Ear, by making it perceive a kind of harmony. Aristotle has defined a Period, "what\textsuperscript{b} has a beginning and an end."\textsuperscript{2a} He might I think have added a Middle too, which must be where there is a beginning and an end. But the beginning and the end are the Principal things in a period, and which distinguish it more than any thing else from any other form of Composition of Words. And the Chief\textsuperscript{99} beauty of a period is the connection, which we perceive in it, betwixt the beginning and the end, by which the Sense of a very long period may be all connected together, and brought much more forcibly upon the Mind of the Hearer or Reader, than if it was frittered and broken down into short Sentences. And this connection betwixt the beginning and the end, is so necessary, that if it be not perceived and readily perceived by a Man accustomed to read or to hear that kind of Composition, it cannot be called a period, but is an abrupt and disjointed Composition; And therefore Aristotle has not improperly\textsuperscript{101} made it the Definition of a period. And [p. 55.] when he says that there should be a Conformity\textsuperscript{102} betwixt the Sense of the beginning and end, he means also, (and I think his words imply as much), that there should be likewise a conformity in Sound: for as Periods belong chiefly to Rhetorical Composition, and as the Composition of that kind, is made to be spoken, the pleasure of the Ear must be very much studied in it, and indeed the people, to whom Orations are addressed, are more led by their Ears than by their understanding.

In Periods such as Demosthenes has composed, there is a Variety in the Sound as well as in the Matter, which appears
wonderfull even to us, but must have appeared much more
wonderfull to his Audience the Athenians who could perceive
what we cannot perceive, the Melody & the Rhythm of his Language.
All that we can perceive in the Sound of his Composition is the
Variety of Articulation in his Words, and their being connected
together in such a Manner, as not only to make the Sound most
pleasant to the [p. 56.] Ear, but to convey the Sense more clearly
to the hearer or Reader.

And this leads me to speak of the Variations, which the
Sense or Matter contained in Sentences, may make and ought to
make in the pronunciation of them. Single Words, as I have
shown, expressing any thing that touches our feelings, naturally
make a Change of the Voice in pronouncing such words. But when a
Number of these are combined together and properly arranged
in a Sentence, they must convey Sentiments and Passions, which
will very much change, at least ought to change the Tone of the
Voice. Nor is there any thing in which the Art of the Orator
is more shown, than in the right pronunciation of such Sentences.
Action, as Demosthenes has told us, is the first, the Second,
the third Quality of an Orator. Now the chief part of Action in
Speaking is pronunciation, that is Action of our Organs in
pronouncing. Now if these are not properly employed upon
Subjects [p. 57.] expressing Sentiments and Passions, And if the
Tones of the Voice are not suitable to the Subject, it will not
have the effect upon the Audience that it ought to have. And not
only in public Speaking, but in private conversation there ought
to be a proper Modulation of the Voice, and a Change of it in
passing from one Subject to another.
There is one Variation of the Voice, which in speaking or reading ought carefully to be attended to, tho' it express no Sentiment or passion; And that is what is spoken or written in Parenthesis, which, as it is disjoined from the context, ought to be pronounced with a different Tone of the Voice. And if the Parenthesis be what it ought to be, that is, of importance to the Subject, the Matter of it will require a different Tone of Voice; for nothing ought to be separated from the Context, so as to stand by itself, unless it be of consequence. And where it is such, I think it is a great beauty in writing and also in Speaking, if it be pronounce with a proper [p. 56.] change of Voice, so as to distinguish it from the Context, and in that way make the reader give the Attention to it, which its importance requires.

And here I conclude what I have to say upon the effect which the matter of Language has or ought to have upon the Sound of it. Many of my readers I know will think what I have said upon this Subject very triffling. But as Our Language has not the ornament either of Melody or Rhythm, and in place of these, Nothing but what we call Accent, that is, a Thump, as it were, by which we distinguish one Syllable of a Word from another, as a Man, who beats a Drum, makes by a stronger Stroke, one Sound louder than another, if we do not vary the Sound of our Language by changing the Tone of it according to the Subject of which we treat, we must speak both very disagreeably, and in a manner which as it is unpleasant to the Ear, does not convey the Sense properly to the hearer.
Of English Verse compared with Greek and Latin -

No. 241 - [M]

A great deall upon the Subject of Milton & the Excellency of his Rhyming Poetry. KW in Comus 111 p. 30 - [M]

To be Printed
The Subject of this fourth Volume of the Origine & Progress of Language is Poetry the Noblest & most artificiall Use of Language that hitherto has been made.

Poetry, we are taught by Aristotle, is an Art of Imitation as much as Sculpture & Painting or as Musick & Dancing were in his time. And the Materials which it uses he tells us are Words. Now in all the Arts the Materials upon which they work must be good, otherwise it is impossible the Workmanship can be perfect. For if the Marble or the Canvass & Colouring be not good of the kind, it is impossible that any Art of the Statuary or Painter can make a Statue or Picture perfectly good, and the better the Materials are the more excellent, ceteris paribus, will the performance be. As therefore the learned Languages & particularly the Greek are in my Judgement much more excellent than any Modern we know, it follows of necessary Consequence that Genius, Learning & Industry of the antient Poets no greater than Ours, and the Subjects they had to work upon no better, yet their Works must be Superior.

Such being the Case it seems not improper to begin this treatise upon Poetry, with an enquiry Whether or not I am right in Supposing that the Learned Languages exceed the Modern so much. And as I have endeavour'd thro' this whole Work to make a Science of Language it will now appear whether I have Succeeded. For if I have truely reduced it to a Science, I must
be able to shew most clearly, not only that One Language is more excellent than another but why it is so.

To take the Trouble to prove that the Greek or Latin are finer Languages than any Modern, would have been thought a hundred or 200 years ago a Labour most ridiculously Superfluous. But in this Age wonderfull Discoveries have been made, and among other that the English or French are better Languages than the Antient, or at least that they cannot be Said to be Barbarous, & as there are likewise who maintain that Arts Sciences & Philosophy are brought to the greatest perfection in this happy Age in which we live, So that in Order to be learn'd & Wise we have nothing more to do but to read what is every Day publishing in different parts of Europe, & particularly here at home, a Task indeed not easy but well rewarded by the Fruits it produces, the Consequence is that the antient Books ought to be laid aside as of no Value either for the Matter or Language, and then we shall be as happy as the Antients were who without the Trouble of learning Languages which consumes So much of our time. apply'd themselves directly to Arts & Sciences. These Notions begin now to be very prevalent. But as the professed Design of my Writings is to restore or preserve Antient Learning & Philosophy, I will endeavour to Shew that the Antients were as much Superior to us in Language as in Arts & Sciences, & that the Modern Languages are barbarous if want of Art can make any thing barbarous.
Of Poetry and the Preference of the Antient Languages to the Modern Read
Of the Nature of Poetry — It is an error to confound Poetry with Versification or Splendid Diction — It is from Aristotle that we are to learn what Poetry is & that there can be no Poetry without a Fable — What a Fable is — Difference betwixt it & an historicall Narrative — No¹ Story, such as it really happened, can make a good Subject of a Poeticall Piece — a real Story however makes a better Subject for such a Piece than a fictitious one ² [p. 2]

I come now to speak of the Stile of Poetry, but I will first Say Something of the Nature of Poetry itself, because I Observe that Severall & Men too who think themselves Scholars, confound Poetry³ with its Stile which is no more than the Dress of it. Whatever therefor, according to those Criticks, is written in Verse⁴, & especially if it be⁵ Ornamented with pompous Language, fine Descriptions & beautifull Imagery, is Poetry. And indeed it is very natural that One who is only a Scholar, & has not Studied the Antient Philosophy [p. 3] should fall into this Error. For my own part I confess that if⁶ that mutilated fragment of Aristotle upon Poetry had not come down to us, in which he has given us the Philosophy of Poetry & likewise of the other Fine Arts.⁷ & if I had not⁸ Studied it diligently I should not have known what Poetry is, tho' I might have admired the Beauties of it, as well as others, for it often happens that we feel the Effects of Art, without knowing exactly what the Art is, & indeed it is always the Case of those who have not made a Study of the Art. But Aristotle has taught me
that Poetry is an Art of Imitation as well as the other fine Arts, Such as Statuary and Painting, are at this day, & Such as Musick was among the Antients, if not among us, and the Subject of its imitation is a human Action, with its concomitant Circumstances of Characters, manners, & Sentiments. Every Poem therefore must of Necessity have for its Subject a Tale or Story, but not every Story, for otherwise there would be no difference betwixt History & Poetry, But it must be a Fable, that is a Story having beginning Mide & End, with Something that is principally in it, & parts Subordinate in Short it must be a Whole.

And here the Word Fable may be apt to lead the unlearned Reader into a Mistake, as if the Subject of Poetry must needs be what is commonly called a Fable, that is a fictitious Story, without any foundation in Truth & Reality. But this is far from being the Case. For the two best Epic Poems we have viz the Iliad & Odyssey are both founded on Fact, whatever Some modern Dreamers may imagine to the contrary, & all the antient Tragedys that have come down to us, are Storys of Men & Families, who, as Aristotle tells us, have done or Suffer'd terrible things. But if Homer & the Tragic Poets had related those Stories, just as they happened or as they had come down to them by Tradition, as they Say the Scriptor Cyclicus mention'd by Horace did, it would not have been Poetry but History tho' probably a very Fabulous History. The Reader will be convinced of this if he considers that no Events which have really happen'd in human Life, would make a good Tragedy or Comedy however Surprising or interesting they might be if they were to be exactly copied from the Life...
The reason of which is that they would not have that unity of Design, & tendency towards One End, which as I have Said, the Fable of a Poetick piece requires. At the same time I think the piece will be much the better if not only the Characters & manners but the facts & incidents are copied from real Life, for that will give a truth & nature to the piece which otherwise it would not have, & I am persuaded those Tragedies mentioned by Aristotle of which the Subjects were altogether fictitious were defective in that respect. (a) A Poem, as Horace Says, is true a Picture. Now a Judicious Painter will not choose a fictitious Subject if he can get a real that will Suit his purpose, & however possesst he may be of the Ideas of the Beauty of Figures to be learned from the Antique he will have real Figures standing to him in Order to give truth & Nature to his piece & it will be only the Arrangement & Disposition that he will leave to his own Genius & Fancy, with no doubt Some addition of the Ideal Beauty to each particular Figure. In like manner the Poet will arrange & compose the particular Events he takes from Nature in such a way as best Suits the principall

(a) It is clear I think that Horace preferrs the Tragedies of which the Subjects were really Stories. I will give the Lines which are commonly not well understood.

Difficile est proprae communia dicere; tuque
Rectius Iliacum carmen deducis in actus,
Quam si proferres ignota indictaque primus.
Design of the Piece, & will add to each of them Circumstances of Surprise & Wonder Such as make the Beauty of Poeticall Incidents. And thus it appears that the Ideall Beauty, however imaginary it may appear to Men of no Genius or Taste, is as real as the Arts of Painting & Poetry are. & it further appears that a Poet must be what the Name denotes a Maker not of Verses only or of Characters & Sentiments but of a Story which must be the Groundwork of the whole piece. (a)

(a). as I have given here the Doctrine of Aristotle upon the Subject of Poetry it is proper before I conclude this Chapter to correct a passage in his Poeticks which as it Stands in all the printed Editions, & I believe in the manuscripts is not intelligible.
Objections to this Definition of Poetry - It makes Virgill's Georgics, not to be a Poem - This Objection answered - Virgil has endeavoured to make a Poem of it, by introducing the story of Orpheus and Euridice - Virgil's Aeneid has not so much true History in it as the Iliad or Odyssey - And there is one most Absurd fiction in it - His Eclogues pretty little Poems. - Armstrong's Poem on Health is not a Poem according to this Definition any [p. 7] more than the Georgics - But the teaching of any Art, or Science by way of Dialogue may be a Poeticall composition - A Descriptive Poem, not Poetry so called - The difference betwixt History & Poetry further explained - This illustrated by a comparison betwixt Poetry & Painting - Poetry is a Creation, therefore the greatest Work of human Genius - A Poet should have real Life before him as well as a Painter - His Subject therefore should not be altogether feigned. [p. 7(1)]

What is feigned must be Natural and probable. Tho' many improbable things really happen, they must not be made Incidents in the Dramatic or Epick - An Ode not a Poem, unless it contain a Story like some Odes in Horace - Horace also a Poet, in some of his Dialogue Satires - Also in some of his Epistles, where he tells Stories - He the first of Roman Poets, having been educated at Athens - Pope a Poet only in his Rape of the Lock, and in his Dunciad - The later a Poem highly ridiculous - His Moral Philosophy in Verse no more a Poem than the Physiology of Empedocles - Shakespear no Poet in his Historical Tragedies, but a very great Poet in his Comedy of the Merry Wives of Windsor,
and wherever he has introduced Sir John Falstaff.  

I am sensible that many objections to this definition of poetry will occur to the reader. And in the first place he will say that according to it, one of the finest poems in the world Virgil's Georgics is no poem at all. And I say it is not, tho' it be in admirable verse & the style of it as richly ornamented as I think the style of any poem is or can be. For I hold that the precepts of any art, or the doctrine of any science, tho' deliver'd in verse or the finest language, is not a poem any more than the philosophy of Empedocles, tho' in verse & which is an example quoted by Aristotle to shew the difference betwixt poetry & verse. Virgil seems [p. 6] to have been sensible of this defect in his work, which perhaps may have been the reason of his introducing somewhat oddly I think & with very little connection with his subject the story of Orpheus & Eurydice. The Eneid of Virgil is undoubtedly an heroic poem, but much inferior to either of the other two, without near so much true history in it & with fiction much more incredible, such as the change of Eneas' ships into sea nymphs, a metamorphosis, more strange & more absurd than any in Ovid. As to his eclogues, they are undoubtedly poetical pieces, & some of them very pretty little dramas. They well deserve the epithet which Horace bestows upon them of Mollie atque Facetum. And it is the sweetness & elegance of the country not of the town, for they are abundantly rural. I except from the eclogues the Pollio tho' it be commonly number'd with them. It is a pretty piece of composition & highly
Ornamented, but in a manner not at all pastorall, & Virgill by making his Woods worthy of a Consull, has made no Woods at all of them. I mean he has gone entirely out of the Stile of the Country. [p. 9.]

There is a Didactic Work in English, written in excellent Verse & in Language as much & as well Ornamented as any in English, & which6 has this Advantage over the Georgics of Virgil, that there is more in it9 of the Art he professes to teach, than there is of Agriculture in the Georgics, yet is not it Poetry for the reason I have given. The reader I am persuaded will be at no loss to guess that the Work I mean is Armstrong's Art of Preserving Health.

But tho'10 the Precepts of any Art or the Doctrines of any Science laid down in a plain direct Manner, will not make Poetry, yet there may be teaching in a Poetical form. And there is a great deal of Valuable Philosophy taught in that way: For Dialogue, if it be not real Conversation, but 11 is a fable with Incidents, Characters and Manners, is Poetry, and I think very fine Poetry, if well composed. Of this kind are the Dialogues of Plato, And those Dialogues of Cicero and Lord Shaftesbury upon which I have commented so largely.6

If a treatise teaching any Art or Science in a plain direct manner12 tho' written in Verse, & with all the Ornaments of Poetical Diction, be not Poetry, much less is Verse merely descriptive, lett the Subjects be ever So fine & the Language Suitable. A Single Description may please as an Epigram pleases, but a Whole Work consisting of nothing but descriptions, like Thomson's Seasons, will be consider'd by every Judicious Critick,
as a Work not only wanting a proper Subject for Poetry, but as having no Subject at all, & fitt only to entertain the raw fancies of Children who can be pleased with the glitter of different things put together, but without Order or Method, or any thing like a System or a Whole. [p. 10.(1)]

But will not History in Verse if the Subject be well chosen, and the Stile properly ornamented, make a Poem? And I say not, for the same reason that a Portrait is not a Picture; And Why is not a Portrait a Picture? And I say it is because it is a mere Copy of Nature, and has not that ideal Beauty, which is essential to Painting and all the Works of Art. This Answer will be sufficient to satisfy the Connoisseurs in those Arts; but for the Satisfaction of those, who are not Connoisseurs, and cannot conceive Any Beauty beyond what is to be seen in Nature, I will explain this Matter a little further.

Poetry as well as Painting is the Imitation of some Action or Event. That this is the case of Poetry has been already shown. And the same is true of Painting these Arts differing only in the instrument of imitation. Now I say what may appear surprising to those who have not studied, as a Philosopher should do, those Arts, that no Action or event ever existed, that without any Change or Alteration would make a good picture or Poem. By this I [p. 10.(2)] would not be understood to mean that the Subject of either Picture or Poem must be wholly invented, But supposing the Subject taken from real Life I say that in Painting\textsuperscript{13} the Arrangement\textsuperscript{14} Attitudes\textsuperscript{15} & groupings of the Figures, in short the whole Composition, must be such as not to be seen in Nature, & besides the Figures themselves, must have
that beauty & grace of which the antient Artists had the idea, as is evident from their Statues but which are not to be Seen in Nature. And in the same Manner in Poetry, tho' the Story for the greater part may have really happened, yet the Incidents must be arranged and follow one another in an order different from that in which they really happen'd, and Circumstances must be added and others varied with new Personages and Characters introduced in such a manner as to make a new Story of the old, and to denominate the Artist a real Poet or Maker.

To make a good Story of this kind is the greatest Work of Genius & Shews more than any thing else the creative Power of the human Mind by which it makes out of its own Ideas as we suppose the Almighty to have created the World, things more beautifull than any that are to be seen in Nature.

But tho' it may appear a work of greater Genius to make a whole Story, I mean to invent it altogether, yet I hold it to be better to make a new Story of an old in the manner I have described, for as in Painting the Painter must have living Figures standing to him in order that his Piece may have truth and Nature in it as well as Ideal Beauty, so I think a Poem will be very much the better for having a foundation in fact. Nor do I think it is possible that there could have been so much truth and Nature in the Iliad and Odyssey, if the Subject of each of them had not been for the greater part facts that really happened. To explain this Matter of Ideal Beauty still further, it may be observed that there is one kind of Poetry in which the necessity of fiction is acknowledged by every body, I mean Comedy; for I believe there
never was a Comedy written in which if not the whole facts, at least the greater part of them were not feigned. But fiction of things in common Life which is so familiar to us is much easier than of high heroic Stories. And yet even of these as Aristotle tells us, Tragedies have been made which had no foundation in fact tho' none of them have come down to us. And there is of that kind one in English that I think the best we have, I mean the Douglas. But of a long work such as the Iliad or Oddysey, it is much more difficult, and I should think almost impossible, to make a good Piece, if it were all fiction without any foundation in truth or reality. [p. 10.(4)]

And here we may observe the difficulty of making a good fable or a Poeticall Piece; Tho' it must be as I have said beyond Nature, yet it must be also Natural; for all the Incidents must be probable, and such as may have happened tho' they never did happen. By which I would not be understood to mean that none of the Incidents must be such as never happened (for I am perswaded that there are in the Iliad and Odyssey many Incidents that did really happen). But what I say is that the Condensation or Composition of them such as is necessary to make that whole without which there can be no fable of any Value, never did exist, and I think I may add never can exist. But it is to be observed that tho' the Incidents may have actually happened, yet it may not be an Incident proper to make part of the fable; for there should be nothing in the fable that is not probable. Now many things happen in real Life that are not probable, so many that an Antient Philosopher quoted by Aristotle, says "it is probable that many improbable things may happen." But tho'
that may be true such Incidents are not proper either for the
Drama or the Epic. for example sudden deaths have not been uncommon
in the best Ages of the World, as we may see from Homer: And
there is nothing more common in the Age in which we live,
than Disease and sudden death: Now an Incident of that kind,
the' not at all improbable would not be admitted in a Poetical
fable: Because all the Incidents there must arise naturally
and probably out of the Subject: And it is not enough as
Aristotle has observed, that one thing should happen in order
after an other, but it must be produced by what goes before. 28

[p. 10.] But it will be Said is not an Ode Poetry & Poetry
of the highest kind. That it does not answer to my Description
of Poetry, Horace who has written himself Such fine Odes will
tell you in the beautiful Lines describing the Different
Subjects of the Ode.

Now Pieces of that kind containing Prayers, & Praises &
Thanksgivings or descriptions of gay & pleasurable things, ought
to be written in a Stile highly ornamented, and as in antient
times they were accompany'd with Musick, but not Musick like
cours in which the Poetry was lost, they must have given the
highest pleasure. But Still I say they are not Poetry unless
there be a Story in them, Such as there is in Some of Horace's
particularly that One where he describes the Rape of Europe.
by Jupiter, And there is One of his Odes, 5 and in the
Judgement of Scaliger 5 the best of them all, which is from
beginning to End Dramatick and is brought to a very agreeable & naturall Conclusion.

The Ode I mean is the Dialogue [p. 11.] betwixt Horace & Lydia, which ends in the reconcilement of the two Lovers.

But is Horace a Poet So much admired, a Poet only in an Ode or two? My answer is that he is much more a Poet in his Satires, particularly his Dialogue Satires, Some of which are as good pieces of Comedy as ever were written, Such as his Dialogue with Damasippus & his Conversation with Davus his Slave, both concluding very naturally & agreeably, particularly the first.

In these other parts of his Works, Horace has executed what is very difficult to be well done, better I think than any other Author. I mean Speaking of himself, and particularly in the two Dialects I have mention'd, he has rallied his own faults most agreeably.

What made Horace excell So much in Dialogue is the particular Study he appears to have made of the Writers of the old Comedy in Athens Such as Eupolis, Cratinus & Aristophanes, from whom as he tells us Lucilius took the Idea of his Satires, and also of Menander the great Author of the New Comedy, & likewise of Plato & the Socraticae Chartae. We need not therefore be Surprised to find So much Dialogue & Story telling even in his Epistles particularly in his Epistle to Maecenas [p. 12.] the Seventh of the first Book, where we have the Story of Philip the Lawyer & Volteius admirably well told, in the way of Dialogue.

As therefore Horace excelled So much in Dialogue, the finest of all writing when well Executed, & as he was the first who introduced Lyrick Poetry among the Romans, and gave them a taste
in their own Language of what Alcaeus, Archilochus & Sappho were, besides polishing & refining that new kind of Poetry of which Lucilius was the inventor, I mean Satire. He is in my Opinion the first of the Roman Poets. This he could not have been if he had not been bred in Athens, which declin'd as it was in Arts & Arms, gave to Rome not only its best Poet, but its finest Gentleman Pomponius Attius, and in much later times a General & an Emperor who Saved them for some time from the Barbarians. I mean Julian.

There is a late English Poet of great reputation. Mr. Pope, very few of whose Works will deserve the name of Poems according to my definition of Poetry, indeed I know none except two. viz. The rape of the Lock, & the Dunciad. The latter is I think the finest Poem of the ridiculous kind that ever was written. It is of that sort of Ridicule which exalts the lowest & even filthiest things by the highest pomp of Language & which I like better than that other kind which [p. 13] debases high Subjects by mean & vulgar Language, such as the Virgile travesti of Scarron in French & Cotton in English. The high Heroic Games of his Dunciad Heroes, are the finest thing of the kind that can be imagin'd, & tho' many People are of Opinion that he has not translated Homer well, No body can deny that he has parody'd Virgill incomparably well in the Dunciad (a) As to his Morall Philosophy, So much admired by Some men, it is no more a Poem than the Physiology of Empedocles mention'd by Aristotle which

(a) [No footnote.]
was [p. 14.] also written in Verse. But I believe was an
original Work of his, whereas Mr. Pope's Ethick Epistles were a
Translation from the Prose of my Lord Bolingbroke, which Old
Lord Bathurst told me he Saw.

There is another English Poet of high reputation, namely
Shakespear who is supposed by many to have written the best
Tragedies that ever were written. Some of these are confessedly
historically being parts of English History well known, and I
believe all of them are so. tho' their history be not so well
known. Now as I have already observed no history or facts that
have really happen'd, can by the nature of things make a good
Tragedy or indeed any thing deserving the name of a Tragedy, as
wanting a Fable which as Aristotle tells us is the Soul of a
Tragedy, the Incidents Characters manners passages the Incidents Characters manners passages being
no more than Appendages of the Fable growing out of it
In those Tragedies therefore as they are called of Shakespear
there may be & there are many Splendid Fables, or purple
Clouts but there cannot be a Piece. But he has written a
Comedy in which he is as much a Poet as any Man who ever wrote
Comedy. The Comedy I mean is the Merry Wives of
Windsor where you have a Subject entirely of the Author's
Invention, & the humours of Sir John Falstaff by themselves,
unmixed with Tragic Incidents so that we have not there as in
the first & Second parts of Harry the fourth, that most absurd
& ridiculous Composition called a Tragi-comedy. Yet even in So
Strange a Jumble of the grave & ridiculous, there are Incidents
contriv'd to Sett off the Character of Sir John, Such as the
Robbery at Gadshill, which Sir John calls The late Action, as if
he had been Speaking of the Battle of Blenheim or Ramillies, and Sir John's falling asleep behind the hanging, losing a Seall\textsuperscript{44} ring, of his Grandfather, and forgiving the Hostess whom he had Abused most grossly, which have Vis comica in them that never was equalled. For I perfectly agree with Lord Roscommon that Falstaff\textsuperscript{5} stands inimitable yet, \textsuperscript{k} And the very Imagination of such a Character with Such a Figure, Shews a Wonderfull Genius for Comedy, and his being able to invent\textsuperscript{45} Such a Fable as that of the Merry Wives of Windsor proves to me that he had the Idea of what a legitimate Piece was\textsuperscript{46}, & only [p. 16] wanted Learning & Knowledge of the Rules of Art which would have taught him that there could be neither Tragedy or Comedy of any Value without a Fable.

From what has been Said I think it is Evident that there can be no Poem truly deserving that name, but what\textsuperscript{47} has for its Subject a Story of the Epic Tragick or Comic kind, longer or Shorter with fewer or more Incidents, but alwaye an Unity of Design, which is Essentiall to all the Works of Art of every kind.

Cap. 3d.

Of the Stile of Poetry - This Stile commonly Verse - But that not necessary - Comedy may be in Prose - The modern Comedys in Prose better than those in Verse - Novells are Poetry, tho' not in Verse - Of Verse, and of the different kinds of it; and of the Mixture of Verse and Prose in some Modern Compositions - The Greek & Latin Verse formed by Rhythm -
Rhythm we perceive distinctly in Music, but not in Speech — We do not read even the Antient Verse according to the Rhythm, but according to our own way of Accenting — The rule for our reading this way not yet ascertained — Of the Variety in the Antient Verse — It is the Vowel that makes the Quantity of Syllables — The long Vowel better marked in the Antient Latin Orthography [p. 17.] than in the Greek — One long Syllable longer than another — The same Verse in Greek & Latin consists of different Numbers of Syllables — Of the several Stops or Breaks in the Greek and Latin Verse — These Varieties in that Verse, give a Beauty of which we cannot have an idea — For that reason the Romans were pleased with Verse, tho' without the Ornaments of Poetical Diction. Which is the case of the Satires & Epistles of Horace — Of the loss of the true Poetical Rhythm among the Greeks — What came in place of it — Tho' Rhythm be entirely lost among us, yet the Variety of Periods may be still preserved — But it is in a great Measure lost among us — We even cannot read a Period, as it should be read. 1 Advice to Schoolmasters in England, to be at pains to form the pronunciation of the Boys, and to teach them to pronounce Periods — the Quantity of Syllables in Greek & Latin may be learned by Boys by mere imitation of their Masters without making a formal Study of it. 2 Boys ought not to be prescribed making Verses as a Task or if they are to make them it should not be Epigrams. 3

Having thus described the Body of Poetry, I proceed now to inquire concerning its Dress. The most Obvious distinction
betwixt the Stile of Poetry & other Stiles in Verse. But Verse is by no means Essentiall to Poetry, & we have One kind of Poetry, which among us is now always written in Prose. I mean Comedy. It is true indeed Horace has Started a Doubt whether Comedy be \[p. 16.\] a legitimate Poem. \textit{Quis a cer Spiritus ad Vis. nec Verbis nec Rebus inest.}\ Yet as it is the Imitation of an Action, tho' not an heroic Action, but a Subject of common Life, and has that unity of Design which is Essentiall to every Poeticall Piece, & indeed to every Work of Art, I think we cannot refuse it the name of a Poem. Among the Antients Comedy was in Verse, as well as Tragedy, The Greek Comedy in Several kinds of Verse, the Latin but in One, & that coming very near to Prose & our Shakespear has written Some Comedies Such as the Two Gentlemen of Verona, & Ben Johnston has written more in a kind of Prosaic Verse. But as Prose is the naturall Language of Men in common Life, I like Comedys in prose much better than those in any kind of Verse, and I therefore preferr the Prose Comedys of Moliere very much to those that are Rymed, & I Observed when I attended the French Theatre in Paris, that the Players were at pains to conceal the Rhyme in Speaking as much as possible.

There is a kind of Writing which has come much into Fashion of late \[p. 17\] I mean Novell writing which has the Same relation to the Epic, that Comedy has to Tragedy. For it is a Narrative the Subject of which is Actions of common Life. Now this I hold to be a Legitimate Poem as well as Comedy & written in Prose with as much Propriety as Comedy. Of this kind there is an excellent Work in English namely Tom Jones of which I have said a good deal else where. But Tragedys or heroic Poems in Prose Such as the
Telemaque of Pension I do not approve of, because the Language of Such Pieces, ought to be much above the Language of Prose. Now Poetic Language without Verse does not please me. As therefor Verse appears to be the Language of the higher kinds of Poetry, it belongs to my Subject to treat of it.

(Notandum) Take in here what is said upon the Origin of Music & Poetry in what I have written of Rhyming Poetry in English p. 3d. 5

That Language was more antient than Versification of any kind is evident; And I believe that Music (by which I mean Musickall tones of the Voice expressive of wants & Desires) 6 was more antient than Language; 7 it being undoubtedly more natural for men to utter musical Sounds than to Articulate; And as I suppose Language to have begun in the Southern and Eastern parts of the World, where we know that the People are naturally more musical than those of the Northern Regions, I cannot have a doubt but that the first Languages were very musical. for if we suppose that Men existed and had intercourse together before they spoke, they must have communicated their wants and desires by inarticulate Cries and these of different tones and different Lengths, as we see the Brutes communicate their wants and desires to one another 8 & as Men is by nature a more musical Animal than any of the Beasts at least that we know, I have no Doubt that his Naturall Language was more musical than that of any Beast. Now after they had invented Articulation. I think it is highly probable, & indeed certain that they would not give up entirely their naturall Language, but would continue to give
various tones & Rhythms to their Words as they had before done to their inarticulate Cries; And hence it is that The Greek and Latin, which we are sure are very Antient Languages, and are Dialects of still more Antient, have both Melody and Rhythm.

[MP 232]

The Artifice of Verse does not appear to be very Antient among Men, very much later than Language & later even than Musick. For the Indians of North America have had Musick past all Memory, but they have not yet got Verse; tho' as Lafaiteau tells us when they sing their Songs they are in use to Shorten their Words [p. 20] in order to adjust them to the Musick. This Shews pretty evidently that Musick is not only the more antient Art but that it has given Birth to Verse. For as in Antient times there never was Musick without Words, which is the case in Italy at this Day; it was most natural that Some way should be contrived of arranging the Words So, that they might correspond with the Musick. In the antient times of Greece when the Musick was very Simple, I have little Doubt, that both the Melody & Rhythm of the Musick corresponded with the Melody & Rhythm of the Language. But in later times, when the Musick became very artificiall, it did Violence both to the Melody & Rhythm of the Language as the Halicarnassian informs us. But in their Poetry the Rhythm of the Language was carefully preserved, & it was only by it that their Verse was made down to very late times when the στυμον Πολυκολ came in fashion, a Sort of Verse in which Quantity was altogether neglected. [p. 20(1)]
Before I begin to explain the different kinds of Verse, it is proper to observe a general distinction betwixt Verse of all kinds and Prose, which is this, that in all verse there is a certain regularity and Uniformity, whether in Rhythm that is short and long Syllables as in Greek and Latin, or in the Number of Syllables, or in the accenting of the Syllables (I mean Accents such as we have in English) or in the Similarity of like endings, commonly called Rhyme; or lastly in any kind of Jingle of the Syllables in the beginning or middle of the Verse, such as was used in the Antient Poetry of the Northern Nations of Europe, of which I shall say something in the sequel. Wherever there is not some Similarity or Uniformity of one or other of these kinds there is no Verse. And wherever Prose partakes more or less of such Similarities it is more or less Verse. Thus if in the Antient Languages there is a Rhythm of the same kind continued for any time, or if several Periods or Members of Periods have the like endings; or if there be a likeness in the Structure of the Language and the Composition; if for example there be many Antitheses, and those figures be used by which like is referred to like, and Contrary to [p. 20(2)] Contrary, then is the Stile something betwixt Verse and Prose, and such a Stile as I do not approve of. (a) [p. 21]

(a) There is a passage in the Burgois Gentilhome of Moliere, where the Burgois desires his Master of Language to write a Letter for him to his Mistress. The Master asks him whether he would have it in Verse or Prose, to which he answers that it
The Greek & Latin Verse was form'd entirely by the Rhythm of short & long Syllables, without any Regard to the Tones of the Syllables, which made the Melody of their Language, & tho' a Beauty in their Composition, made no part of their Versification. Of Rhythm in Generall I have Spoken largely elsewhere & have Shewn that it is perceived by three Senses, Our Eyes, our Ears, & our Touch. The Rhythm of the Motion of our Bodies we perceive by our Eyes particularly in Dancing (where we distinguish readily the grave & Slow Steps from the Quick, tho' we certainly have not So accurate a Perception of it, nor are So much entertain'd by it as the Antients among whom it was form'd into an Art of Imitation as much as Poetry & Musick, expressive of Characters Sentiments & Passions. By our Ears we have a distinct perception of Rhythm in Musick, as indeed without Rhythm we cannot conceive Musick, & it is by Rhythm chiefly that we [p. 22] distinguish the different kinds of Musick from one another, but the Rhythm of Speech or Articulate Sound we do not So readily perceive, nor are our Ears form'd to it, having nothing of the kind in our own Language. And hence it is that we certainly do not read the antient Verse as the Antients did not marking by our pronunciation must be neither; but the Master tells him that it must be one or other. Now I think the Master is mistaken; For there are several Stiles now written and these very fashionable Stiles so loaded with Epithets and Antitheses and of such Uniformity in the whole structure and Composition of the Language that they are truely neither Verse nor Prose, but a heterogenous mixture of both.
as they did the difference betwixt long & Short Syllables, & the
ratio they had to one another \(^{17}\) but distinguishing the long \(^{18}\)
from the Short, by what we call Accent, that is by making it
louder not longer. Now as I have Shewn that the Antients had \(^{19}\)
nothing like our Accents, that alone must have made their
pronunciation of their Verse perfectly different from Ours.
But besides we do not mark even in that way all the long Syllables,
but only, as I have Shewn, when they happened to be the
Antepenult Syllable of a Word. See upon this Subject p. 5 Of the
Structure of Greek Verse \(^{20}\) All this NOTwithstanding we give
a certain Ictus to the Syllables of the Verse, at different
Intervals, which makes it sound agreeable* to our Ears, tho'
it must be a pleasure very different from that which it gave
to the antient Ears. By what Rule this Ictus is given, has not
yet been determin'd, \(^{21}\) tho' I \(^{22}\) imagine it may be determin'd,
but it would be found to be a System of prosody very different
from what we learn at School. [p. 23]

But tho' we have not the practise of the antient Rhythms,
we know the Theory of them, & by that means discover a Wonderfull
Artifice & Beauty in the Composition of their Verse. \(^{23}\) For
besides the Order \(^{24}\) regularity which all Composition in Verse
has above Prose, there is a Variety in it Such as is not to be
found in any Modern Verse, & without Variety, as I have \(^{25}\) taken
Occasion frequently to Observe, there can be no Beauty in any Work
of Art. This Variety may be first observed in the Single
Syllables, a combination of which makes what we call Metrical
feet. Now as it is by the Vowel that a Syllable is Sounded,
So it is by its Vowell that it is made Short or long.
Quantity therefore belongs originally to Vowels which accordingly in the learned languages are divided into long & short; & as there is Science in every thing belonging to those Languages the ratio of the long to the Short was determin'd to be as 2 to 1. \[p. 23(1)\]

This ratio was well expressed by the way the Antient Romans noted it, that is by Doubling the Vowel thus a long a the mark'd by doubling the Character & wrote it as they pronounced it \(\text{aa}\), which I think is better than the Greek method of inventing a new Character for the long Vowel \(\text{\textsuperscript{26}}\) even if they had compleated the Invention by making a new Character for every long Vowel. for the Roman Method tho' it lengthens the Writing a little expresses better the nature of the long Vowel & the Difference betwixt it & the Short. But a Short Vowel may be made long & a long Vowel longer by \(\text{\textsuperscript{27}}\) what they call Position, that is by the Addition of Consonants to it. Any one Consonant added to a Vowel will make it Somewhat longer, but two or more will make a Short Vowel long, and a long much longer. But the Antients had So delicate an Ear & pronounced So accurately, that they distinguish'd whether the Vowel was long only by Position or by \(\text{\textsuperscript{23(2)}}\) its own Nature. The Consonants prefix'd too as well as postpon'd made Some Difference as to the length or Shortness of the Syllable, as the Halicarnassian has Observed, \(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) but which was not attended to in the Metrical Art. But the Nature of the Consonants Added or prefix'd to the Vowel, made a very great difference in the Sound of the Syllable, for Some of the Consonants being like L & the other liquids, of a Soft & pleasant Sound made the Syllable glide Sweetly thro' the Ear, whereas the Mutes, especially when they were aspirated, & more Still when two aspirates were joined
together, made the Word exceedingly harsh & unpleasant, & was very expressive of any Sound of that kind as in the famous Line of Homer

ταύρων τε και τετέρανηθεν διωνυσίου τε οἰενός

and so much for the Syllables in their Verse

Of Syllables their feet are composed, & as they consist of several Syllables even to the number of [?] & these of unequal lengths, this must make a wonderfull variety in their Verse particularly in [p. 23(3)] their lyric poetry, where not only in the same stanza but in the same Verse you have different feet of different lengths [p. (23)] which makes such a variety in the compositions of some of their lyric poets particularly Pindar that he seems to have follow'd no rule which has made Horace say of him Numerique furtur Lege Solutis. But even in their Heroic Verse where the feet are all of equal length, by the variety of Dactyle & Spondees only they make very various Verse. For tho' these feet are of equal length yet their Composition being different the one consisting of three Syllables, the other only of two, an Hexameter Verse in Greek or Latin may be so composed as to have thirteene or seventeen Syllables or any number betwixt these two, (a) whereas all our modern Verse of the same kind must consist of the same number of Syllables. [p. 24]

But in the antient Verse there was not only the variety of short & long Syllables, & of some long Syllables longer & some short Syllables shorter than others (for by the addition or

(a) See p. 10. Ibid.
taking away of a Consonant at the End of a Short Syllable, you make the Syllable longer or Shorter than it was before tho' Still a Short Syllable). Also the Variety of Feet of Different times, & likewise of a Foot of the same time according to the Division of it into its component parts, But there was a Still greater Variety in it produced by different Stops & Pauses which the Nature of the Verse made necessary, & without which in a greater [p. 25] or less Degree, No Verse of any kind can have any Beauty. For if it were to go on in a constant flow, without Stop or pause or any Division into parts, there could be no Number or Measure in it. Now in the Antient Verse as well as in every other, and indeed in all Speech, there must be a division into Syllables, the minutest of any, yet it must necessarily produce some Stop, as some time however short is required in changing the configuration of the Organs of Speech in passing from one Syllable to another.

2c There is the Division into Words, common also to all Speech, which the Sense as well as the Sound makes necessary, & therefore is more perceptible from the former (a). 3o Besides these two

(a) In a Language Such as ours there may be a Verse all of Monosyllables So that there will be as many Words as Syllables & the two Divisions will be the same. There is a Verse [p. 26] of Milton where there is but one Dissyllable Him first, him last, him midst & without End

There are no Such Verses in Greek or Latin nor indeed do I think them pretty as there are too many Stops or breaks in them & of such a kind as to make the Composition quite gaping at the
Stops there is a third which is peculiar to the antient Verse, but has not been observed by the Moderns, because we do not perceive any more than the Rhythme of the antient Metrical feet.

The Stop I mean is betwixt those feet, which the learned & delicate Ears of the Antients must have perceived, otherwise they could not have perceived the distinction betwixt the feet, nor consequently the Rhythme of them.

The fourth & last Stop or break in the antient Verse is what is called the Caesura. In all the modern Verse of any length, there is likewise a Caesura but of kind quite different from the Antient. [p. 28.]

Besides these four Stops, there may be Stops which the Sense requires in the beginning or midle of any Verse, & the Lines may be run into One another by the continuation of the Sense from the One to the other, for as the Halicarnassian has observed, Poetry admits of the Variety of Composition in Periods & Members of Periods that Prose does.

Such being the Case I think we may pronounce without hazard of being mistaken, that the Antient Verse, as read by the Antients, having all the Beauty of Prose, & many more peculiar to itself, was the most various & at the same time the most beautifull Composition we can imagine, & indeed more beautifull than we can imagine, which I believe is the Case of more than One of the antient Arts.

same time I think this Verse of Milton not improper for expressing what he intended.
But setting aside all the other Beauties of the antient Poetic Composition, the very Rhythm of their Verse gave them I am persuas'd very great pleasure And it was no doubt a pleasure of the Rational kind, for it arose from Numbers, Ratios and Proportions, which make Beauty of every kind; and without which nothing can please the intellectual Mind. It was I am persuas'd for the sake of this pleasure for no other, that Horace composed his Satires & Epistles in Verse, in which Acer Spiritus ac Vis. nec Verbis nec Rebus inest. Where there is nothing of the Mens divinior et Os magna Sonaturum, & as he says himself, Si prius Ordine Verbum posterias facias Est Sermo purius. And indeed I must confess that tho' I very much admire his Satires & Epistles yet to my Ear, the Numbers of them give little or no Pleasure, and the Sense & Pleasantry of them would have entertain'd & instructed me as much if they had been in plain Prose. But I am persuas'd the Romans Valued them much more on that account, otherwise I do not think that Horace would have been at the trouble to have versify'd them.

But this Rhythm of Antient Verse so beautifull and so various, was in later times lost both among the Latins and among the Greeks. The Progress of its decline among the Latins we cannot so well trace, but among the Greeks we know there was under the Emperors of Constantinople introduced a kind of Versification by Verses which they called Στυχοί πολήκωδοι, which were very little better than our blank Verse. They were long verses consisting of fifteen Syllables, & we have many of them that have come down particularly the Chilias of Tzetzes who
lived in the 12th Century (a) [p. 29(2)] The measure was a kind of Trochaic, and was formed not by long and short Syllables, but like our Trochaics by accented and unaccented Syllables with little or no regard to the quantity, as Tzetzius has Observed in those Verses, where he laments the Ignorance and barbarity of the Age in not only tolerating but approving of such Versification. (b) This I think could not have happened till the Antient pronunciation of the Language was in a great measure lost, as it is now intirely among the Modern Greeks, whose Poetry must of necessity be of the same kind with ours, as their Language is pronounced in the same way.

Thus the Rhythm of antient Poetry was lost. And I doubt irrecoverably lost. But the Rhythm of their Prose by Composition in Periods may still be preserved. And it is a Rhythm, which our Ears perceive and which fills them most agreeably. This kind of Composition however, [p. (29)]

(a) Eustathius ad Lib. 1. Iliad. p. 11, tells us that they consisted Sometimes of 17. Syllables or perhaps more, but then he says the Supernumerary Syllables were Simple Vowels which they Slurred over in the pronounciation but if they had consonants join'd with them, so that they could not be passed over in that way they were Said to be πολυπόδες & were laugh'd at.

(b). See Du Cange's Glossary Graec. under the Word πολυπόδες. Here take in Tzetze's Verses - [Space left for 13 lines of Greek quotation]

He was Obliged however to comply with the barbarous taste he condemns So much & has written a great many of thse Verses himself. tho' he has Shewn that he could write much better.
both in Writing & Speaking was quite out of Fashion among us, till the Example of one great Speaker in Parliament has begun to revive it at least to give men an Idea of what it is which was well nigh lost. For I Observe that very few can read a period, So as to give it a proper rounding & circumbutation, & make a Whole of it, having a beginning Middle & End, by which means as I have Observed elsewhere, the Sense at the Conclusion of the Period is brought out upon the hearer more fully & Strongly, than if it had been fritter'd down in Short Sentences. But on the Contrary if ill pronounced it will be hardly intelligible, & indeed if the neglect of Studying this kind of Composition goes on much longer, it will be hardly intelligible, tho' ever So well pronounced, because we shall lose that faculty of Comprehension which is necessary for taking in & understanding a period of any length.

And here I will presume to give an Advice to the Masters of the great Schools of England, for which I think they ought to thank me tho' I believe that will not be the Case. Instead of making their Scholars read & repeat & even write So much Latin Verse, they should teach them to read well Speeches in the Greek and Latin Authors composed as all Speeches ought to be in Periods, then get them by heart, & repeat them with all the graces of Action & Elocution. In this way both their Memorys will be exercised, & their pronunciation form'd, And in this way & this Way only they will acquire an Ear & a taste for composition in Periods, & will naturally & almost without Study fall into that Method of Speaking when they come to Speak in Publick. By teaching therefore in this way they will do great Service to
the Publick, in a Country where Publick Speaking is so much practised, & of Such use, nor should they despise a Task which among the Romans was perform'd by Men of Genius even Poets. Os pueri tenerum balbumque Poeta figurat. It was in this way, as I said before, that the Duke of Wharton became so great a Speaker, & in the same way the greatest Speaker of this Age was form'd. As to the making of Greek or Latin Verses, it ought never to be enjoin'd as a Task, for if the Boy's Genius lies that way, the Reading of the Greek & Latin poets will naturally dispose him to try to imitate them; & if he has not the Genius, it will be time lost to attempt to make a Poet of him. It is true that a Boy by the practice of making Verses, becomes very accurate in the Quantity of Greek & Latin Syllables, but this may be acquired by imitation & habit merely & if he hears the Master or the other Scholars read properly, & is made to read or repeat So himself, he will learn the pronunciation of the learned Languages just as he learns the pronunciation of his own without making a formall Study of it.

And Secondly I think it is unnecessary that Boys should be obliged to make a Study of that whereof there is neither Art nor Science, and of which after they have learned it, they cannot make the proper use, as I think I have very clearly Shewn. But if they are to write Verses lett it not be Epigrammas, for that naturally gives them a taste for a Quaint epigrammaticall Stile which is not pleasant in Conversation, & is entirely unfitt for Writing or Speaking in Publick upon any Serious Subject. Lett them not therefore employ that time in Seeking for quaint Conceits, Points, & turns of Wit, which they
ought to employ in the Study of Science & good Learning. And so much for Versification in the learned Languages.

Of Rhyme - A Barbarous Ornament of Poetry - It can please only Children or Barbarians, who have no idea of true Rhythm - The Greeks when they lost the Rhythm of their Language, did not substitute Rhyme in place of it - That the invention of the Arabians - was not practiced by our Gothic Ancestors till later times - In what the Art of the Gothic Poetry consisted - Rhyme made use of sometimes as an Ornament of Poetry; but it must be sparingly used - fit for Odes, Songs or Copies of Verses - but improper for long works, such as an Heroic Poem or a System of Morals - Of the Greivous burden of Rhyming particularly in the Italian Poems - The Taste of Rhyming came to Britain from Italy - And the English added to it the practice of Heuristic Rhyming - They practiced also in England something like Rhyming in their prose. - Milton condescended to write Sonnets after the Italian Manner - Not so successfull in this, but very successfull in his imitation of the Italian Opera in his Comus - The Octavo Rimo And the Sonata Verse still practiced in his Italy - Tis in such Verse, that their Improvisoris pour forth their extemporary Poems. - Of the French Verse - Their long Verse most tediously uniform - This not much mended by their masculine & feminine Rhymes - Their short Verses with alternate Rhymes are their best Poetry - In this Fontaine
His Poetry also adorned with a Mixture of old Words.

[p. 34(1)] I come now to speak of Modern Versification, the Chief Ornament of which is commonly thought to be Rhyme. How inferior the pleasure given by the Jingling of like endings must be to that pleasure which true Rhythm, Numbers and measures, and the perception of the Ratios of long and short Syllables to one another give to a learned Ear, is too obvious to be enlarged upon. The one [p. 34(2)] is the pleasure of Children or Barbarians who are advanced no farther in their taste of Music and Poetry than to be delighted with the Jingling and beating. The other is the pleasure of Men who can perceive what constitutes the Beauty of all Arts and particularly is the chief Beauty of the Art of Music I mean Rhythm; Nor indeed can there be any Beauty of any kind without harmony or proportion of one kind or another.

It is evident therefore that Rhyme must have been invented by a Nation who either spoke a Language having no Rhythm like the French Language, or if it had who had Ears so unmusical as not to perceive it or make use of it. It was therefore necessary that among them something should be contrived to supply the want of Rhythm by which only true Metre can be made, tho' I think a Nation would have done much better to have stopt short as the Indian of North America did, and carried the invention of Poetry no farther, than the shortening or Lengthening their Words to adapt them to their Music. The Greeks after they had lost the Rhythm of their Language, were not so barbarous as to Substitute Rhyme in place of it, but made
their Verse as I have Observed,\textsuperscript{a} by what we call Accent instead of Long and Short Syllables as we make our blank Verse.

Rhyme is said to have been an invention of the Arabians and by them brought into Europe. One thing seems to be certain that it was not the invention of our Northern Ancestors the Goths; for Olaus Wormius in his\textsuperscript{10} most Curious Treatise entitled Literatura Runica\textsuperscript{b} where he explains the many different ways in which the Goths made their Verse, has told us that Rhyme which he says is the whole Artifice of their Modern Verse was no part of the Artifice of their Antient. (a). They had, he says, no less than 36. kinds of Verse of which he has thought sufficient to explain only one, the Art of which he says consisted first in an equal Number of Syllables in the Lines: 2dly in what may be called Alliteration, or the use of the same Letters in the same or different Lines: or Lastly in the Jingle of the same or like Syllables in the same Line. This our Author explains at considerable Length\textsuperscript{11} in p. 167 & 168. of the above quoted work. See also what Bartholinus in his Danish Antiquities Says of the Gothic Poetry Lib. 1. Cap. 10.\textsuperscript{c} of which he gives many Specimens from which it appears that their Verses were Short without Rhime, & very often beginning or concluding with the same Line. \textit{e.g.} the Song of One of their Kings concludes all its Stanzas with. But a Russian Girl despises me.\textsuperscript{12}

By what I have here said of Rhyme, I would not have it understood that the use of it is always blameable, but on the

(a.) Appendix Literat. Runicae p. 165.
Contrary, as the Language of Poetry admits & even requires a great Variety, and a Style very different from the common, it may be used as an Ornament of the Verse; And accordingly it is so used by Homer in sundry passages, where he has a mind to make his Versification very sweet and flowing (a): And accordingly it is acknowledged by the Antient Masters of the Critical Art to be one of the Ornaments of Homer's Versification, but like other Ornaments of Stile, such as Antithesis, Parisosis and the Like, it must be temperately and Moderately used, otherwise it becomes highly disgusting and Offensive to Men of Good taste. To Suppose therefore, that Rhyme is essential to Poetry, and to be pleased with the constant Chime of like endings, shows a very bad taste, no better than that of children, who delight in rattling and jingling, instead of Rhythm, Numbers and musical Modulation. At the same time I admit that in a Language such as ours, wanting entirely the Rhythm of the Antient Languages, Rhyme may not only be permitted but is really an Ornament for want of better in small pieces, or Copies of Verses, as they are called, such as Odes or Songs, or any thing made to be sung or danced to; Who can deny that the fine song, for example, in the Comus,

"By dimpled brook & fountain brim," is the better for being Rhymed, or the fine Anacreontic Poetry, as good, I think as any that ever was written, such as,

"Come and trip it as you go,

"On the light fantastic toe," &c.

(a) [No footnote.]
is the better for being Rhymed? But what, I say is, that a long
heroic Poem, such as Pope's translation of Homer, a whole Tragedy
such as some of Dryden's and all the French, cannot be approved of by
any Man of taste, and less still a whole System of Moral
Philosophy, such as Pope's Essay on Man all in Rhyme.

I should disapprove very highly of the Constant use of
Rhyme in long works if it were more easy than it is. But to
Rhyme well is certainly very difficult, and it is a greavous
Bondage to which Poets are subjected, when instead of Studying the
Sense and Sentiments, and [p. 39] proper Ornaments of diction,
they are obliged to beat for Rhymes, not Duets, I mean the
common Rhymes of two Syllables, but Triplets sometimes, and even
Quadruplets. To this bondage the Italian Rhyming Poetry is
subjected, for their Octavo Rimo, in which they write long
narrative Poems such as the Jerusalem of Tasso consists of two
triple Rhymes and one ordinary Rhyme of two Syllables: And
their Sonata which is composed of 14 Lines in the first eight, there
are only two Rhymes, so that there are two Quadruplets, and the
six remaining there are two Triplets, so that there are here likewise but two Rhymes And all these Rhymes so many in Number,
and disposed in a certain order which is invariable must be
double Rhymes, that is not a Rhyme of one Syllable with another
which is our Common Rhyme but of two Syllables, such as *era,
spera, erra guerra, viso, diviso, viso, paradiso.*

After the Revival of learning, and when English [p. 40] Poetry began to take a regular form, we followed the Italian
fashion of versifying, Italy being then the country in Europe,
which was the Standard of Wit and Learning; Accordingly Spenser
wrote his *Fairy Queen* with as great a Variety of Rhymes as is
to be found in the Italian Poetry; for in his Stanza there are
the Quadruplate and Triplate\(^\text{24}\) Rhymes of the Sonnet, and also
the common Rhyme or Rhyme of two Syllables of the *Octavo Rimo*,
which made the Addition of a Line to the *Octavo rimo* necessary,
and this line, which is an Alexandrine, is in my Opinion, a
very great improvement both upon the Italian Sonato, and the
Octavo Rimo. (a)

(a) The English appear to have been so fond of Rhyme in the
reign of Harry the 8th. and Queen Elizabeth, that they invented
a kind of Rhyme, unknown\(^\text{25}\), I believe to the Italians a Rhyme of
Hemistichs, not now and then occasionally as we see them in
Homer, but constantly and Uniformly as much as any other Rhyme.
Of this kind we have verses made by no less a Man than the great
Chancellor More, which Warton has given us in his History of
English Poetry vol. 3, p. 97.\(^f\) They are composed in Stanzas
of four Lines. The Second and the fourth Rhyme\(^{26}\) to one [p. 41]
another in the ordinary way. The first and the third are longer
Lines, of which the Hemistichs Rhyme. There is another copy
of Verses, which he has given us p. 300 of the same volume
written by Thomas Tusser who died in 1580, where there is still
more jingle; And indeed I think it may be compared to the ringing
of a peal of Bells. There are there\(^{27}\) six verses, whose
Hemistichs all Rhyme to one another. The first three have subjoined
to them a very Short verse of four Syllables; And the last three
conclude with a Line of the same Length, rhyming to the first
To such a Slavery of Rhyming did Spenser in imitation of the Italians submit and not in a Short work but in a very long one, for his Fairy Queen consists of Six Books with 12 Cantos in each, and a Seventh Book of two Cantos. And each Canto containing from 40. to fourscore Stanzas.\textsuperscript{28} Even the free Spirit and elevated Genius of Milton, who understood and has practiced so well the Rhythm \textsuperscript{[p. 41]} of the Antient Poetry, stooped, such is the prevalence of fashion to write in English Italian Sonata Verse. That he should not have succeeded in this kind of Poetry, fettered and enslaved as he was by the Multiplicity of Rhymes,\textsuperscript{29} is not to be wondered: tho' I do not condemn them all by the Lump, as some Critics do, but think some of them good, such as that upon his blindness; tho'\textsuperscript{30} in my Opinion it would have been better, if there had been no Rhyme at all in it. But if he has not been so fortunate in imitating this kind of Italian Poetry, he has imitated with wonderfull success the Italian Opera in his Comus\textsuperscript{31}; For \textsuperscript{[p. 42]} he has there mixed most agreeably Blank Verse and Rhyme, \textsuperscript{[p. 44]}\textsuperscript{32} & has introduced the finest Songs that ever were composed, \textit{ipse Molities} as his Friend Sir Henry Wotton\textsuperscript{35} says, & he has short Line. And not only did they affect this similarity of like endings in their Lines of Poetry, but in their Prose as well as in their Poetry, they Studied a similarity of Letters in the beginning of their words. Of this Alliteration \textsuperscript{[p. 42]} he has given us an Example p. 344. of the same volume.
Dancing besides, not by way of Interlude & betwixt the Acts but as part of the Piece. And with the finest Anacreontick Poetry in English, he has contrived to mix likewise as a part of the Piece, the most Sublime Philosophy. In short he has made of it the finest Dramatic Poem that I believe ever was Exhibited upon any Modern Stage (a). The octavo Rimo & the Sonato are Still the fashionable Poetry in Italy, & it is in the Octavo Rimo that the improvisatoris & improvatrices utter their extempore Rhapsodys, which look liker to that Poeticall inspiration of which the Antient talk so much or to the Enthusiasme of the Sybil or Priestess of the Delphic God. Afflata est numine quando jam propiore Dei, than any thing else in modern times. And So favour'd Still is this Country by the Muses above any other, that only in Italy Such inspired poets are to be found. And [p. 45] So much for the Italian Versification, 

As to the French Verse it must necessarily be rimed, as they have neither Quantity nor Accent (I mean Accent in our sense of the word) for otherwise their Verse would be nothing but a Composition of a certain Number of Syllables, ten or twelve for example. Their long Verse or heroic as they call it consists exactly of 12 Syllables, divided into two Hemistiches each of Six Syllables, & betwixt the two there is a Stop whether

(a) See what I have said in praise of this Author. vol. 3. p. 68. - and of this Piece in particular vol 1 of Ant. Metaph. p. [xliii]
the Sense require it or no, & no where else in the Line. This regular Caesura allways in the Middle of the Verse, makes this kind of French Versification, exceedingly tiresome & disgusting by its dull uniformity to an Ear accustom'd to the Variety of antient Composition. They have contrived a way peculiar to themselves, of varying a little the Chime at the end of their Disticks, by the Alternacy of Masculine & Feminine Rhymes. But it appears to me to add more to the Difficulty of the performance, than it Serves to relieve the Ear of the disgust occasioned by the constant clink, which appears to me not unlike to a stroke given by a hammer or any other Instrument at the end of so many Syllables pronounced, or to the Castanette which they use in certain Dances. The only French Verse therefor which pleases me is their Short Verse with the Rimes alternate which I think is an agreeable Variation & the French Poet who writes the best in that kind of Verse is in my opinion Fontaine in his tales and fables where he has most agreeably mixed the Old & the new Language, making what they call the Stile de Marot.

[p. 46(1)]

Chap. 5.

Of English Versification - Rhyme continues still to be much practiced in England - The two Rhyming Poets of greatest Reputation are Dryden & Pope - Comparison of these two - The best of all Rhyming Poems in English is Thomson's Castle of Indolence - The Words there as well Chosen as possible, tho'
the Poet was fettered by Triplet & Quadruplet Rhymes as well as by the common Distich - He writes a Marot Stile in English, which is very beautifull - His Stanza's are periods of Nine Lines in place of two, the Common length of a Sentence in Rhyming Poetry. - Of Blank Verse in English - not only our long Verse may be composed without Rhyme, but short Lyric verse - For Blank Verse Poetry, a variety of Accentuation is absolutely necessary - The Custom of drawing back the Accent to the Antepenult Syllable is very prejudicial to this kind of Poetry - [p. 46(2)]

Lord Surrey, the first who composed Blank Verse in English - Then Roger Ascham - After them Shakespear and Ben Johnson; And last of all Milton, the best Writer of that kind - The great excellency is his Composition of his Verse in Periods - This one of the great Beauties of the Antient Poets, particularly of Horace - The variety of the Stop in Milton's Verse, a great Beauty - Milton's Composition in his Speeches - More in periods still than his Narrative - Examples of this Composition in his Speeches - Compared in this Respect with Mr Pope - Rhyming Verse requires a Caesura in the Middle, and a Stop at the end - By Composition in Periods, the Defects of our Language can only be Supplied - Verse so composed must be properly read, otherwise it is not intelligible - The great difficulty of reading, is to mark the verse and yet to preserve the period - There must be some Stop at the end of the Verse; and for that reason it should terminate upon a word on which some Emphasis is to be laid - A remarkable Example of the neglect of this - The Antients in their Heroic Poetry observed the Rule of not concluding their Verses with insignificant Words or Monosyllables -
but not so much in their familiar Writings in Verse — Examples of this from Horace — No Beauty of Composition either in Verse or Prose without periods — Aristotle's Definition of a Period — Of Armstrong's Blank Verse in his Art of health — He composed likewise in Periods, and the Diction often more splendid than Milton's —[^2]

[^2]: [p. (46)]

I come now to Speak of English Verse. Rhyming has been long predominant in England as well as in other Nations of Europe, and we have many famous Rhyming Poets particularly Dryden & Pope. Of these two there are many that prefer the first, & I think it must be allow'd in his favour, that he has not the halt so often in the Middle of the Verse[^3] as Pope[^4] who has it almost constantly & thereby makes his Verse very near as Monotonous as the French. Besides there is not so much of Point & turn and Antithesis in Mr Dryden as in Pope, whose Versification in that & other respects has been very well imitated & I think ridiculed, tho' I believe that was not meant, by the Author of the Verses upon Tobacco.[^5] Dryden[^5] too makes his Verses run more into One another, whereas Pope generally concludes the Sense with the Verse, & allmost allways with the Distick. Now there can hardly be conceived a Composition more dully uniform; or more void of that Variety which is Essentiall to the Beauty of all Works of Art than a Composition consisting wholly of Sentences all of ten or at most twenty Syllables. This Sameness together with the great pains he has bestow'd in polishing his Lines, has given his Verse a kind of Sing Song air[^6] which he himself has very well ridiculed in those very fine Lines —
Then all your Muses\(^7\) [softer Art display, 
Let Carolina smooth the tuneful Lay, 
Lull with Amelia's liquid Name the Nine, 
And sweetly flow through all the Royal Line.]\(^b\)

But tho' the generall Stile & manner of Pope's Versification, 
cannot be \(p. 47^8\) approved of by a good Critick it must be 
allow'd to be perfect of its kind. His Sentiments too & Imagery 
are very fine, & there is a Splendor in his Diction which is 
hardly equalled by any other of our Poets. What I dislike the 
most of his Works is his Essay on Man. No good System of 
Philosophy could be expected from the Quarter from whence that 
Essay came,\(^9\) tho' there are no Doubt very Shining passages in it, 
but if the System were ever So good, I could not be reconciled\(^10\) 
to Arguments tagged with Rime, or a Series of Philosophicall 
Reasoning carried on in Metaphors Antitheses, Points & Turns\(^11\)

The best riming Poem in English of any Lenght, is, in my 
Judgement Thomson's Castle of Indolence,\(^12\) which is written in 
Spenser's Stanza verse where the reader, who is fond of Rhyme 
will find all the variety of it he could desire; And besides the 
ordinary Rhymes, he has there as I have observed both Triplets 
and Quadruplets And these either alternate or following one 
another immediately And he has\(^13\) imitated Spenser in adding 
to his Stanza, the Alexandrine Line of which in several 
Passages he has made excellent use.\(^14\)\(^15\) notwithstanding the 
extreme difficulty of the Versification where every Stanza 
consists not only of Common Distich Rhymes but of Triplets and 
Quadruplets\(^16\) neither the Sense nor propriety of Expression, 
where to be Sacrific'd to the Rhyme, & the Words appears any
Seem all to be so natural and well chosen, that for my own part
I do not know that I could change any one used by the Author for a
better. Then [p. 48\(^{17}\)] there is the greatest Simplicity, and at
the same time the greatest Elegance in the Language, with a
certain Rust of Antiquity which pleases me very much. For he
has like Fontaine before mention'd, made a kind of Marot Stile
in English, by mixing a great many old and now obsolete words with
the present Language. It is by such an Artifice as I shall shew
in a proper Place\(^{6}\) that Homer has adorn'd his Stile so much
and made it the most various and at the same time the most beautifull
Stile that was ever written. [p. 48(1)] He has availed himself
of the Advantage which the Stanza of Spencer\(^{18}\) has above all other
Rhyming Poetry that of admitting Composition in long sentences or
Periods sometimes of nine lines instead of sentences of ten or
twenty syllables. And those Periods rest\(^{19}\) on the finest base,\(^{20}\)
to speak in the Language of Antient Criticism (a) I mean the
Alexandrine Line. To quote examples of this from the Castle of
Indolence, would be to quote almost the whole Poem. I shall only
transcribe the fifth Stanza of the first Book, where he describes
the Situation of the Castle of Indolence, in these most
beautifull Lines

"Full in the passage of the Vale above,
A Sable, silent, solemn forrest stood,
Where nought but shadowy forms were seen to move
As idless fancied in her dreaming mood

(a) See p. 235. of this Vol.)\(^{21}\)
And up the hills on either side a wood
Of Blackening Pines, ay waving to & fro,
Sent forth a sleepy horror thro the blood
And where this Valey winded out below

The murmuring Main was heard and scarcely heard to flow.

[p. 48(2)] Here not to mention the Elegance of the Words, which are as well chosen as possible, the Lines are most beautifully and naturally Rhyming to one another; And the Sense carried on without any full Stop or pause, And at last concluded with the Alexandrine Line which wonderfully expresses the thing it is meant to describe. Such a composition as this cannot be in any other kind of Rhyming Verse [p. (48)] In Short Thomson’s Stile in the Castle of Indolence is perfectly different from the Stile of his Seasons, (& I think I could hardly praise it more) which I imagine is owing to his travels in Italy, & his Studying there the antient monuments of Art, & from them forming a taste for that Noble Simplicity which is the perfection of the Writing Art, as well as of every other.

But the English Language is not like the French, incapable of Verse, except in Rhime [p. 49.] for it has Accents by which not only Heroic Verse may be composed without Rime, but every kind of Shorter Verse, as is Evident from the Nature of the thing & the Examples I have given. I would therefore have Lyrick Poetry of that kind attempted which from what Mr West has done in the Translation of Iphigenia I am persuaded would Succeed. Only I would have the English consider that if they have a mind to promote that kind of Poetry, they must take care to preserve the Variety of their Accents & not throw them back So far as
the Antepenult Syllable of the word or sometimes even the first of four Syllables, as in the word interested, which is commonly so pronounced as to be unfitt for any kind of Verse. And if we pronounce Horison accented upon the first Syllable as I have heard some people do. Milton could not have written - The Horison round - Investing with bright Rays. [KW] [p. 50]

In short if the English would have their language fit for this kind of versification, they must preserve the variety of accents upon their words sometimes accenting them upon the last Syllable, sometimes upon the penult, and but rarely upon the Antepenult: The consequence of which is, as I have elsewhere observed to obscure the pronunciation of the two following Syllables. It is by thus accenting the different Syllables of a word that we can give any variety to the pronunciation of our language; and supply as far as possible the want of Rhythms & tones of flections and different terminations in our words.

The first Author in English who had courage enough to declare against the barbarity of rhyme is Roger Ascham (a) the Preceptor of Queen Elizabeth, of whom I have spoken elsewhere, and commended as an excellent Scholar and very good Critic. But before him [p. 51] my Lord Surrey of the noble family of Norfolk, in the days of Henry the 8th, showed what our language could do in blank verse in a translation of the 2d. & 4th Books of Virgils
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Aeneid (a). But after this time in the reign of Queen Elizabeth there was a great deal of writing in Blank Verse particularly by Shakespeare and Ben Johnson. But whatever praise we may bestow upon those Authors as Poets I think much cannot be said in praise of their Versification. The first Author therefore in my Opinion, who has composed good blank Verse in English is Milton.

Stile, as I have elsewhere observed⁶ consists of two things, the Choice of Words [p. 52.] and the Composition of them. Of these two, the latter is much more difficult as well as more excellent. In the choice of Words Milton is not distinguished from other Poets: And indeed his poetical Language is the most simple of any in English; but in composition he excels all our Writers either in Verse or Prose, and particularly in the composition of his blank Verse; for there he has joined the beauty of Prose composition in Periods with the Rhythm of the Verse more than any other of our poets (b) & it is more by this than any thing else that his Versification is distinguished from that of Shakespeare or Ben Johnston, or the blank Verse Writers before them such as My Lord Surrey for then our Poetry being but newly emancipated from the Slavery of Rime, still retain'd a great deal of the Composition of Rhyming Verse, in

(a) See Specimens of that Translation in Warton's Work above quoted Vol. 3. p. 21

(b) See the Halicarnassian.
Sentences of 10 or 12 Syllables\(^{37}\). How much this is practiced in Antient Versification it is needless to Observe; I shall only say that I know no Poet that has practiced it more or more successfully\(^{38}\) than Horace in his Odes, which [p. (53)] must have given a Beauty and Variety\(^{39}\) to them especially when they were sung with the accompaniment of the pipe or Lyre,\(^{40}\) such as we can hardly have an idea of. For their Music was so simple, and so well adapted to the Subject that the Poetry was not lost in the Music as it commonly is with us, but the hearer enjoyed both.

Milton has given this Beauty of Prose composition to his Verse by making his Verses tho' distinguished by the Rhythm so connected by the Sense, that they run into one another, so as to make a period, sometimes of more than 20. Lines. At the same time\(^{41}\) as in Prose, even Rhetorical Prose the Whole composition ought not to be in periods, (for if it were so there would not be that Variety without which there can be no fine writing or Speaking), so there are [p. 54] some of Milton's Verses\(^{42}\) which terminate the Sense, like Mr. Pope's Rhyming Verses.

To give Examples of this Beautiful variety in Milton's Composition, would be to transcribe almost the whole of the Paradise Lost, and the Comus; I need go no farther for an example than the first Lines of the Paradise Lost.

Of Man's first disobedience, and the fruit
Of that forbidden tree, whose Mortal taste
Brought Death into the world, & all our woe,
With Loss of Eden, till one greater man
Restore us and regain the blissfull Seat,
Sing Heavenly Muse⁴³;

Where the Reader will Observe that in the first Verse, the
halt is upon the 7th Semiped, in the Second it⁴⁴ is upon the
Sixth, in the third it is likewise upon the Sixth, in the fourth
it is upon the fourth, in the fifth it is upon the third⁴⁵,
& in the⁴⁶ last it is upon the⁴⁷ fourth

In his Speeches there is, as there ought to be still
more composition in periods. I have elsewhere⁴⁸ given a very
fine example of this composition in the Speech with which

[p. 55] Satan opens the Council of Pandemonium. And if my
reader desires an example of a much longer period, he may have it
in Satans Speech's in the first Book to Beelzebub; consisting
of 21. Lines and a half, and which is as remarkable for the
Variety of Matter contained in it, and for the clearness and
perspicuity of the Composition, tho' it may appear obscure and
involved to an unclassical Reader, as for its length. I will
only give one instance more of a shorter period, but which
is as well composed as any in Demosthenes. It is that with which
Belial begins his Speech in the 2d. Book.

"I should be much for Open War, 0 Peers,
"As not behind in hate, if what was urged
"Main reason to perswade immediate⁴⁸ war,
"Did not diswade me most, and seem to cast
"Ominous conjecture on the whole success;

Now with⁴⁹ this Composition of Milton let any man who has
ear or taste compare the Versification of Mr. Pope. And I think
he must be Struck with the tedious sameness and Uniformity
of the⁵⁰ one, [p. 56] And the beautifull Variety of the other.
I will give but one instance from Mr. Pope; And it shall be of some Lines perhaps the finest he ever wrote. They are upon a Subject which I think very interesting I mean his old mother, and give me an high Opinion of his heart as well as of his Genius.

Me may the pious Office long engage
To rock the cradle of repose Age;
With lenient Arts extend a mother's breath,
Make languour smile, and smooth the bed of Death.
Explore the sigh, explain the asking Eye,
And keep awhile one parent from the Skye.

Where we may Observe that the Sense is terminated with every Line, and the Caesura generally about the Middle of the Line.

And indeed as our Ear always expects a Chime at the end of the Verse, and not being able to run it on without some Stop, we naturally halt about half way: And as to the running of the Verses into one another, if the Sense Oblige us to do so, there would not be Stops sufficient at the end of the Verse to make us perceive the Clink: So that it is impossible that Rhyming Verse can be composed in periods.

And here we may Observe that Milton's composition gives to our Verse all the Variety that the Language will admitt of.

I have already Observed the wonderfull Variety of the Antient Verse, not only by its different metrical feet & its Caesuras in different parts of the Verse, but by its Words of different lengths & various flexions & terminations in which we are very deficient, having not much variety of termination, less Still of Flexion, & a great deal too many Short Words, very many of them Monosyllables, of which Milton as I have Observed has composed
a Whole Verse all except One Word of two Syllables. The only way therefor we can give any [KW] Beauty or variety either to our Verse or Prose, is by composition in periods. (a)

But Periods both in Verse and Prose must be well read or Spoken, otherwise they will not please the Ear nor will even be intelligible in many cases. And accordingly [p. 56] I have observed that many Readers are not able to carry their Attention thro' Milton's long periods, nor have comprehension enough to enable them to take in and Connect the whole Sense of them. I therefore repeat it again that nothing is more necessary in the Education of Our Youth than to teach them to read and repeat periods, beginning with periods in prose as more easy; for in verse there is some difficulty to make the roundness and flow of the period to be perceived by the Ear, while the Sense is comprehended by the Mind, and at the same time to preserve the Verse. This is done by a little halt at the end of the Verse, and a very little if the Sense of the Verse run into the following, not more than an emphasis laid upon any Word in speaking or reading prose. It is for this reason the Word terminating a Line however it may be connected with the Words of the following Line ought to be a word which will bear some emphasis [p. 59] Which is the case of the words fruit, Taste, woe, Man, Seat. top concluding the first six Lines of the Paradise Lost. In this respect both Shakespear and Ben Johnson,

(a) See what I have further said upon this Subject p. 269 - 278
when they run their Verses into one another are often very
deficient; which has the effect either to confound the Sense, or
destroy the Harmony of the Verse. [p. 59(1)] There is another old
Play-writer that I happen just now to have in my hand Vist,
Massinger who is more faulty in this Respect than either of
the other two; for he concludes the Line with a that or but
or an he, and sometimes even with an of. As in A Play of his
entitled the Picture he makes one of his Personages say,

-I am thrown

From a Steep rock, headlong into a gulph
Of Misery, and find myself past hope,
In the same moment that I apprehend
That I am falling. And this the Figure of
My idol few hours hence & c. -m

Here either the Stop must be at the word of which is no
more than a mark of the Genitive Case, or the verse will be
lost. It is the observance of the contrary rule, which next to
the composition in periods gives the greatest Beauty to Milton's
Versification. And indeed unless this be attended to the
composition may be good prose, but is not Verse.

It may be observed that in Latin, when the Subject is
heroic or [p. 59(2)] where the Versification is intended to be
made Sweet and flowing, the Word terminating the Line is always
a Word of some significance and such as will bear an Emphasis,
whereas in the Satires and Epistles of Horace, of which the
Subject is common Affairs of Life or the Precepts of an Art
Such as the Art of Poetry and the Stile only distinguished
from Prose by the arrangement of the Words in Metrical order
as he tells us himself, the Line is often terminated by prepositions Adverbs, or conjunctions. Thus in his Art of Poetry, where he decides the question, whether it be Nature or Art that makes the Poet, he says

-Ego nec studium sine divite vena
Nec rude quid prosit video ingenium; alterius sic
Altera poscit open res et conjurat amici (a)

Some Lines after he concludes again with another Sic, where speaking of those who are hired to mourn at a funeral, he says,

- Et faciat prope plura
Dolentibus ex animo sic
Et
Deriso vero plus laudatore movetur. (b)

And a little before that, speaking [p. 59(3)] of the difficulty that a rich Man has to distinguish a friend from a flatterer, he divides a word, and concludes the Line with one half of it. Thus

-miraber si sciat inter-

Noscere mendacem, verumque beatus amicum. (b)

And as to his Epistles, I need only quote the 14th. of the first Book to his Villicus, or Overseer of his farm, where you have one verse terminated with the preposition inter another with the Conjunction et, and a third with the pronoun tu. And it

(a) Vers. 409. et seq.

(b) Vers. 434.
may be observed that not only in the two last instances but very frequently he concludes his verse with a Monosyllable: Whereas Virgil who studied the flow of his verse so much, scarcely ever terminates a Verse with a Monosyllable, neither in his 77 Aeneid, his Georgics, or even in his Pastorals. But Homer who suits his Versification as well as his Diction to his Subject better than Virgil and does not always study as Virgil does to make pompous sweet flowing verse, sometimes terminates his verse with a Monosyllable but never where he wants to adorn his Subject with fine Versification. 78 79

This Observation may afford some excuse to those old English Poets I have mentioned, [p. 59(4)] who write Comedy in Verse, and terminate their Lines, with such insignificant words as I have mentioned. But my Opinion is that 80 it would have been much better if they had written their Comedies in the plain Style of Conversation; for tho' the Rhythm of the Latin Versification made Horace's Verses, as I have observed agreeable, without any Pomp of Language, and even with these Abrupt endings of the Verse, yet in our 81 Language, where there is no such Rhythm, and where the Verse cannot be distinguished, except by a Little pause at the end of it, if there be not a Word of some significance upon which that pause can be made it appears only to be an 82 affectation of Verse, and Offends 83 rather than pleases. 84 [p. (59)]

Before I quit this Subject I cannot help repeating an
Observation I have already made (a) that a Man who does not perceive the Beauty of Periods either in Verse or Prose, and prefers what I call the Short cut of a Stile, appears to me to have no idea of what Beauty is, nor to know that there can be no beauty but in a whole, of which the parts are distinguishable. Now that is the Case of a period for as Aristotle has defin'd it, (b) it is that which has a beginning & an End in itself & is not terminated by the Sense only for when that is the case, it is not a period but what he calls εἰρήνη λειτουργία where the Ear expects no End, which he says is unpleasant, whereas when a well composed period is read or Spoken, we See as it were the Goal where we are to Stop, which makes us go on pleasantly & fills our Ears agreeably with Something that is in it Self compleat & not mutilated. For this purpose a Period must have a certain Length: for otherwise we cannot well distinguish its beginning from its end, nor perceive that relation of parts without which there can be no Beauty. This Aristotle has told us in another place where he says [p. 60.] [M] that a certain Magnitude is necessary for Beauty as well as a certain Order & Arrangement of the Parts. Therefor says he a very small Animal cannot be beautifull because the parts are So small that they cannot be distinctly perceived, nor a very great One Such as an Animal of ten thousand Stadia, because there we

(a) p. 239.66

(b) Rhetor. Lib. 3. Cap. 987
cannot comprehend the Whole & consequently not perceive the One. (a) The Author, who I think writes [p. 61] the best blank Verse next to Milton is Dr Armstrong in his Art of preserving health. He too composes in periods, and varies his Stile by very beautiful figures of composition; and his diction is always poetical: And indeed I cannot help saying that in the choice of words he very often exceeds Milton, who sometimes lets his Stile down to prose, as when he makes

God the father turn a School divine.

(a) I will here give the Reader Aristotle's Words.

Ἐὰν δέησει το καλον καὶ ζωον καὶ ἀποικ παθμα ό δυνατησει κεκ τυχαν, ου μονον ταύτα τεπαχενα δει εκεν, ἀλλα καὶ μεγαθον ὑπαρχειν μη το τυχαν το γα το καλον ἐν μεγαθει καὶ τάξει ἐστι διο οὔτε
παραλόγων ἐν τε γεγοντο καλον ζωον. Συγκεκται γαρ η θεωρια ἡ τρις
τον ἀνασπερον μονον γνωμην οὔτε παμμεθες. Ου γαρ ἀμα η θεωρια γενεται,
ἀλλα συγκεται τον θεωρον το ἐν καὶ το ζωον ἐκ της θεωριας. οὐν ἐκ μυριων
σταδιων ἐν ζωον. Περι ποιησις Καρ. 6.

[M] Here the Reader may Observe that the Definition of Beauty which I have given of Beauty in the 5th Chapter of 2nd Volume of Metaphysicks agrees perfectly with Aristotle's Idea of it. He says as I do that there cannot be Beauty without a Whole & that there [p. 61] must be parts in every thing that is beautifull and also that there must be certain Order & Arrangement of these parts. That is in other words there must be a System.
Of Dryden's Ode on St Cecilia's Day - The finest piece of Rhyming Poetry in English - A Wonderfull Variety of Verse in it - Not only different in length and Shortness, but in the Measure of the Verse - He has used feet different from any of those hitherto mentioned, as belonging to English Verse - Analysis of the Versification of this Poem - All the Variety of Measure to be found in it, that can be imagined in English Verse - Of the necessity of analyzing English Verse into feet, as well as Greek and Latin Verse - More Variety of Verse in this Ode than in any modern Poem - Mr Pope's Ode on St Cecilias Day, much inferior to Mr Drydens - has one Stanza different from any in Mr Dryden's Ode - The Italian Language capable of all the Variety of Verse that is in English - But no one Poem in Italian of such Variety as Dryden's Ode. - Reason why the Antients had not in their Language such Accents as ours -

Happy, happy, happy pair,
Where the measure is very happily changed for the Trochaic And the Repetitions of happy, and None but the brave, are I think exceedingly fine, and very well suited to the Subject, being as it were the Acclamations of the People. 6

In the second Stanza beginning [p. 68] with "Timotheus placed on high he returns to the Iambics, with the liberty allowed in that verse, of making the first foot a Trochaic; The Verse I Mean is, "Such is the power of Mighty Love."
In the end of this Stanza the verse is very agreeably shortened, and the Rhyme tripled with a common Rhyme interposed; The Verses I mean are

With ravished Ears
The Monarch hears,
Assumes the God,
Affects to nod
And seems to Shake the Spheres.
Which most happily describe the thing signified by them; And indeed seem to act it.

The next Stanza Contains the praise of Bacchus: It begins likewise with Iambics, the common foot in English Verse; And goes on for three Verses till the description becomes more animated; And then he changes the Verse to Trochaic, with a Variety which he has not hitherto used, such as that of a residuous Syllable after the conclusion of the last foot, a Variety which as I have shown has been practiced by other Poets. The verse I mean is

"Sound the Trumpets, beat the Drums,"
In the next verse he has a Variety very common in English Verse; for the first foot is a Dactyle; the next is a Trochaic, and after it a Residuous Syllable accented or half a foot. The Verse is

"Flushed with a purple Grace."
Then he has the Common Iambic Line, "he shows his honest face," which may seem Prosaic, but I think makes a very agreeable Variety intermixed with the other Lines. The Line after that is
a Trochaic with a residuous Syllable; And it has a very fine break of the Sense in the Middle which if [it] be well imitated by the Music, should produce an excellent effect. Now give the Hautboys breath; he comes, he comes; Then he changes most beautifully, I think, from this long Line to shorter Trochaics, with a Residuous Syllable

Bacchus, ever fair & young,
Drinking joys did first ordain;
Bacchus' blessings are a treasure;
Drinking is the Soldier's pleasure;

Then he changes again to Shorter Trochaics Still, without any residuous syllable

Rich the Treasures
Sweet the pleasures

And then he concludes with a longer [p. 70.] Trochaic with a residuous Syllable:

"Sweet is pleasure after pain.

Where it is to be Observed that the residuous syllable pain, Rhymes to ordain, at the distance of four Lines that are thrown in between; A Rhyme of which I do not Observe any other example. These Seven last Lines beginning with Bacchus ever fair, are of that kind of Poetry, which the Greeks call Orchestic such as we are told some of Pindar's Odes were; And indeed the Measure is altogether Saltant; and might I am persuaded be danced to with great propriety.

The next Stanza begins with a Daotyle; then two Trochees and a Residuous Syllable.

"Soothed with the Sound, the King grew vain
then follows a Line all Iambics,

"Fought all his Battles o'er again
Then follows a very long Iambic Line, which expresses wonderfully well the thing it describes,

"And thrice he routed all his foes, & thrice he slew the slain
being the longest verse verse in the whole Poem and in that way imitating very well the vain, teadeous boasting of the King. Then follow three Iambics

"The Master saw the Madness rise;
his glowing cheeks, his Ardent Eyes,
And while he heaven & earth defyed

then he most happily changes the Verse as the Musician Changes his Music, And gives us a verse of three Trochaics with a Residuous Syllable. [p. 71.]

"Changed his hand & checked his pride
After this he returns to the Iambic measure, which I think more proper than the Trochaic to express Grief.

"He chose a mournfull Muse,
Soft Pity to infuse
This Last Line the Reader may observe is Shorter than the other consisting only of two feet and a half; and in the Second place has an Anapestic in place of an Iambic which makes the Line shorter in the pronunciation than the proceeding tho' it consists of the same Number of Syllables. Then he gives us an Iambic of four feet

"He sung Darius, great and good,
then an Iambic of three feet,
"By too severe a fate
then follows a wonderfull Change into a measure very uncommon in English but which suits the Subject exceedingly well. It is a Line of two Spondees and four Repetitions of the same Word,

"Fallen, fallen, fallen, fallen,
Then a Line of two Dactyles, describing as it were the precipitate Motion of his fall,

"Fallen from his high Estate,
Then he goes on in three Iambic Verses,
And weltering in his Blood,
Deserted at his utmost need
by those his former bounty fed

then he varies the measure by making the first foot an Anapaestic, and the Second an unaccented Syllable interposed betwixt two accented, which may be called a Cretic and the last an Iambic.

"On the bare Earth exposed he lyes,
Then he returns again to the Iambics

"With not a friend to close his Eyes,
Then he lengthens his verse, preserving still the same measure
by adding one Iambic foot more,

"With downcast look the joyfull Victor sat,
Where the Reader may observe that the last word sat, Rhymes to Estate at the distance of five Lines, which I am perswaded is a Rhyme without Example in English. Then follow four very fine Iambic Verses, with alternate Rhymes
Revolving in his altered Soul
The various turns of fate below,
And now and then a Sigh he stole,
And tears began to flow —
Where he has made an Agreeable Variety, by making the last verse shorter by a foot

To Pity naturally succeeds Love, which he describes in the next Stanz, beginning with four Iambics, [p. 7334]

"The mighty Master smiled to see
"That Love was in the next degree
"Twas but a kindred sound to move;
For Pity melts the Mind to Love,

Then he changes to the Trochaic in which he goes on for four Verses —

"Softly sweet in Lydian measures,
"Soon he soothed his soul to pleasures,
"War, he sung, was toil & trouble,
"Honour but an empty bubble,

Then he goes on in the same Measure, but varying the Rhyme to alternate, instead of the Common Rhyme,

"Never ending, still beginning,
"Fighting still, and still destroying,
"If the World be worth thy winning
"Think, 0 think it worth enjoying

where the Reader may Observe that the composition is agreeably varied by35 turning to Alexander and addressing the two last Lines to him; a like figure of Speech is to be found in Virgil, and also in Milton And it may be also observed that the Double Rhymes, or Rhymes of two Syllables here appear to be very well adapted to the Subject and to suit that mode of Music which by
the Antients was called the Lydian. Then he goes on in the same measure, and with the same Number of feet:

"Lovely Thais sits beside thee,
Take the Good the Gods provide thee
After this when he comes to describe the effect of the Music upon the Hearers, he changes both the measure and the length of the Verse, making it Iambic with an additional foot

The many rend the Skyes with loud applause

So Love was crowned, but Music won the cause [p. 74]

Then when he comes to describe how Alexander was moved, he gives us a very different kind of Verse, with a great Variety of Rhymes, and one Verse to which there is no Rhyme, which to me is a very agreeable Variety.

"The Prince unable to conceal his pain,
Gazed on the fair,
Who caused his Care; and sighed and looked, sighed & looked,
Sighed and looked & Sighed again
Here the Reader may Observe a Wonderfull Variety in the versification The first Line consists of an Iambic, Then a Dactyle, then an Anapaest. And concludes as it began, with an Iambic. The next Line has a Short Trochaic of two feet; the next an Iambic of the same Number of feet: The fourth is a longer Line, and of very various measure; for it consists of two Iambics, and a foot consisting of two accented Syllables, and one unaccented interposed between them, which as I said may be called a [Cretic] foot. The fifth Line begins with the same foot with which the other ended, and then
has two Iambics: And he concludes the Stanza with two Jambic Verses longer than the preceding.

"At length with Love & Wine at once oppressed,

The vanquished Victor sunk upon her breast.

The next Stanza describes a Scene very different, and in very different Verse: The first two verses consist each of four Iambic feet;

"Now Strike the Golden Lyre again

"A louder yet, and yet a Louder strain.

Then follows a Trochaic Verse of the same Number of feet;

"Break his bands of sleep asunder, 45

Then the measure is changed again from the Trochaic to the Iambic; and a longer verse consisting of five feet and a half or a Residuous Syllable,

And rouse him like a rattling peal of Thunder

Next follows a greater variety of Verse, than what we have yet had.

Hark, hark the horrid Sound

Has raised up his head

As awake from the dead

And amazed he stares around.

Of these the first Line consists of a Spondee, and two Iambus's. Of the next the first foot is an Iambic [p. 7646] and another is an Anapaest; As the Second ended with an Anapaest, the third begins with it, and concludes with it consisting only of two Anapaests. The fourth likewise begins with an Anapaest, and concludes with two Iambics, consisting of three feet. Then follows an Iambic verse of four feet,
"Revenge, Revenge", Timotheus cries

Next a much shorter verse and of a different measure, consisting only of two\textsuperscript{47} feet and these Anapaests

"See the Furies arise,"

And he continues the description of the Furies in the same Length of verse and in the same measure

"See the Snakes that they rear,

How they hiss in the Air -

But he varies the description by the following Line, which is longer and of a very uncommon measure; for it consists of three\textsuperscript{48} Anapaests\textsuperscript{49}

"And the Sparkles that flash from their Eyes

the only verse in the Poem of that kind. The next is a Short Iambic verse of three feet, and the next after that is a Trochaic of the same number of [p. 77\textsuperscript{50}] feet.

"Behold a ghastly band,

Each a Torch in his hand

Then follows a long Line of an unusual measure; for it consists of two Trochees, two Dactyles, and a Residuous accented Syllable or half foot

"These are Grecian Ghosts, that in battle were slain

Then follows a Short Line, consisting of an Iambic, a Trochee, and an Iambic again,

"And unburied remain,

Then comes another short Line,

"Inglorious on the plain

consisting of an Iambic, an Anapaeest and an Iambic again.

Then follow two Lines of the same Length and Measure consisting
each of two Trochees and a residuous Syllable.

"Give the Vengeance due

To the valiant crew -

Next follows a Line of an uncommon Measure,

"Behold how they toss their torches on high

The first foot is an Iambic, the Second an Anapaest; the third is of two accented Syllables, and one unaccented, and may be called [an Antibacchius]. And the fourth is an Iambic. The next \(^{[p. 78]}\) Line, is shorter and of a different measure. The first foot has two accented Syllables and betwixt them an unaccented called [a Cretic.]. And the two next feet are both Anapaests.

"How they point to the Persian Abodes

The next Line is,

"And Glittering Temples of their Hostile Gods,

consisting of two Iambics, an Anapaest and an unaccented Syllable betwixt two accented, called [a Cretic]. The next Line is,

The Princes applaud with a furious joy,

Here the measure is very different, consisting of an Iambic and three Anapaests. The next Line is a longer one,

"And the King seized a flambeau with Zeal to destroy,

consisting of an Anapaest, of two accented Syllables with an unaccented interposed and concludes with two \(^{52}\) Anapaests

Then comes a very short Line,

"Thais led the way

consisting of a Trochee, and, the foot I have so often mentioned, and which I find is very common in this poem of an unaccented Syllable betwixt two accented.
The next Line is

"To light him to his prey.

a measure of which we have [p. 79.\textsuperscript{53}] hitherto had no example; for the first foot is an accented Syllable betwixt two unaaccented which may be called [an Amphibrach] and an Anapaest. The last Line of this Stanza is a long Line consisting of Six Iambics:

"And like another Helen, fired another Troy

The Poem is concluded with a Stanza all in Iambics; The verses differing only in their greater or less length, which I think is variety enough for the conclusion, which as well as the beginning\textsuperscript{54} ought in all Works to be plainer and simpler than what goes before. There are two Lines in it of Six Iambics each, which have a very good effect intermixed with the Short Lines.

These Observations will I am persuaded be thought by many of My Readers very trifling; And they will say that their Ear perceives all that Variety of Measure, which I have described, without frittering and breaking it down as I have done; but such Readers will excuse me for telling them that they are not Men of Science, otherwise they would know that there can be no [p. 80\textsuperscript{55}] Science without accurate division into parts. They are not even Scholars; for if they were the would know that it would be impossible to explain the Greek and Latin Prosody, or to reduce it to any rule, if the verses were not divided into feet. And I see no reason why our English Rhythm of accented and unaaccented Syllables may not be divided in the same way as the Rhythm in the learned Languages of long and short Syllables.

I had another reason for insisting so much upon the Variety
of Measure in this Ode, that I wanted to supply the Defects of my System of English Versification, which I have given in the Second Volume of the Origin of Language, and which I think may boast is the best and indeed the only system that I know of upon the Subject. I have mentioned there no other feet of English Verse, except Iambics, Trochees and Anapaests, having no other Examples before me except of those measures. But [p. 81] Mr Dryden has shown me that there are in our Language, likewise Spondees Dactyles, and [Cretics?] and, [Antibacchius's?] And in short, all the Variety of feet in Greek and Latin. And that we can boast of having in our Language a Poem more varied by long and Short Verses and by Change of Rhythm and Measure than any Poem in any modern Language, without excepting even the Italian.

Mr Pope has matched himself, unfortunately I think, with Mr Dryden, in this Ode; for his performance is I think much inferior to Mr Dryden both in Sentiments and Diction, and also in Variety of Versification. There is only one Stanza of Verses in Mr Pope's Ode which I think is pretty, but is not to be found in Mr Dryden's. It is this

Thus Song could prevail
O'er Death, and o'er hell
A conquest how hard and how Glorious,
Tho' fate had fast bound her,
With Styx nine times round her,
Yet Music and Love were Victorious.

Thus I think I have not only made a System of English
Versification, but shown that it is a compleat System, and such as may be compared to the Versification in the learned \[p. 82.62\] Languages. It is such that the English ought to be very fond of it; as it sets their Poetry much above the French, and that of any Language now living, the Italian only excepted\(^65\), which have Accents as well as the English, employs them to give that Variety to their Poetry, without which, as I have more than once observed there can be nothing perfect in any of the Arts. But tho' the Italian has all that Variety of feet which the English has and accordingly uses them in Dramatic pieces, I do not know that there is any one Poem in Italian of so small a compass as Alexander's feast, which has the same Variety of measure, and of long and short verse that is to be found in Mr Dryden's Ode.

Before I leave this Subject of Modern Accents, I think it is proper to Observe that the Antient Greeks and Romans had them not; for they are never mentioned by their Grammarians, which \[p. 83.66\] could not have been, if they had been part of the Grammar of their Language as they are of ours. Nor indeed does it appear to me that they would have been consistent with the Nature of their Language, for I do not think they could have been made to agree with their Accents or Syllabic Tones, and their Quantity or Rhythm. And it would have been as if we should endeavour to make a flute or a Fiddle sound like a Drum.\(^67\) To have joined them with these, would have been to have overloaded the pronunciation of their Language, and to have made the Ear less sensible to the Beauty of its Melody and Rhythm
Of Versification.

No. 252.
Every body in the least acquainted with Letters, must acknowledge that there is a great difference betwixt the Stile of Poetry & Prose, besides the Numbers or Measure of the Verse, & every Man of a Natural good taste, who has read but a little of either, will readily perceive the difference, but it belongs to Science to explain in what the difference consists. And tho' few people are so ignorant, as not to know, like the Bourgeois Gentilhomme in Moliere, that what is not Poetry must needs be Prose, yet I know many people who think themselves very good Criticks, yet if they were desired to state distinctly in what the difference betwixt the Stile of Poetry, & of Prose consisted, wou'd find themselves at a very great loss. His Answer probably wou'd be that the Stile of Poetry was more Figurative than that of Prose. But such an Answer would not be sufficient; for in the first place, it is only a comparison betwixt the Stile of Prose & Poetry, not a Definition of either, & saying that they only differ in degree, whereas in reality they differ in their Natures. Secondly Who makes this Answer must explain what figures he means for there are some figures which belongs to Prose as much as to Poetry; nobody will say that the Stile of Thucydides is Poetical, & yet there are more figures of Diction in his Stile, than the Rhetoricians have names for.

It is from the nature of Poetry, as well as [p. 2d.] of every other kind of Writing, that we must deduce the nature of the Stile belonging to it. Now it is a true as it is a common
Saying that Poetry is a kind of Painting, by which it is meant that Poetry as well as Painting addresses itself to the Senses & Imagination. For it is not strictly true that Poetry is a Species or kind of Painting, but it is a different Art, & of much greater extent. For Painting applies itself only to the Sense of Sight by the medium of colour & that way only moves the imagination. And it represents the action only in one instant of time, & not in Succession; Whereas Poetry applies to all the Senses by the Medium of words, & attacks the Imagination every way; & it Represents an Action in it's progress & Succession; & by that Means has the effect which every body must feel from the Plot of a well written Play.

From this nature of Poetry it follows 1mo. That as Generals are not apprehended by the Senses, & therefore cannot be painted; So Poetry deals as little as may be in General & abstract ideas & particularly avoids all Metaphysical terms expressing Ideas of the highest Abstraction. It therefore particularizes every thing as much as possible, & instead of mentioning the thing in General, names a particular thing of the kind, which falls under the Sense, & may form a Picture in the Imagination.

This is what Milton means, where he speaks somewhere in his Prose works of the Simple & Sensual nature of Poetry, & nobody understood it better, or practised it with [p. 5d.] more success. Thus, in the first book of his Paradise Lost, instead of Saying that Satan's Shield was like the Moon seen thro' a Telescope, which is a very fine thought indeed, but would have been no more than a Prose comparison, if he had exprest it in that manner; but see how he has embodied & colour'd it
Like the Moon/ whose orb thro Optick\(^6\) Glass the Tuscan
Artist views/
at Evening from the Top of Fesule/ or in\(^7\) Valdarno
to descry new Lands,/ Rivers or Mountains in her spotted
globe\(^b\)

Here is a perfect Picture representing a particular Action with
the necessary Adjuncts of Time & Place.

Again instead of saying that the Host of fall'n Angels
were lying upon the Lake of Fire & Brimstone, as Leaves that
cover a Brook\(^9\) in Autumn which\(^10\) runs under the Shade of Trees,
a very apt comparison indeed, but exprest in too General &
Abstract a Manner for Poetry, he thus renders it most
beautifully & Poetically

Thick as Autumnal Leaves that strow the Brooks
Of Allombrosa where th' Etrurian Shades
High overarcht embower. -\(^c\)

It is in this way that not only sensible images are presented
to the Imagination, instead of General Ideas, but the Poetry is
enrich'd & diversified with Variety of History & Literature.

Virgil, who I think in the Onaments of the Poeticall Stile
exceeds all Poets, has studied this method of Expression extremally,
& has applied it to the most common things. For example instead
[p. 4th.] of Mentioning Water plainly he calls it
Achyloia Pocula

Pocula inventis Achyloia miscuit uvis,\(^d\)
And in the Line preceeding, instead of Speaking of Acorns in
General, he mentions the Acorns of a particular wood

Chaoniam pingui Glandem mutavit Arista;\(^e\)
& in describing \(^{11}\) Mountains struck with Thunder instead of Speaking of Mountains in General, he says

\[ \text{Aut}^{12} \text{Athon aut Rhodopen aut Acroceraunia telo} \]

\[ \text{Dejicit.}^f \]

But 2do. As Painting represents particular objects, not General Ideas, so it must of necessity represent the circumstances accompanying the particular object; & the great Skill of the Painter is to choose such circumstances, as will strike & affect the imagination most. In like Manner a Poet describes a thing by it's circumstances, & by a happy choice of these he makes what is commonly call'd beautiful imagery. In this, as in every other Ornament of the Poetical stile Virgil excells almost every other Poet; & in no part of his work so much as in his Georgicks, which with respect to the diction & versification, is perhaps the highest finishd Poem in the world. I will give but one or two instances out of many. In the beginning of Spring he recommends deep Ploughing. If he had said no more, any Farmer cou'd have given the same precept in plain prose. But see how he has made Poetry of it \[ [p. 5th.] \]

\[ \text{Depresso incipiat jam tum mihi Taurus aratro} \]

\[ \text{Ingemere, & Sulco attritus splendescere Vomer.}^g \]

Here is a picture which represents the Action of Ploughing in the most lively manner; for we see as it were the Plough press't down, & the Ploughshare shining with the Attrition of the Earth, one of the most striking circumstances to the imagination in this Rural operation. And he has taken the advantage of his art to express a circumstance which could not have been represented by the Painter, namely the groaning of the
Ox that Draws the Plough. Again in the same Georgick he recommends several things to be done by the Farmer, which though seemingly trivial are absolutely necessary & if neglected the crop will be bad. Of this too Virgil has made a fine piece of Imagery

Quod nisi assiduis terram insectabere rastris
Et sonitu terrebis aves, et ruris opaci
Falce premes imbrem; heu frustra alterius
Spectabis acervum; concussaque magnum famem
in Silvis solabere quercu,

Where there can be nothing more lively or pleasant to the Fancy than the picture of a hungry Man shaking the Oak for Acorns.

It is in order to describe objects by their circumstances & qualities that Poetry makes so much use of Epithets, which therefore ought to be as particular as may be, expressing things that fall under the Senses. Of this kind are almost all the Epithets used by Homer such as ἀνακινητός, μεγας, κρατάων, ἄβαστος, ἀκυκληνος & c., & there are very few of those general Epithets to be found in him, with which our Prose, as well as our Poetry so much abounds such as Divine, glorious, dreadful, terrible & c. For even the Epithet of which is common to all the Heroes has a determinate signification in Homer; for it denotes a Man descended of the Gods, or of the θεων γενος, according to the notion of those times, that all those antient Men of Superior Strength & prowess, were descended either mediatly, or immediately of the Gods. Thus Bellerophon, after having gone thro' all the trials, upon which he was put by the King of Lydia, was acknowledged at last to be of the genuine race of the gods.
And tho' many of Homer's Epithets may appear very simple, & what we wou'd call dull or flat, such as white milk, black blood, or the black Earth, & c, they are all such as paint the Object, by Expressing such sensible qualities of it, as distinguish it from other objects.

It is also to sett objects more clearly before our Eyes, that Poetry uses Similitudes so much more than Prose. For Similitudes do as it were exhibit the thing twice. And if there be any thing obscure in the original, it is made more visible in the Likeness. Similitudes do at the same time vary & embellish the Stile extremly, & therefore are more suitable to the nature of Poetry, whose chief business is to delight & move. 22

But 3tic. Poetry not only delights in giving a body & substance to things, but also in animating them, & giving them Passions & affections. This is what chiefly gives energy to the Poetical Stile, & affects our Imagination more than any ornament. In the same manner as a Picture representing Life & action affects us more than a Landscape, or a piece of Still Life. The Poets therefore do everywhere personify, & give life [p. 7th.] & action to things inanimate. Homer is full of Epithets of this sort, such as λος 23 ανδρας 24 λίθη μαμμάωνα 25, διος ζητες θεικεχνηστα. 26 And Virgil not content with giving Epithets of this kind, which may be call'd Miniature Pictures, sometimes dwells upon the Image, & draws it at full length. As in the description of a Grafted Tree

Nec longum tempus, et ingens

Exit ad caelum ramis folicibus arbor,
Mirat atque novas frondes, et non sua poma.

These appear to me to be the chief things which discriminate the stile of Poetry from that of all Prose writing. For as to Metaphors & other Tropes & Figures, they are indifferently used in verse, & in prose, only it is to be observed that Poetry permits a greater frequency of them; I say, only permits, but by no means requires, for it is a great mistake, tho' I think a common mistake of our Poets, to imagine that the Stile of Poetry may not be as simple & natural as that of Prose. And I maintain that to be crouded by Metaphors & other Figures, is as great a fault in Poetry as in prose. The Stile of Poetry ought not indeed to be vulgar, but neither should good Prose; And the one as well as the other may be diversified & embellished by a variety of Figures. The Stile however of Poetry ought to be, generally speaking more removed from common use than Prose. And therefore as I just now said it admits a greater variety of Figures, & of stronger figures than Prose, & also made words, & words compounded, & such as are antiquated, in short every thing that can raise the Stile above common Idiom.

But still it is to be remembred that all these Ornaments are no more than the dress of Poetry, & that it is Fiction, or as Aristotle most truly & Philosophically expresses it, the Imitation of Human Actions, which constitutes both the body & Spirit of Poetry, & it is there that Homer excells all Poets; for tho' I give the preference to Virgil before him & all other Poets in the Ornamental part, yet with respect to the composition of the Fable, the invention of Incidents, & the Representation of Characters & Manners, which he has contrived so skillfully
to work into a Story, I think there is not the least comparison to be made. But to return to our Subject.

The Rhetorical Stile is that which comes the nearest to the Poetical, particularly one Species of it known commonly by a name, which does not at all show it's nature; vizt. The Demonstrative, Whereas it should be call'd the Panegyrical, as we have not adopted the word Epideictick in English. But even the Stile of this Species of Rhetorick differs from that of Poetry in the three great articles above mentioned, & comes only near to it in the strength & variety of it's Figures, & in the numbers of it's periods. As to the Judicial & deliberative Eloquence, if it be of the right kind, it is still further removed from the Poetick Stile [p. 9th.], because it has little or nothing to do with the Senses or imagination, but addresses itself chiefly to the understanding of the Audience; & if it is to move their passions, it is not by Poetical Pictures, but by facts & arguments. Of this kind is the Eloquence of Demosthenes, which does almost as much honour to the People to whom it was addrest, as to the Orator himself. For he does not use to convince them by the use of that froth & Declamation which Cicero thought necessary to practise upon the people of Rome, but of solid Sense & argument, which was certainly the highest compliment he could pay his Audience. There is therefore in him no mob of Metaphors, such as makes almost an Allegory if not a Riddle of the Stile, no Poetical words or descriptions, nor any other language, but that of Business; very few Epithets, & only such as contain an Argument; not even those pretty little flowers which were
thought to be Suitable to the Oratorial Stile, & with which Isocrates his Cotemporary so much abounds, I mean the ὑμικός, & the ἐνόμωμος, & such like figures, by which the Ear is so much soothed, & Prose acquires something like the regular cadence of Poetry. The Antithesis itself, that favourite figure of all ornamented writings, he uses but very seldom, & in such a way that we hardly perceive it; & yet there is more Art, more variety & true Elegance of Composition in his Orations than in any other Prose Writing I know. But the Art is so conceal'd, that tho' you feel the [p. 10th.] effect of it, you must be an Artist yourself to find it out, And if those orations please us so much in the Reading, tho' it's impossible we can have the delicacy of an Attick Ear, & therefore all the harmony of the numbers of his periods, which Dionysius the Halicarnassian has been at so much pains to explain to us, must be in a great measure lost upon us, what a wonderfull effect they must have had upon the people of Athens, when delivered by the orator himself, with all that force of pronunciation & Action, which he possest in so eminent a degree.

The highest praise that perhaps ever was bestowed upon Demosthenes, & which at the same time, shows more evidently than all that the Halicarnassian has said the singular beauty of his composition is a Speech which Lucian has put into the mouth of Jupiter in Imitation of an Oration of Demosthenes. The beginning of it, is a Parody of that oration, but when the Parody can no longer be carried on Jupiter stops short, & here says he Demosthenes fails me; & then he goes on in what would be reckoned good composition, if it were not sett beside that of
Demosthenes; but compared with it, hardly appears tolerable. 34

The Historical Stile is still farther removed from the Poetical, for the purpose of History is simple truth, nor does it apply like Rhetorick to the Opinions & Passions of Men (a.) But the antients by mixing Harangues with the narrative, have given it the beauty & variety of Rhetorical composition, but they have taken great care, not to mix the two Stiles, & nothing for example can be more different than the Stile of Thucydides' Narrative & of his Orations. Our modern historians having given up the practice of inserting Orations in their histories, & thinking plain narrative dull & tedious, & not sufficient to show their Abilities as Writers, have [p. 11th.] formed a very

(a.) Aristotle in the 1st. chap. of his 3d. Book of Rhetorick, says that the Art consists of three things, first Fact & Argument, or as he expresses it αὐτὰ τὰ πραγμάτεια, then the Diction or manner of Expressing things, & lastly the Action & Pronunciation, which he calls θεωρηκῆς, which last says he is the most powerfull of all; but as he says afterwards διὰ τῆς μοιχῆς τὴν ἡκοιτίδας, 35 for to Men of Sense, nothing more is required than to say the thing plainly; and if their Ears are not offended, they will not desire that they shou'd be pleased. Then he adds ἂν δὲς ὁ δεῦρος μεσσος δοξάσας τῆς πραγμάτεως τὸς πρὸς τὴν Ἡρώκην ὡς ὅρθως ἅλτος ἄλλος ἐν ἀνοιξέω τῆς ἐπιμέλειας πολιτείαν.
strange kind of Historical Stile, mixt almost of every kind of
Stile, being partly Poetical, partly Rhetorical, partly
Didactick, & but the smallest part of it Historical.

The Author who has led the way to this Motely kind of
Composition is an Antient, who has much more Reputation for the
matter of his history, than I think he ought to have, but who
deserves none at all for his Stile, I mean Tacitus. He is the
Parent of the broken disjointed Composition, of which I have
spoken already, of short shrewd Sentences, containing Oracles
of Wisdom, as is commonly thought, but most preposterously
intemmixt with the Narrative; & also of Poetical description
in history. Of which last I shall only give one example
among many which might be given, from that passage describing
the field of battle, where Varus & his Legions fell.

Does not this put every Reader in mind of the passage
in Virgil

Hic Dolopus manus, his saevus tendebat Achillea,
Classibus his locus. and the only difference is, that Tacitus' description is more
circumstantial, & therefore more Poetical.

I am very sensible how different this my Judgement of Tacitus
is from that of the many; but I am not ashamed to say with Milton
that what I esteem in matters of Stile & Composition is very different
from what passes for best among them. What profuse Commendations
have been bestowed by some modern Critics upon Quintus Curtius
history of Alexander the Great; And yet it appears to me the
perfect model of a vitiated poetical Stile. And it is
undoubtedly the work of some unbratilis Doctor in the School
of Declamation who out of the many different Reports about Alexander chose not what was best attested, but what was most marvellous, as the fittest subject whereupon to display his Rhetorical talents; So that the work is truly as contemptible for the matter as for the Stile; And yet I do not wonder that it shou'd be much admir'd by those who are so fond of Tacitus; for it is very probable that they are of the same Age, & they have both form'd their Taste of Writing in the School of Declamation.

Qui bavium non odit, ainet tua carmina Maevi. W 41

The Epistolary Stile shou'd have nothing neither of the Poetical or Rhetorical; neither [p. 12th.] should it have the Gravity, Dignity, or flowing composition of the Historical. It shou'd be very concise, with little or no Ornament; & it's chief virtue is that Character of Stile which the Antients called the Ethick, & which I have explain'd elsewhere.

The Didactick Stile rejects almost every kind of Ornament, especially those of the Poetick kind, & requires nothing, but clearness, method, & brevity; for every thing Superfluous in teaching does hurt. The greatest model of this kind of Writing, is Aristotle, who is said also to have excell'd in the Epistolary stile, which of all others comes the nearest to the Didactick. But we are not to imagine that the acroamatick works of Aristotle as they are call'd, such as the Books of Analyticks are models of the Didactick Writing. For they never were intended for Publication, & are to be considered only as a kind of Class books, containing very shortly the Substance of what he explain'd at more length to his Scholars; & therefore it is that those Books have neither Preface nor Epilogue.
But if we would study Aristotle for his Stile (& he was admired for that too by the Antients) we must go to his Exoterick works, such as his Books of Rhetorick; & his Treatise of Morals addrest to Nicomaschus, both which he intended for Publication.

[endorsement]

[KW] No. 227.

[M] Of the Poetical Stile.
Apparatus Criticus

1. Popular, <Fine> 2. such as ... & Poetry; 3. <those Arts we> 4. MS: Painting 5. and also ... Orchestic Art. <|->
6. <of our> 7. <Versification> 8. <which gives us pleasure, as all our knowledge> 9. <Beau> 10. <Idea, in ->>
11. (M) It is ... tell you<and> 12. we<-> 13. <we> 14. <of> 15. make<made> 16. <are Beauties of another>
<is a Beauty of a higher> 17. <the> 18. <any<either>
27. <Euphonia> 28. <than> 29. <Musicall> 30. first<before
I do that> 31. <of> 32. I am ... a Poem. 33. in<of>
34. in Greece, 36. <Poems> 36. <th> 37. or<or>
38. Poetry<Tragedy> 39. q <could 40. & 41. Conclusion
<end> 42. else<where> where: CS. 43. <Now, as ... be a
<and not a very> 44. Magnitude<Length> 45. MS: ποετικής
46. MS: ποετικής 47. <really 48. <many> 49. a Writer<one>
50. <which I ... well known, 51. <the> 52. <the Subj>
53. <proper, 54. At the ... paper Apt, 55. <vist, <was>
56. and consuming it, 57. of Affairs, 58. <came>
59. two<one> 60. Servant s 61. <came> 62. MS: Kingdom<and Estate.
63. (M) <where I ... can have> 64. τελευτησεν 65. <but, 66. much, 67.<higher>
68. (a)/(a) ... Cap. 2 69. <the> 70. Actions and, 71. Poetry and ... imitative
Arts,<Poetry,> 72. or Ways 73. (M) (B)/(B) ... Cap. 24.
74. <mere> 75. <Poetry>: CS. 76. MS: <post> 77. As Aristotle ...

of Poetry. 78. or <m> 79. being <and was>

80. our Pantomimes 81. <the Rhythm of> 82. <by>

83. <m> 84. in some sort 85. <I have seen> 86. that was . . . for Music 87. vist. 88. (b <a>) 89. (M) & as . . . of Imagination. 90. <promised> 91. <?-->

92. <sometimes> 93. <the> in some of their Entertainments; such as> 94. or Statuary 95. themselves 96. <the>

97. MS: Rhythm 98. (M) And Poetry . . Language wants. 99. <mu>; CS. 100. <great> 101. <therefore> 102. <?-->

103. Randolph. 104. was acquainted <knew all which I have here mentioned it> 105. <several> 106. the whole <it>

107. <I cannot chuse a better example [p. 41] to illustrate this than the fine> 108. in Discourse. 109. After this . . . betwixt her <While She> 110. She goes . . . there come <are thus discoursing come> 111. those <those> 112. it is impossible, 113. so gradually <in Such a Way> 114. As much . . .

the Mother, 115. was 116. taken altogether . . . the Discovery. <I think is one of the greatest Beauties of this Scene.> 117. <A>edipus 118. <but> 119. from <for>

120. (M) <Gallant Norvall <Very Young Man> 121. And makes . . .

Antient or Modern and which I think gives the Discovery an [p. 46] Advantage over all the other Discoveries in Antient Plays, where the event was joyfull, such as the Electra of Euripides.> 122. (MW) Discovery <Circumstance>
Ch. 1

1. <fir> 2. ^or<And> 3. MS: be be 4. ^ingenious Mind<Ear at least to the learned Ear Mind [p. 2] as well as> 5. Romans <Greeks> 6. <the> 7. (a)/(a) As the ... Ambitus. & c. 8. ^1<0> 9. ^237. ^10.<or> 11. of which ... principal part 12. <do not please> 13. <Prose th or> 14. ^1mo. 15. & Aristotle ... Cap. 8. ^16. to, 17. more than ... Motion is<two Motions, at least are> 18.<& it is the pronunciation> 19. MS: What [M's note to printer makes it clear that "Which" is intended.] 20. Rhythms 21.<It is a> 22. (KW) as to imagine that 23. not 24. (KW) all the Arts that he now practices, <by Instinct those Arts which we See the Brutes practise;> 25.<I believe> 26.<sunk> 27.<artfull artf> 28. ^believe<Suppose> 29. (KW) (a)/(a) This Notion ... of Birds. 30. in the ... of the<with a View to the> 31.<not with> 32. the narrow View in which it is commonly Studied> 32. with<in> 33. <those People> 34. (^k<and>) 35.<with> 36. (KW) (a)/(a) This is ... Caspian Seas. 37.<mu> 38. Whether they ... the Syllables. 39.<Compo> 40. (KW) ^form a ... of Art, <Articulate> 41. ^Single 42. ^The first ... onlyMonosyllables ^The first Languages spoken by Men were no better than Wild Cries broken and distinguished by some Articulate Sound. And hence it is that the Words of all The barbarous Languages are very long, tho very defective in Articulation, wanting the use of many Letters;
But when Men began to form a Language of Art, they must have
begun with analysing Articulation into its Elemental Sounds; for
Analysis is the beginning of all [p. 8.] Arts & Sciences.
Having thus got the Elements of Speech, they would combine these
Elements into Syllables; [This cancelled passage was originally
the introductory section of the inserted passage "And there . . .
& Rhythm." (see 53.)*] 43. <at once> 45. <wants
and 46. <did> 47. <either of> 48. <so> 49. <in
Egypt.> 50. <we have> 51. <to have been> 52. <the>
53. <And there . . . & Rhythm.> 54. <which>
55. <(for the Genius of the Chinese does not appear to me to be
inventif)> 56. <and a> 57. <the> 58. MS: lilkarnassian?
59. <that> 60. <I have> 61. MS: is is 62. <the> 63. <KW>
so clear,> 64. <the Greeks> 65. <Such> 66. <KW> falls
<rises to> 67. <KW> from the first to<upon> 68. <and
Architecture> 69. <that> 70. <descri>: CS.
71. <KW> Now is . . . other Art.> 72. <th> 73. <or>
74. <to the North> 75. <I have Oberserved> 76. <who>
77. <it>
78. <even> 79. MS: shall shall 80. <I oun> 81. <The Rythme . . .
I speak) 82. <or of the feet which they compose> 83. <&
these feet> 84. MS: Elevan 85. <the> 86. <Verse as>
87. <KW> Demosthenes <him> 88. <ch>

Ch. 2

1. Ratio<n> 2. <or to . . . Sometimes Short> 3. <the
the ear> 7. <KW> way> 8. <old> 9. <& I . . . So marked
10. <in> 11. the 12. a 13. ratio(a) 14. <th> 15. <diff>
16. <ex> & 17. <?-> 18. <of S> 19. <that> 20. <of>
21. <could> 22. <was> 23. <Sensibl> 24. <a greater Stop
because> 25. host<s> 26. (KW) prostrate<Spread> 27. the<his>
28. <a> 29. <whi> 30. (KW) There is ... the Image.
31. (KW) word Embower<Embwr> 32. as I have Observed
33. the 34. & when they. The> 35. <Thus> 36. (KW) of
their ... et aure< of their finger, beating time as it were
to it. And in this Way I understand Horace where he Says
Legitimumque Sonum & c.> 37. <our> 38. <by th> 39. <by>
40. (KW) (E) 41. (KW) No. 1. (E) 42. MS: Midde 43. <thr^>CS.
44. (KW) See also ... three pages. 45. oftner I ... 
Greek or Latin. 46. is 47. <breaks in> 48. each of
49. <we> 50. <att> 51. <even> 52. <of> 53. made<made>
54. <Period> 55. <or M> 56. to, 57. whereas<as> 58. or
<&> 59. <mu>:CS. 60. <of all Diction> 61. [p. 11.] Horace
too ... very much<and from Virgill you [p. 13] may take the
following. Me vero primum Dulces ante Omnia Musae & c.? There
is a great deal of the same kind in Horace 62> 62. There is ...
in Horace<||The Variety last menti> 63. (KW) in<as>
64. shaw 65. <the> 66. <Terminations of> 67. give<s>
68. <Violent> 69. MS: in in 70. MS: Rhythm 71. (KW) been
72. at this day.

Ch. 3

1. <tho' by far> 2. MS: Rhythm 3. (KW) whrch 4. <of -?->
5. <th> 6. MS: interals 7. (KW) There is ... of Sounds.
8. MS: Rhythm 9. (KW) own, <s> 10. MS: there is
11. thing 12. what we call 13. Hexameter 14. <or at
most two> 15. (KW) Syllables <es> 16. our 17. Tityre
<Styrum> 18. (KW) and even . . . than long. 19. MS: Question
Question 20. it 21. <think> 22. (KW) the Subject 23. <-?->
24. <igna>

Ch. 4

1. <ifor> 2. Latin 3. <much> 4. (KW) But if . . . certain
that 5. <therefor> 6. (KW) or <&> 7. MS: Rhythm
8. MS: Languages 9. in all Languages 10. proper <necessary>
11. in pl. 12. <& mak Sa> 13. they have . . . & now.
14. <tone> 15. (KW) The French . . . of them. 16. in his . . .
of Terence. 17. Accent 18. <A>ts autem sive elevatio
19. <to pronounce the first foot> 20. (KW) But before . . .
as long. 21. 238 <1(a)> 22. (KW) top of . . . No. 238
<top of p. 18.No. 1> 23. in 24. MS: Disyllable 25. <My
Second> 26. (KW) Dactyle <Spondee> 27. for as . . . have
mention'd. 28. if it were not the Verse would be altogether
Spoil'd. 28. <hs> 29. & procumbit humi Bos. 30. <it>
31. & the . . . be given. 32. <s> 33. (KW) And indeed . . .
Antient Verse. 34. <together> 35. <-?-> We> 36. (KW) We
cannot . . . same tone. 37. <upon> 38. Word <W Verse>
39. <four> 40. <together> 41. un accented 42. <b>
43. & also . . . unaccented interposed 44. time<s>
45. <Stamp> 46. Stop <unaccented Syllable> 47. Teg<m>
48. <Inter> 49. <Intervall> 50. the 51. the 52. are
53. MS: with with 54. <distinguish'd &> 55. <P> CS. 56. <Now> 57. therefore. 58. MS: Beaty 59. MS: Beaty 60. I do . . . it, is. 61. <but> 62. for this reason. because the articulate Sounds of the Language are not near So Sweet & So agreeably Varied as those Sounds in Greek & Latin, & for another reason, viz.> 63. <tw> 64. or rather discrimination. 65. discrimination. 66. <Stop> distinction. 67. < intervals> 68. Heroic. 69. <& Spondaic> 70. From what . . . Syllable itself. 71. <what I have Said> 72. <there is not> 73. This I . . . true. For 74. <f> 75. <KW> be long. 76. <account> 77. (KW) so arbitrary. 78. into. 79. (KW) 80. from our Infancy. 81. &<A> 82. of. 83. &<A> 84. <it> 85. <should> 86. &<A> 87. <&> 88. <-?-> 89. 47<46> 90. <fixing> 91. arbitrary. 92. (KW) as if a person. 93. <but> 94. <-?-> 95. better. 96. word. 97. from what . . . Word Fides. 98. <in> 99. <but read . . . of it.> 100. But<and> 101. <a t> 102. <&> 103. only. 104. of their own composing. 105. upon a certain Day. 106. to all this. 107. (KW) approve of<af> 108. <either> 109. <wh within> 110. (KW) Verona<Verona> 111. <needs have> 112. <agt> 113. <in> 114. (KW) Thurlowe. 115. <are> 116. <neglect>: CS. 117. <of Body wi> 118. <learning> 119. <what> 120. (KW) properly. 121. <-?-> 122. <ill Spoken> 123. <the> 124. <dict> 125. <for I . . . an Orator> 126. the best . . . ever wrote. 127. <exhibiting> 128. <pronoun>: CS. 129. (KW) In short . . . of Milton. 130. <di> 131. <\> 132. & besides . . . thro' Life, 133. 0<\o>n 134. <are So m> 135. (KW) as it is said.
136. <say> 137. (Kw) / Government & 138. MS: a a 139. <the>
140. <upon whose Lips> 141. <Hon> 142. And if . . . would
wait. 143. <it> 144. (M) / Geography <Geometry> 145. And
which . . . Young Scholar.
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Ch. 1

1. Contents. Chap. 1 . . . the pronunciation — 2. <long
Syllables,> 3. by far 4. <short, and> 5. and either . .
call them. 6. I allow to be <are> 7. in Sounds 8. our
9. <it is> 10. accented 11. as the Antients had
12. neither <we> 13. And that . . . to Man; 14. <the>
15. <their> 16. having <as they have> 17. W <when

Ch. 2

1. <Of the different ways> 2. <very> 3. Examples of . .
from Virgil. 4. Chap. 2 . . . Slower Motion —
5. Music <Rhythm> 6. <several>; CS. 7. <See also . . . called
Accent. 8. also 9. Poetry <Language> 10. <as I have
shown,> 11. besides the . . . there is, <besides the Stops
at the end of every Word, and those which the Sense may require,
there is > 12. as to . . . English Verse 13. <the>
14. tedious <tedious> 15. any smaller . . . Number of <fewer>
16. commonly 17. That there . . . is distinguished
immediately after that after immediately after 18.

only filled . . . single Monosyllable 21.

Stop of . . . sense requires third stop is that which the Sense makes necessarily if it . . . even when

but it . . . be a not a very Verse

(a)/(a) See . . . kind given. An example given in a Treatise upon Verse by one Mason; but why it offends the Ear so much the Author does not appear to know.

But the greatest beauty of all in our blank Verse is the Liberty it allows of running the Verses into one another; by which means Milton has composed in Verse the finest periods that we have in English, [The second half of insertion "And here . . . in English," was cancelled by insertion 45.]

And I . . . often wanting.

And here lyes the great difficulty of reading such Verse; for the Verses must be [p. 19] so pronounced, that both the Verse shall be marked, and the Sense carried on. But when so read, it makes the greatest Beauty of blank Verse; for it is by composing his Verse in that way that Milton has made the finest periods in English; Virgil's composition . . . the Aeneid, the Composition very beautifull, where very beautifull; And the . . . the Georgics, all the "a?" Odes, my And I . . . Ear my are a difference,
<a variety> 58. a difference . . . the Number, 59. such as . . .
ποτ άρετόν 60. <a utre emptω> 61. <the> 62. more<more>
63. <every>

Ch. 3

1. <L> Allegro 2. of it 3. <they> 4. Italian 5. <was>
6. Chapt. 3 . . . upon Milton 7. called Metre . . . the Word
8. (a)/(a) The . . . the Greeks 9. (< 10. and accordingly . . . Arabian Cyphers,.) 11. as I . . . well informed
12. That the . . . called Alliterations 13. <and I think . . . upon the Subject> 14. tender<pleasant>
15. in the first Line<Cradle> 16. is disjoined<is disjoined> 17. <that> 18. there is a Vacation<in an English>
to be> 24. <nothing> 25. <that> 26. <part> <p. 27>
catch-word "particularly".] 27. I think<is> 28. <at certain stated intervals> 29. Now it . . . for them 30. That a . . . was so<How so> 31. <a Man> 32. MS: subjated 33. <such>
34. And at . . . Alexandrine Line 35. in the same Piece
36. <till he comes to> 37. <Alegro?> 38. See 39. Here the . . . in English 40. and also . . . the Verse.
41. of 42. <with>: CŚ. 43. <good> 44. <them>
45. and of . . . same measure 46. Dialogue betwixt<History of> 47. MS: Saviours ["s" uncancelled by mistake.
48. and Satan,<trial such as we have it 49. in the Gospels>
49. it 50. the Subject . . . Heroic Poem.) 51. <Machinery>
52. as I call it. 53. as I . . . said elsewhere. 54. <attempted>
55. MS: amnuerint 56. of Milton 57. (K5) six <two> 58. We
have . . . or no. 59. a. 60. <person> 61. <of t> 62. MS:
entitled 63. neither 64. <from> from 65. any <no>
66. much less <not nor> 67. (K5) are very good 68. without,
69. Plot. 70. that is . . . of Milton. 71. repeat <add>
72. <an Observation I have already made> 73. and I . . .
already made,> 74. (a) [No footnote.] 75. as great . . .
to be, 76. (K5) still <yet> 77. (K5) not im <properly
78. another <an> 79. Horace makes . . eminent Degree
80. Lastly <To conclude> 81. a Writer and as 82. <that>
83. <improper> 84. <> 85. <And first as to Syllables: The p
86. <for otherwise a Work consisting of any Number> 87. <with a
perfect Monotony> 88. even the most barbarous 89. has <has
90. Rhythm or 91. as we call it 92. Mon<syllables
93. great Art of Language> 94. by words 95. in them,
96. and all the Beauty 97. the beauty of 98. What <which
99. <chief 100. MS: than it 101. not im <very >properly
102. should be a conformity <must be an Agreement> 103. are,
104. they, 105. <of our <the> 106. and also in <or>
107. what I have to say 108. one Sound of 109. both
110. which as it is 111. in Comus <also of his>
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1. & 2. <succeed> 3. a hundred . . . years ago 4. <there are
many who think they have found out> 5. <t>
Ch. 1

1. <of the .. fictitious one - 3. Poetry<it>
2. Verse<es> 5. especially if it be 6. <I> 7. in which ..

11. Every Poem .. but not<To make a Poem therefor a tale or Story is Absolutely necessary, and not> 12. <in it>
13. we have viz<1. <it would> 15. tho'<&> 16. very
17. however Surprising .. might be 18. <th> 19. (a)/(a)

It is .. well understood, 20. <Characters or Sentiment>
21. & it .. not intelligible.

Ch. 2

1. -<A> 2. (KW) 2d. Objections .. John Falstaff.<
3. <are> 4. <one> 5. <to either> 6. change.<metamorphosis>
7. <them<the> 8. <has>1CS. 9. in it 10. <teaching>
11. <is> 12. (KW) <But tho’ .. direct manner<If a
Treatise upon any Art or Science> 13. I say .. in Painting
14. <&> 15. <of> 16. (M) <that in .. really happen’d.<the real fact,> 17. <than to make only an old Story new,>
18. <an old Story> 19. (M) To make .. have described.<To make in this way a new Story of an old I think is better than to make it wholly new, I mean to invent it altogether;> 20. that his .. may have<to give> 21. in it<to his Piece> 22. To explain .. observed that 23. tho' none .. to us.

27. <live> 28. (KW) But will ... goes before.

29. Dramatick and <a pretty little Drama, which> 30. <which is ... naturall Conclusion, <where there is a Plot wrought up

31. & very agreeably & naturally unravelled.> 32. & Story telling.

33. MS: Mecaenus 33. MS: Vulteius 34. This, which>

35. not 36. ridiculous 37. <Fac> 38. <can> 39. <of which>

40. <of> 41. being no ... of it <are but appendages>

42. <or> 43. <first> 44. <rig> 45. <invent> <contrive>

46. was 47. <is>

Ch. 3

1. We even ... be read. 2. <If> 3. (KW) 3d. Of ... be Epigrams. 4. <other Stiles, of Prose> 5. (KW) (Notandum)

Take ... p. 3d. 6. (M) (by which ... & Desires). 7. <for it is more> 8. ^Men existed ... one another. <Music was prior to

Speech, and that [p. 4] Men communicated their wants and desires to one another by different Modulations of the Voice as we see

the Brutes very much vary their tones in order to express what they mean, I think it is evident that when Men, 9 invented

Articulation> [The second half of insertion 8., "man being ... invented Articulation", was cancelled by insertion 10.]

9. different Modulations ... when Men, <Musical tones, as we see that the Brutes when they do that, vary very much their
tones, according to what they mean to express, it is evident, that when they> 10. (M) & as ... their Words, <man being

naturally a more musicall Animal than any of the beasts we
know. Now after they had invented Articulation [p. 4] they would not altogether give up their Musical Language, but would continue still to give Melody and Rhythm to their Words, of which . . . the sequel. those figures . . . by which . . .

11. of what kind the Verse of the Northern Nations was, has been explained by Others. All I shall say upon the Subject is that however barbarous their Poetry appears to have been it seems to have been better than their Music. Their musicall parts being, as I have elsewhere observed, very bad. What I shall say therefor upon Verse, will be confin'd to the Greek & Latin Verse, & to the Verse in the modern Languages of Europe.

15. MS: is is 16. difference betwixt . . . one another <ratio of the long Syllable to the Short, which was as two to One, but> 18. the long <it> 19. <al> 20. See upon . . .

Greek Verse. 21. <but> 22. <mis> 23. <And> 24. <regularity> 25. (KW) have <-> 26. the long Vowell <it> 27. <Posit>

28. they <these> 29. This Variety . . . different Lenghts. In the first place they use feet of Different Lenght, not only in the same Stanza, but in Some kinds of Poetry in the same Verse,

30. 31. that he . . . Lege Solutis. 31. <who has Such Variety> 32. But <2o> 33. (a)/(<a) See p. 10. Ibid. 34. <As the Greek Language was form'd by Poets & their first Writings were in Verse, their Language was more than any other fitted for Verse, & the antient Poets Such as Homer in Order to give a Variety of Rhythm to their Words & So adapt them to the Verse in which they wrote added took away or changed Letters, making a Short Vowell long which was done either by repeating the Vowell & saying AA instead of A, or by Adding another Vowell to it & making a Diphthong
of it, nor was this taking any extraordinary Liberty but proceeding
in the Way the whole Language was form'd. See the above
Dissertation on the Stile of Homer. p. 79^1> 35. (than othe)
36. or taking ... Short Syllable) of a Consonant to the End of
a Syllable, you make a> 37. (the) 38. (of) 39. (b) 40. (first)
41. There is a As in this> 42. Dissyllable 43. are 44. (of)
45. or break 46. the Caesura> 47. (th) 48. or 49. (th)
50. various & ... the most 51. I am persuaded 52. (KW) And
it ... this pleasure (It was for this reason I believe)
53. (Sir) 54. (M) by Verses 55. (M) were was> 56. (M) They
were (It was a> 57. (M) verse s> 58. (of) 59. (Sul)
60. MS: Slulled 61. (M) & we ... laugh'd at or of more by
the contraction and running together of Vowels. But if there
were more than the 15. Syllables without such contraction, the
Verses were said to be πoλυτόδες, and were [p. 29(2)] despised as
Eustathius informs us (a)/(a). Eustathius' Com. on Iliad 1. p. 11.
62. (M) (b)/(b) ... much better 63. (if the com) 64. (bot)
65. (KW) And I ... however (bot) But the Rhythme
66. (KW) But this ... however, bot But there is One kind of
Rhythme which our Ears perceive & which fills them most agreeably.
This kind of Composition> 67. (if well composed) 68. MS:
Comprehension 69. (of) 70. By teaching ... Poeta figurat
71. (as I have inform'd) 72. or repeat 73. (KW) that
Boys ... proper use <to learn by Rule & Study as a Science,
that of which after we have learn'd it, we never can (74 the
proper Use:) 74. Caret in MS. 75. Epigramm ([e?])s 76. (leads)
1. Of English Versification - Rhyme continues still to be much practiced in England - The two Rhyming Poets of greatest Reputation are Dryden and Pope - Comparison of these two - The best of all Rhyming Poems in English is Thomson's Castle of Indolence - The Words there as well Chosen as possible, tho' the Poet was fettered by Triplet and Quadruplet Rhymes, as well as by the Common Distich Rhyme - He writes a Marot Stile in English, - which is very beautifull - His Stanza's are periods of Nine Lines in place of two, the common length of a Sentence in Rhyming Poetry - Of Blank Verse in English - Not only our long Verse may be composed without Rhyme, but short Lyric Verse - For Blank Verse Poetry a Variety of Accentuation is absolutely necessary - The Custom of Drawing back the Accent to the Antepenult Syllable is very prejudicial to this kind of Poetry. 

5. Of Rhyme 

6. Of Poetry

7. like the French Language

8. I come 

9. I come now to speak of Modern Versification, the chief ornament of which is commonly thought to be Rhyme, the invention, as it is said, of the Arabians, who first brought it into Europe. But be that as it will, it is certain that the western Nations of Europe had no other Poetry during the barbarous Ages. That it must have been invented by a Nation who either spoke a Language
having no Rhythm, or if it [p. 35] had,> 9.<I think is evident.
And I think it is also evident that our Northern Ancestors were
such a People.> 10. <Leter> 11. <(c)/(c).> p. 167> 12. The
Greeks ... despises me.> 13. < contrary 14. < sweet flowing>
15. MS: Armament 16. G <commiss 17. < for example>
18. < conduct> 19. G < common 24. < and Triplet 25. un <known>
26. <stanzas> 27. < three> 28. < and not ... fourscore
29. < I think > 30. < but > 31. G < omnis>
32. G<38> [This and subsequent renumberings of pages were necessitated
by the replacement of MP 232, pp. 33 - 36 (which are now missing)
by pp. 33 - 42 in KW's hand.] 33. (KW) [p. 33d.] Cap. 4. . . .
and Rhyme, <4334> Still a whole System of Morall Philosophy
Such as Popes Essay<35> on Man, all in Rhyme I should disapprove
very highly of the constant use of Rhyme in long Works if it were
more easy than it is. But to Ryme well is certainly very difficult
& it is a grievous Bondage to which Poets are Subjected, when instead
of Studying the Sense & Sentiments, a proper Ornaments of Diction,
they are Obliged to beat about for Rhymes not Duets only but
Tripletts Sometimes, & even Quadruplets When English Poetry
began to take a regular form, We follow'd the Italian Fashion of
Versifying, Italy being then the Country in Europe which was the
Standard for Wit & Learning. Spencer<36> therefor wrote his Fairy
Queen in the Octavo Rimo Verse, the same in which Tasso writes
his Epic Poem of Hierosolyma Liberates, but Spenser made a great
improvement upon it in my Opinion, by the Addition of the
Alexandrine Line to the Italian Stanza. But it added considerably
to the difficulty of the Ryme; for it made a Quadruple in Spenser's
Stanza which is not in the Italian; for there is there only two
Triplets and one common Rhyme of two Lines.\textsuperscript{37} Even the free Spirit & elevated Genius of Milton, such is the prevalence of Fashion, Submitted to write The Italian Sonata\textsuperscript{39} Verse, consisting of 14 Lines, in the first eight of which there are no more but two Rhymes So that there are two Quadruplets, and in the last six there are only two Rhymes, which makes two Triplets. So that here is the most grievous bondage of Rhyming that can well be imagined, especially if we consider that all the Rhymes in Italian are Double, that is of two Syllables, a burden, which in English Verse we are not subjected to, tho we sometimes use it. But the rest of Milton undertook and accordingly in his 14 Lines he has but four Rhymes making two Quadruplets and as many Duplets.\textsuperscript{6} A Poetry such as this which cramps the Genius of the Poet so much cannot be good. And accordingly Milton's Sonnets are commonly reckoned the worst of his Poetical Compositions, tho' I think some of them are good, such as that upon his blindness; but in my Opinion it would have been better if there had been no Rhyme at all in it,\textsuperscript{41} but he has\textsuperscript{42} Succeeded very much better in his imitation of the Italian Poetry in his\textsuperscript{43} Comus where\textsuperscript{44} 

\[34. (KW) 35. (of) 36. Spenser 37. (of) 38. (of) 39. (of) 40. (of) 41. (of) 42. (of) 43. (of) 44. (of)\]
Rhine, & Rhyme, Sir Henry Wotton, See what...<Ant. Metaph. p.> 47. MS: Rymor 48. or to...
propicre Dei 49. Still 50. Still 51. 45<39> 52.<to which I will only add, that all their Rymes are double that is of
two Syllables which makes ziming in that Language Still more
difficult.> 53. MS: Hemistichis 54. <-?-> 55. <thump>
56. MS: give 57. appears to...certain Dances. <has not the
Effect of relieving my Ear of the Disgust occasion'd by the constant
Clink & it must add very much to the Difficulty of the performance,>
58. 4<6<0> 59. MS: Varia

Ch. 5

1.<Compared> 2. (KW) Chap. 5...than Milton's 3.<So
often> 4.<has> 5<-?-> 6.<air<turn> 7.<Dryden too...
your Muses 8. 47<41> 9.<but if it> 10.<re_conciled
11.<Points & Turns<& quaint Conceits> 12.<where (a)/(a)>
[Insertion 15. was originally a footnote.] 13.<added to his
Stanza> 14.<(a)/(a)> 15. (KW) which is...excellent use. <
the Reader, who is fond of Rime will find plenty but with all the
Variety that Ryme is capable of, for you have there all the
Rymes of the Italian Octavo Rimo [p. 46] & Sonato with the Addition
of the Alexandrine at the End of the Stanza made by Spenser. This
must have cost the Author prodigious Labour much greater than that
of any Italian Poet composing in the same kind of Verse, as the
Italian Language abounds much more even in Double Rimes than the
English does in Single yet> 16. (KW) where every...and
Quadruplets 17. 4<8<2> 18. of Spencer 19. rest<Stand>
20. \( \text{which is to be f} \) 21. \( (a)/(a) \) See p. 235. of this Vol. \( \text{[i.e. D\&F IV.]} \) 22. \( \text{well} \) 23. \( \text{[another?]} \) 24. \( (KW) \) He has . . . Rhyming Verse 25. \( \text{from which} \) 26. 4 9 3 27. \( \text{Ante}\)pennut 28. \( (M) \) of Rhythms & Tones 29. \( (a)/(a) \) See Warton's . . . p. 415. 30. \( \text{But Milton is the first} \) 31. \( (M) \) much 32. \( \text{the Poets} \) 33. \( \text{as much or perhaps} \) 34. \( (M) \) of our 35. \( \text{Antient or Modern} \) 36. \( (M) \) See the Halicarnassian 37. \( (M) \) & it . . . 12 Syllables 38. \( (M) \) or more Successfully 39. \( \text{and Variety} \) 40. \( \text{which must have given them a Variety and} \) a Beauty 41. \( (M) \) time 42. \( \text{like} \) 43. \( \text{Sing Heavenly Muse} \) \( \text{Sing Heavenly Muse} \) 44. MS: it it 45. \( \text{third} \) 46. \( \text{fourth} \) 47. \( \text{fift} \) 48. \( \text{immediate} \) 49. \( \text{with} \) 50. \( \text{Words} \) 51. \( \text{but} \) 52. \( \text{has} \) 53. \( (M) \) old 54. \( \text{I mean his old mother} \) 55. \( (M) \) indeed 56. \( (M) \) not being able to \( \text{as we cannot} \) 57. \( \text{the} \) 58. Oblige 59. 2.6.4/9 60. \( \text{tho} \) 61. \( \text{in} \) 62. \( \text{time} \) 63. \( \text{halt} \) 64. \( \text{laid?} \) 65. seat 66. Vizt. Massinger 67. Be\( \text{e} \) 68. \( \text{insignificant} \) 69. \( (M) \) or the . . . of Poetry 70. Adverbs 71. \( \text{profit} \) 72. MS: possess 73. \( \text{the} \) 74. \( \text{conjunction} \) et 75. \( \text{another with} \) 76. \( \text{a third with} \) 77. \( \text{Iliad} \) 78. But Homer . . . fine versification 79. \( \text{And the same} \) observation app 80. \( \text{they had} \) 81. \( \text{our} \) 82. \( \text{an} \) 83. \( \text{o} \) 84. \( \text{There is . . . than pleases} \) \( \text{[MP 232, pp. 59(3) - 59(4) are catalogueed separately as MP Box 17, fol. 3.]} \) 85. \( \text{that} \) 86. \( (M) \) repeating an . . . p. 239. \( \text{observing} \) 87. \( (b)/(b) \) Rhetor. Lib. 3. Cap. 9 88. \( (M) \) Now that . . . he says \( \text{Now that will not be the case if the Whole is very small, and consequently the parts still smaller any more than if the Whole} \)
be too great, so that the parts are too many or two great to be comprehended by the Mind. [p. 60.] Aristotle therefore had good reason to say 89. MS: Animall Animal 90. <allmost imperceptible> 91. <\in> 92. <the One &> 93. <(a)> 94. also 95. a\n|\certain\96. <\What Aristotle says of a Period in 3d Book Cap. 9th of his Rhetorick is well worth> 97. MS: beutifull

Ch. 6

1. <\upon the> 2. < ||| (Text.) There is no poet that I know who has done this, except Mr Dryden in his Alexander's Feast, which for the Beauty of the Sentiments and Diction, and the Variety of the Versification, is the finest piece of Lyric Poetry in English. There is in it not only all the Variety of Rhymes and of long and short verse that can well be imagined, but also of the Measure of the Verse, which is most agreeably changed in different parts of the Ode, and exceedingly well suited to the different Sentiments. As the Beauty of his Versification has not I think been sufficiently attended to, I will beg leave to go thro' it with that view; and I think I will make it appear that the English Versification is capable of a still greater Variety than what I have observed in it. The first Stanza is all in common Iambic Measure with great Variety however of Long and short Verse, 5 down to the 3. of Rhymes and 4. Poetry & 5. with great ... short Verse, 6. And the ... the People. 7. 68. <12> 8. C\sc|\contains 9. a \sc|\the 10. 69. 13> 11. or half a foot 12. \c\ae|\common 13. \does 14. which if ... excellent effect 15. \the 16. 70. <14> 17. <Sal>: CS. 18. These Seven ...
great propriety. 19. Iambic 20. "And thrice he routed all his foes || And thrice he Slew the Slain." 21. being (which is by far) 22. and in . . . the King 23. 71. (15) 24. the 25. consisting only . . . a half; 26. which makes . . . of Syllables.

27. 0 change 26. into a (of the) 29. 72. (16) 30. (two) 31. foot an (feet) 32. Anapaestics 33. Second and . . . the last (third) 34. 73. (17) 35. (addressing the two last)

36. where the . . . called Lydian. 37. 74. (18) 38. 0 (s) are 39. very (more) 40. (than any hitherto mentioned)

41. in (te) terposed: GS. 42. as I said. 43. p. 75 has "end"; catch-word on p. 74 is "ended". 44. 75. (19) 45. (Then follows a verse of very uncommon measure) 46. 76. (20) 47. (Anap)

48. three (two) 49. (and an Iambic interposed betwixt them). 50. 77. (21) 51. 78. (22) 52. (other) 53. 79. (23)

54. as well . . . the beginning 55. 80. (24) 56. and indeed . . . know of (if not the only System) 57. 81. (25) 58. likewise

59. (Rhym) 60. And that . . . the Italian. 61. (shown)

62. 82. (26) 63. the French . . . that of (any Poetry in)

64. MS: no 65. MS: accepted 66. 83. (27) 67. And it . . . a Drum.

MP 227

1. MS: distinctly 2. (himself) 3. (as well as to the)
4. by the . . . of colour 5. (in) 6. 0 (T) ptick 7. in (on)
8. Like the . . . spotted globe: (mistakenly?) cancelled in MS.
9. that cover a Brook 10. which (that) 11. describing
<speaking of> 12. <?-> 13. assiduous 14. Ay <universal e <a)m
15. <Magnum> 16. <magnan> 17. <things that ... the Senses>
<such qualities as might be painted> 18. MS: ποδοκόκος
19. MS: κορυφαία η <πόσ> 20. MS: λοικολένης 21. such as ...
terrible & c. 22. It is ... & move. 23. MS: λοιος 24. ην \(s\)
25. MS: οίχνη Μαγνανωπόσ 26. <so> 27. <a variety <diversity> 28. <the>
29. Epideic<k>tick 30. <use, <choose> 31. by the use of 32. \& <of>
33. <must be in a great measure lost to us> 34. The highest ... appears tolerable. 35. MS: ηροκοκος 36. MS: δοκ. ὦς
37. εκλογής 38. MS: πολιτεία 39. in history 40. tendebat,
<ardebat> 41. I am ... carmina Maevi. 42. <th>
43. <No. 256>
Changes of Page in Marginal Insertions

98. . . . Articulation, it [p. 37*] had Melody . . .
121. . . . other Play [p. 46] Antient or . . .

MP 235:

Ch. 1: 38. . . . without Rythme [p. 7*] & I . . .
53. [p. 8*] And there . . . Chinese, who [p. 9] I believe,
   . . . Greek, which [p. 10*] it is . . .
71. . . . the Greeks [p. 11*] practiced an . . . which Antient [p. 12*] Writers have . . .

Ch. 2: 9. . . . Vowels are [p. 18] So marked . . .

Ch. 3: 7. . . . precisely the [p. 35] same with . . .

Ch. 4: 4. . . . not so [p. 40] much as . . .
15. . . . well as [p. 42*] we; but . . .
31. . . . System that [p. 20] has hitherto . . .
33. . . . of the [p. 21] Verse being . . .
60. . . . the Mind [p. 24*] perceives Beauty . . .
69. . . . filling up [p. 25] that Interval . . . if upon [p. 26*] a Drum . . . the Resemblance [p. 27*] very Compleat . . . unaccented Syllables [p. 28] must be . . . is not [p. 29] longer upon . . .

MP 241:

Ch. 2: 17. . . . the Sound [p. 13*] is distinguished . . .
55. . . . a Line [p. 20*] should only . . . Lines together [p. 21*] each of
Ch. 3: 70. be no [p. 45] Poeticall Exercise ... 

MP 232:

Ch. 2: 19. ... the World, [p. 10.3] things more ... 
Ch. 3: 8. ... wants and [p. 4] desires to ... 
10. ... indeed certain [p. 5] that they ... 
30. ... has made [p. 24] Horace Say ... 
Ch. 4: 12. ... in which [p. 36] the Goths ... 
57. or any [p. 46] other Instrument 
Ch. 5: 7. ... of that [p. 47] Variety which ... 
15. ... reader, who [p. 48] is fond ... of which 
[p. 49]
76. the case, [p. 60] it is ... be no [p. 61] Beauty.
This ... 

MP 227: 7. ... of that [p. 47] Variety which ...
Changes of Scribe in Marginal Insertions

MP 232:
Ch. 1: 2. ... historical Narrative – [KW] No Story ...
Ch. 2: 19. ... any thing [KW] else the ...
Ch. 3: 3. 3d. [M] Of the ... in Verse – [KW] of Verse ...
   66. ... same way. [M] Thus the ...
Ch. 4: 12. ... quoted Work. [M] See also ...
Ch. 5: 77. ... not mutilated. [KW] For this...
Notes

a. OEP VI.
b. Poetics IV.5. It was from the Poetics that Monboddo took the anecdote concerning Zeuxis (MP 243, p. 6).
c. "The beautiful."
d. George Lambert (1710 - 1765), scene-painter at Covent Garden Theatre, and founder of the Beefsteak Club.
e. "euphony."
g. Poetics I.11.
h. AM II, ii, 6.
j. Ars Poetica 240: "I shall aim for poetry moulded from the familiar."
k. των τε και μείζον αρετή τιμή τε βατή τε (Iliad IX.490): "and theirs withal is more excellent worth and honour and might."
l. Monboddo's normal spelling.
m. "in bare prose or in metres." Monboddo relied on an unsound text in reading ἔφοβος into the passage.
n. διὰ των σχηματιζομένων εὐθύων (Poetics I.vi): "by means of
rhythmical gestures."

o. Poetics I. b: "with rhythm alone."
p. "with unadorned rhythm"; perhaps a recollection of ταυς λογοσ ψιλος (Poetics I. 7).

q. Ἑραδ ώς XXX.
r. Livy VII. ii. 9.
s. Rhetoric III. i. 3.
t. O&P II, 304, n.
u. Douglas Act III.
v. "Tantum series innotetque pollet" (Horace, Ars Poetica 242): 
"such is the power of order and connection."

MP 235

Ch. 1

a. "rhythm alone, or unadorned rhythm"; c.f. Poetics I.
c. An approximation to άριθμοι παρ' ἑτεοικέ, "Everything relates to number," quoted in Sextus Empiricus' Adversus Mathematicos.
d. τοῦ σχηματος τῆς λέξεως δεθμος (Rhetoric III. viii. 2): "the number belonging to the form of diction."
e. A constant mis-spelling by Monboddo.
f. Kirkpatrick Williamson's marks indicating a passage to be incorporated in O&P. The following passages from this chapter were used, with modifications, in O&P:
"Quantity or . . ." (p. 3) -
"for it" (p. 3).

"as well . . ." (p. 4) -
"other Art" (p. 10).

"Mr Bevin . . ." (p. 6) -
"at Canton" (p. 6).

"but my . . ." (p. 9) -
"2 to 1" (p. 9).

"that in . . ." (p. 12) -
"their Senses" (p. 13).

"From this . . ." (p. 13) -
"numerous Prose" (p. 14).

5. See f.
6. Q&P IV.i.17.
7. See f.
8. See f.

1. Thomas Bevan, sent to Nanking in 1753; member of the Canton Select Committee; left China 1781. See H. B. Morse, The Chronicles

See f.

"quantity, or . . ." -
"for it"

(VI, 132 - 133).

"as well . . ." -
"other art"

(VI, 135 - 149).

"Mr Beving . . ." -
"at Canton"

(V, 444, n.).

"This information . . ." -
"two to one"

(V, 444, n.).

"that in . . ." -
"their senses"

(VI, 149 - 150).

"From this . . ." -
"numerous prose"

(VI, 158 - 159).

Joannes Sajnovics' Demonstratio idiomae Ungarorum et Lapponum idem esse (Hafniae, [1770]).


o. Thomas Burgess (1756 - 1837), Bishop of Salisbury. John Harford, in his Life of Thomas Burgess, D. D. (London: Longman, 1840), comments on Burgess's painstaking grammatical studies, observing that he "even submitted to the drudgery of committing to memory the whole of Nugent's Greek Primitives" (p. 9). For Monboddo's correspondence with Burgess, see Bodlean MS. Eng. Letters C. 133, ff. 136 - 89; C. 140, f. 46. Selections are included in Harford, pp. 43 - 48, 51 - 54, 73 - 79.


r. See f.

s. See f.

t. MP 235, Ch. 3 and 4.

u. See f.

v. See f.
b. "Quadripedante putrem sonitu quatit ungula campum" (Aeneid VIII.596): "with galloping tramp the horse-hoof shakes the crumbling plain."
c. οὖς ἐσείται πεδίνδε κυλὶνδετο λαος ἡ νεκρῆς (Odyssey XI.596):
then down again to the plain would come rolling the ruthless stone." Aristotle uses the same example (Rhetoric III.xi.3).
d. λαος ἡ νεκρῆς ὠδηκεποτε λοφον ἀλλι' ὑπε μελχολι (Odyssey XI.596):
"he would thrust the stone toward the crest of a hill; but as often as he was about to . . ." e. ταχυ μεντο ἐν ὀλυμ πολυ κινουμενον (Physics 218.b.17).
f. c.f. MP 240, p. 64, where Monboddo cites Iliad XI.130 as an example of such a spondaic line; c.f., too, PB 2, p. 71, where Monboddo notes Eustathius' having recorded seven such spondaic lines in Homer.
g. "Burnt after them to the bottomless pit" (Paradise Lost VI.866).
h. Monboddo repeatedly refers to the English heroic line as a hexameter. This may be due to the influence of Joshua Steele's proposed division of the iambic pentameter into six quasi-musical bars, and his conclusion that "our heroic lines are truly hexameters" (Steele, p. 27).
i. De Oratore III.186.
j. "Him first, him last, him midst, and without end" (Paradise Lost V.165).
k. "Thick as autumnal leaves that strow the brooks/ In Vallombrosa, where th'Etrurian shades/ High over-arch'd imbowr" (Paradise
1. "Rhetorick . . . To which Poetry would be made subsequent, or indeed rather precedent, as being less suttile and fine, but more simple, sensuous and passionate" (Of Education).

m. Ars Poetica 274: "and can catch the lawful rhythm with fingers and ear."


o. Aeneid I.8.

p. Noctes Atticae XVIII.xv.2. The "treatise" was part of Varro's lost Discipline.

q. O&F V, 455 - 66.

r. Georgics II.475: "But as for me - first above all, may the sweet Muses . . . ."

s. MP 235, Ch. 3.

t. MP 126 (missing); c.f. O&F VI, 456 - 73.

u. An imperfect recollection of two passages from Satires I.iv: "quod prius ordine verbum est,/ posterius facias, praeponens ultima primis,/ non . . . / invenias etiam disiecti membra poetae" (58 - 62, "if you put the opening words of the line at the end, placing last before first, you . . . will not find the remains of a poet, however dismembered") and a reference to comedy minus its metre as "sermo merus," "unadulterated prose" (48).

v. UR.

Ch. 3

a. "Tityre, tu patulâe recubâns sub tegmine fagi."

b. De Oratore III.xlvii.185; 1. 195 - 95.
Ch. 4


b. OAP IV.1.15.


d. OAP II, 333.

e. MP 237, p. 28(9).

f. Not in fact a Virgilian verse.

g. Aeneid V.481.

h. Eclogues I.1.

i. MP 237, pp. 6 - 7.

j. Ars Poetica 274; c.f. MP 235, Ch. 2, note m.

k. e.g. Magna Moralia I.xxxiv. c.f. AM II, 152.

l. Thomas Burgess (see MP 235, Ch. 1, note n.).

m. OAP II, 330 - 335.

n. For further details of this custom, see G. F. Russell Barker's chapter on Westminster in Great Public Schools (London: Edward Arnold, [1893]), pp. 221 - 56, especially pp. 245 and 256.

o. UR.

p. UR.

q. c.f. MP 232, pp. 29(1) - 29(2).

r. "with good accent and good discretion" (Hamlet II.ii.497 - 98).

s. OAP IV, 244; c.f. OAP V, 51; and OAP VI, 233.

t. Institutio Oratoria I.1.
u. "os tenerum pueri balbumque poeta figurat" (Epistles II.i.126): "the poet fashions the tender, lisping lips of childhood."

v. Edward Thurlow, 1st Baron Thurlow (1751 - 1806), closely involved in the Douglas case (1767) in which Monboddo figured prominently.

w. OAP VI, 210.

x. Quoted in Cicero, De Oratore III.lvi.213.

y. "hoc fonte derivata clades/ in patriam populumque fluxit" (Horace, Odes III.vi.20 - 21): "from this source sprang the disaster which spread throughout the land and the people").

z. Of Education.


MP 241

Ch. 1


b. OAP IV, 38 - 40.

c. OAP IV, 36.

Ch. 2

a. OAP IV, 115.

b. De Oratore III.186.
c. MP 235, p. 26; PB 16, 2 - 5.
d. OUP IV, 224, n.
e. Aeneid I, 500.
f. Aeneid I, 8.
g. Paradise Lost I, 302 - 304.
h. Gerhard Vossius, Grammatica Latina, in which the verse quoted actually reads "Aurea carmina Iuli scribis maxime vatum" (p. 309, 5th ed.).
j. "And with persuasive accent thus began" (Paradise Lost II, 118).
l. Actually "rura".
n. ὠνις ἑπεὶ τὰ πεδόες κυλιότερα λαχασ δινοῦσας (Odyssey XI, 596);
c.f. MP 235, Ch. 2, note c.
o. "Quadripedante putrem sonitu quatit ungula campum" (Aeneid VIII, 596); c.f. MP 235, Ch. 2, note b.
p. λαχασ βοήσει ποιν λοφον ἄχρι ὀπε μᾶζα οὖν (Odyssey XI, 596);
c.f. MP 235, Ch. 2, note c.

Ch. 3

a. OUP II, 386; c.f. MP 232, Ch. 4; MP 242.
b. Sir Charles Wilkins (1749 - 1836), orientalist and pioneer in the study and printing of Sanscrit.
c. An inaccurate version of Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot 408 - 411.
d. In fact only five of Milton's 25 sonnets are in Italian.
e. Monboddo's theatrical interests, it seems, did not extend
to Irene.

f. Comus 229 - 34.

g. Comus 119 - 124.

h. OAP II, 393.

i. 93 - 94.

j. 102 - 106.

k. L'Allegro 25 - 34.

l. Comus 242.

m. OAP II, 386, n.; III, 84, n.; IV, 224 - 25, n.

n. Poetics XXIV.23; c.f. OAP IV, 224 - 25, n.

o. AM III, xlii - xliii.


q. Probably a reference to the missing Of Style, MP 147.

r. See Poems, & c. upon Several Occasions (London: Bring, 1673), Poemata pp. 4 - 10.

s. 21 - 22.

t. 9 - 10.

u. "Quaeque" in Milton.

v. 54.

w. OAP III, 51 - 54; IV, 131 - 34; V, 11, 245, 253 - 68.

x. OAP V, 467.

y. On Milton's familiarity with classical philosophy, see AM I, 29, n. and 39, n.; and AM III, lxxiii. There is no mention there, however, of the Vacation Exercise; the reference here is simply to MP 241, p. 26.

z. Are Poetica 408.

2a. Rhetoric III.ix.5.

2b. See MP 235, Ch. 4, note w.
Ch. 1

a. Ars Poetica 136.

b. Ars Poetica 128 - 130: "It is difficult to give well-worn subjects your own stamp; and you will do better to make a play of a Trojan tale than to lead the way with an unknown and untold story."

c. Ars Poetica 361.

d. This incomplete footnote was finally included in OAP IV as published; see OAP IV, 391 - 92, n.

Ch. 2

a. Satires I.x.44.

b. Eplogues IV.

c. OAP IV, 304 - 94.

d. Poetics XXV.29.

e. Ars Poetica 85 - 85.

f. Odes III.ix.

g. J. C. Scaliger, Poetices VI.vii.

h. Satires II.iii.

i. Satires II.vii.

k. In fact an approximation to a line of John Sheffield, Earl of Mulgrave: "But Falstaff seems inimitable yet" (An Essay Upon Poetry 261).
a. Horace has "quod".


c. *Q&P* III, 134 - 35; 296 - 98.


e. Περὶ συνθεσεως ονοματον XI.

f. *Q&P* IV, 39.

g. *Q&P* II, 301 - 329.

h. A reference to the missing *MP* 222.

i. Περὶ συνθεσεως ονοματων XV.

j. *Iliad* III.365. The phrase recurs in *Odyssey* IX.71: τεκέει τε καὶ τερμαγεα θεługεις ἀνέμοιο.

k. *Odes* IV.ii.11.

l. *MP* 132; the reference is probably to p. 89<797.

m. *Paradise Lost* V.165.

n. Περὶ συνθεσεως ονοματων XXVI.


p. Charles Du Gange Du Fresne, *Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimae Graecitatis* (Lyons, 1698), col. 1196. This is also Monbozzo's source for Eustathius' comments on στροφὴ τολμηκολ.

q. Pitt the Elder; c.f. a reference in *Q&P* V, 19, n. to Pitt as "the greatest man of his age."
a. **OAP II, 570 - 78.**

b. "os teneum pueri balbunque poeta figurat" (**Epistles II.i.126**);

c. *n.* MP 235, Ch. 4, note t.

t. **OAP IV, 244.**

---

**Ch. 4**

---

a. **OAP IV, 97 - 109.**


d. *Comus* 119.

e. *I'Allegro* 33 - 34.


g. By "Duplets" Monboddo presumably means "Triplets"; and he takes no account of those of Milton's sonnets which employ a fifth rhyme.

h. The lack of specific volume and page references here may indicate that AM III was not published when footnote (a) was written, thus dating the reference between 1782 (AM II) and 1784 (AM III).

i. *Aeneid* VI.50 - 51: "since she now feels the nearer breath of a deity."

---

**Ch. 5**

---

a. Isaac Hawkins Browne.
c. The topic is discussed in MP 230, pp. 49 - 50, which supports the hypothesis that MP 232 was to be followed by an account of Homer in the original plan of OAP IV.
e. OAP II, 324; IV, 116.
f. OAP III, 389 - 91.
g. OAP III, 11.
h. OAP III, 139 - 39.
i. Paradise Lost II. 119 - 123.
j. An inaccurate version of Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot 408 - 13.
k. OAP IV passim.
l. OAP II, 405.
m. The Picture IV, i.
n. 409 - 411: "For my part, I do not see of what avail is either study, when not enriched by Nature's vein, or native wit, if untrained; so truly do each claim the other's aid, and make with it a friendly league."
o. An inaccurate approximation to 432 - 33: "et faciunt prope
plura dolentibus ex animo, sic/ derisor vero plus laudatore
movetur": "... and do almost more than those who grieve at heart."
p. 424 - 25: "... I shall wonder if the happy fellow will be
able to distinguish between a false and a true friend." Horace has "sciit", not "sciat".
q. "continuous speech."
r. In fact from Poetics vii, not vi; i.e. VII: "Moreover, in
everything that is beautiful, whether it be a living creature
or any organism composed of parts, these parts must not only be well arranged but must also have a certain magnitude of their own; for beauty consists in magnitude and arrangement. From which it follows that neither would a very small creature be beautiful — for our view of it is almost instantaneous and therefore confused — nor a very large one, since being unable to view it all at once, we lose the effect of a single whole; for instance, suppose a creature a thousand stades long."

a. The line is in fact Pope's: Epistle to Augustus 102.

Ch. 6

a. OAP II, 392.
b. OAP II, 393 - 401.
c. Ode for Mysick, on St. Cecilia's Day 87 - 92.

MP 227

a. Of Education.
b. "like the Moon, whose Orb/ Through Optic Glass the Tuscan Artist views/ At Ev'ning from the top of Pesole,/ Or in Valdarno, to descry new Lands,/ Rivers or Mountains in her spotty Globe" (Paradise Lost I,287 - 91).
c. "Thick as Autumnal Leaves that strow the Brooks/ In Vallombrosa, where th'Etrurian shades/ High overarch't imbown" (Paradise Lost I,302 - 4).
d. "pocula inventis Acheloia miscuit uvis" (Georgics I,9);
"And blended draughts of Achelous with the new-found grapes."

e. *Georgics* I.8: "changed Chaonia's acorn for the rich corn-scar."

f. "ant Athon aut Rhodopen aut alta Ceraunia telo/ deicit" (Georgics I.332 - 33): "dashes down Athos or Rhodope or the Ceraunian peaks with his bolt."

g. *Georgics* I.45 - 46: "even then I would start my bull groaning over the lowered plough, and the ploughshare glistening from the rubbing of the furrow."

h. "quod nisi et adsiduis herbam insectabere rastris/ et sonitu terrebris aves et ruris opaci/ falce premes umbram votisque vocaveris imbrem,/ heu magnum alterius frustra spectabis acervum/ concussaque famem in silvis solabere quercu" (Georgics I.155 - 59): "Therefore unless you repeatedly cut down the weeds, frighten the birds by shouting, check the shade of the darkened land with your knife, and invoke the rain with your vows, vainly alas! will you eye your neighbour's bigger store, and in the woods shake the oak to solace hunger."

i. θεσκης: swift-footed; μεγας: great; κοροθηλως: with glancing helm; βωτινις: ox-eyed; διος: divine.

j. "race of men half-divine" (*Iliad* XII.23).

k. ἃλλ ὅπε ὑπ γενησεκε Θεου γονον ἄνν ξοντα (*Iliad* VI.191): "But when he now knew that he was the valiant offspring of a god . . . ."

l. *Iliad* IV.521; *Odyssey* XI.598: "the ruthless stone."

m. *Iliad* V.661; XV.542: "the eager spear."

n. *Iliad* IV.125 - 26: "the arrow eager to wing its way . . . ."

o. *Georgics* II.80 - 82: "and before long a mighty tree shoots up skyward with joyous boughs, and marvels at its strange foliage and
fruits not its own." Virgil has "miraturque", not "mirat atque."


q. διὰ τὴν μακρὰν τῆς πολιτείαν (Rhetoric III.1.4): "on account of the corruptness of our forms of government."

r. "But since the whole business of rhetoric is to influence opinion, we must pay attention to it, not as being right, but necessary" (Rhetoric III.1.5).

s. MP 148, pp. 9 - 10.

t. Gap for intended insertion of part of Tacitus' Annals I.61; see passage in full in OAP III, 231.

u. Aeneid II.29 - 30: "Here the Dolopian bands encamped, here cruel Achilles; here lay the fleet . . ." Virgil has "Dolopum", not "Dolopus".

v. "cloistered pedant"; c.f. Petronius' "umbraticus doctor" (Satyricon II.iv).

w. Virgil, Bologues III.90: "Let him who hates not Bavius love your songs, Maevius." Bavius and Maevius were, as the Oxford Classical Dictionary records, poetasters "rescued from oblivion by Virgil's contempt."

x. c.f. OAP III, Ch. 8.
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