

STUDIES IN ENGLISH LITERATURE

Volume XXIII

A QUANTITATIVE APPROACH
TO
THE STYLE OF
JONATHAN SWIFT

by

LOUIS TONKO MILIC
Columbia University



1967
MOUTON & CO.
THE HAGUE • PARIS

© Copyright 1967 by Mouton & Co., Publishers, The Hague,
The Netherlands.

No part of this book may be translated or reproduced in any form, by
print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission
from the publishers.

Printed in the Netherlands.

To the memory of my Father

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Professor James L. Clifford, as my chief sponsor and my guide in the Age of Swift and Johnson, has first title to my gratitude toward my elders. Professors Elliott Van Kirk Dobbie and Allen Walker Read both allowed my dissertation to interrupt their leaves of absence: for this I am grateful. To Professor Dobbie, I also express my thanks for his candor, his careful criticism and his warm sponsorship. To Professor Read, whose student I have been for fifteen years, I tender thanks for his inspiring example.

I am considerably indebted to Professor Colin L. Mallows both for his tireless advice on statistical problems and for his good grace. To Mr. Charles P. Hurd, the Registrar of the University, and Mr. Richard Gilmore, Manager of the Machine Service Division, I am grateful for the use of their valuable machines.

At the Watson Scientific Laboratories, I learned the use and value of electronic computers. To the International Business Machines Corporation, whose generosity made the installation available to the University, I offer my acknowledgments. To Dr. Kenneth King, the Director of the Laboratories, and to Mrs. Jayne Pisani, who taught me programming, I offer grateful thanks for their exceptional kindness.

I wish also to thank Professor Theodore R. Bashkow, of the School of Engineering, for putting the School's IBM 1620 computer and associated equipment at my disposal. To Mr. John N. Waddell, I am obligated, like many another researcher in the Columbia University Libraries, for his unfailing help. I must also thank Professor Inge D. Halpert for help in translating a German dissertation.

To my friend, Professor Harold E. Pagliaro, who drew all the graphs and has many other claims to my obligation – thanks multiplex. To Dr. P. L. Milic, I owe a great debt of thanks for advice and help given over a long period, including the original suggestion to use electronic machinery. To my mother, who typed the entire manuscript, a son's gratitude.

I am beholden to Mrs. Mira Merriman and Mrs. Virginia Glickstein for help in the final stages of the work. My affectionate thanks are gladly tendered to Miss Lilla M. Curley for considerable assistance with bibliography and proofreading. I am very grateful to my student, Mrs. Elizabeth MacAndrew, for extensive help with the Index.

More intangible assistance has come to me from my old friends, Professors Morroe Berger and James D. Merriman III, whom I thank for their invisible shares in this work.

To the Dean of Graduate Faculties, who gave me a grant of five hundred dollars for research expenses, I offer this belated thank you. I am glad to acknowledge the aid of the Committee on Publication of the Faculty of Philosophy, Columbia University.

LOUIS T. MILIC

New York
April 10, 1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	7
List of tables	11
List of figures	14
Introduction	15
I. The Reputation of Swift's Prose Style	20
II. The Problem of Style	40
III. Principles, Assumptions and Methods	74
IV. Seriation	84
V. Connection	122
VI. Words without Meaning	137
The Consistency of Swift's Style	154
Quantitative Features of Swift's Style: Grouped	
Word-Classes	166
The Stable Style Statistic (SSS)	182
The Stability Factor	187
Nominal, Verbal and Adjectival Styles	195
Three-Word Patterns	204
Introductory Connectives	225
The Swift Profile	230
VII. A Case in Point: <i>A Letter to a Young Poet</i>	237
Conclusion	270

Appendices	275
I. Make-up of Samples in Chapters IV and V	277
II. Some Factors of Experimental Design	279
A. Definition of Word-Classes	281
B. Comparison of Two Separate Analyses of <i>Modest Proposal</i>	283
C. Make-up of Samples and Sub-Samples in Chapters VI and VII	285
D. The <i>Federalist</i> Experiment	286
E. Parts of Speech Distribution in Three Modern British Writers compared with one Sample of Swift and the Swift Average	288
F. Closing Sentence-Elements by Word-Class, as a Percentage of Total Sentence	289
G. The <i>Junius</i> Problem	290
H. <i>Letter C</i>	291
Bibliography	295
Index	309
Key	Opp. 318

LIST OF TABLES

4.1	Frequency of lists in 10,000-word selections from seven eighteenth-century writers	89
4.2	Percentage of doublets and triplets in 10,000-word samples from six eighteenth-century writers	90
5.1	Percentage of initial connectives in 2000-sentence samples of Addison, Johnson, Macaulay and Swift	125
5.2	Number of different connective types in two 1000-word samples of Addison, Johnson, Gibbon and Swift	128
6.1	Distribution of the words of a c. 3500-word text (Swift's <i>Tale</i>) into word-classes, according to actual count and percentage	155
6.2	Comparison of the percentages of word-class frequency between two random samples of the same work of Swift (<i>Examiner</i>)	157
6.3	Comparison of percentages of word-class frequency between two samples drawn from the same work of Swift (<i>Gulliver</i>) by different sampling methods	158
6.4	Comparison of the differences in word-class percentage between two pairs of samples of Swift, each pair representing a different work	159
6.5	Comparison of word-class frequency distributions between two sets of one-tenth samples (350 words) of Swift's <i>Examiner</i>	161
6.6	Comparison of absolute differences resulting from the comparison of two pairs of whole samples of Swift and two pairs of one-tenth samples from <i>Examiner</i>	162
6.7	Word-class frequency distribution of all the whole samples of Swift, with computed arithmetic mean	163
6.8	Word-class frequency distribution of whole samples of the four control authors, with computed mean of the total	164
6.9	Means and standard deviations of the Swift samples and the control samples, each taken as a separate population	166
6.10	Grouping of word-classes into Parts of Speech (P/S) and Function Words (FW), for all whole samples, with computed mean	170
6.11	Connectives as individual word-classes and grouped (Group C), in percentages for all whole samples, showing mean and range	173

6.12	Modifiers as individual word-classes and grouped (Group M), in percentages, for all whole samples, with computed arithmetic mean and range	174
6.13	Finite verbs and auxiliaries as individual word-classes and grouped (Group VA), in percentages, for all whole samples, showing mean and range	176
6.14	Verbals as individual word-classes and grouped (Group VB), in percentages, for all whole samples, showing mean and range	178
6.15	Stable Style Statistic (SSS) for Swift's <i>Tale</i> compared with other Swift samples, showing absolute differences for the four word-groups and total absolute difference	183
6.16	SSS values for all samples	184
6.17	Detailed summary of SSS values, showing extremes, mean, median, range and number of items for individual authors and groups	185
6.18	Standard Deviations (SD) and Stability Factors (S) of three word-classes and four word-groups compared in the Swift and control populations	189
6.19	Frequency distribution of word-classes and word-groups in Swift's <i>Miscellaneous</i> sample (20), divided into one-tenth sub-samples	190
6.20	Comparison of range of variation in three word-class and five word-group percentages among Swift whole samples and among sub-samples of Swift's <i>Miscellaneous</i>	191
6.21	Percentage and Stability Factor of all word-classes and word-groups in Swift's <i>Miscellaneous</i> sample	192
6.22	Comparison of Stability Factors (S) for sub-samples of different sizes, all drawn from Swift's <i>Gulliver I</i> (Sample 25), by word-groups	193
6.23	Stability Factors for all samples, in three word-classes and five word-groups	194
6.24	Ratio of nominals to verbals in the samples of Swift and controls	198
6.25	Boder's Adjective-Verb Quotient (AVQ) for various types of writing	200
6.26	The Adjective-Verb Quotient for Swift and controls	202
6.27	Three-word patterns in Swift and controls, showing number of different patterns (D), total patterns (P) and total words (N)	208
6.28	The three most frequent three-word patterns in Swift and controls	211
6.29	Frequency distribution of the most frequent single three-word pattern (513101), in actual occurrences and as a percentage of total patterns (P)	212
6.30	Number of patterns appearing only once (I) as a percentage of the number of different patterns (D), showing also number of words in sample (N) and number of total patterns (P), for whole samples of Swift and controls	213
6.31	Comparison of the relative changes in D and I for two sam-	

	ples of Gibbon and four of Swift as the size of the sample increases, showing N, P, D and I as number of actual occurrences and I/D, D/P and I/P as percentages	217
6.32	The ten most frequent three-word patterns in all the samples combined, ranked in descending order and showing equivalents in English	221
6.33	Relative rank of the ten most frequent patterns, by individual whole sample	222
6.34a	Distribution of the 18 Most Frequent Patterns in the combined samples (MFP), ranked in numerical order, as a percentage of total patterns (P), for Swift samples	223
6.34b	Control samples	223
6.35	Verb and non-verb component of 18 Most Frequent Patterns (MFP), as a percentage of total three-word patterns (P)	225
6.36a	First sentence-elements by word-class, as a percentage of total sentences	229
6.36b	Control samples	230
6.37	Total introductory connectives, for Swift and controls, as a percentage of all introductory elements, showing individual values for the three connective word-classes	231
6.38	Summary table of identification criteria for all authors showing relative rank and earlier for each criterion	232
6.39	Three-discriminator style profile (normalized)	235
7.1	Average length of sentences (in words), for samples of Swift, controls and unknowns, compared with results of earlier researchers	247
7.2	Word-class frequency distribution for unknowns, as percentages	250
7.3	Individual sample and average VB values for Swift controls and unknowns, as percentages	251
7.4	Individual sample and average D values for Swift, controls and unknowns	254
7.5	Individual sample and average Introductory Connective values for Swift, controls and unknowns, as percentage of total sentences	255
7.6	Reference table of Not-certain and Not-reliable criteria	256
7.7	Summary of attributions of three unknowns on the basis of three groups of criteria of varying reliability	256
7.8	Three-discriminator style profile (normalized), for unknowns	259
7.9	SSS values for unknowns	260
7.10	Summary of SSS values for all samples, showing average SSS and items involved in computation	261
7.11	SSS values of <i>History</i> against Swift, controls and other unknowns, ranked in descending order	263
7.12	Frequency of introductory connective word-classes for unknowns, as percentage of total sentences	264
7.13	Distribution and classification of Seriation items in Letter I and Letter II, according to prominent features, by page number	265

LIST OF FIGURES

6a.	Values of VB for Swift and Controls as a Percentage of Total Words	180
6b.	Values of VA Plotted against Values of VB for Swift and Controls	181
6c.	Adjective-Verb Quotient (AVQ) for Swift and Controls Compared with Boder's Scale	201
6d.	Actual Values of D for Swift and Controls	210
6e.	Unique Patterns (I) as a Percentage of Different Patterns in Doubling Sizes of Sample (N) for Swift and Gibbon: $\frac{I}{D}$. . .	215
6f.	Different Patterns (D) as a Percentage of Total Patterns (P) in Doubling Sizes of Sample (N) for Swift and Gibbon: $\frac{D}{P}$. .	216
6g.	Unique Patterns (I) as a Percentage of Total (P) in Doubling Sizes of Sample (N) for Swift and Gibbon: $\frac{I}{P}$	218
6h.	Relationship of Total, Different and Unique Patterns for Gibbon, in Doubling Sizes of Sample, expressed as Percentage Ratios	219
6i.	Relationship of Total, Different and Unique Patterns for Swift, in Doubling Sizes of Sample, expressed as Percentage Ratios	220
6j.	Values of Non-Verb Component of 18 Most Frequent Patterns (MFP), as the Sum of Percentages of Different Patterns . . .	226
6k.	Introductory Connectives (IC) as a Percentage of Total Sentences for Swift and Controls	228
6l.	Three-Discriminator Profile of the Style of Swift and Controls, all Values being expressed as Percentages of Swift's Average .	234
7a.	Average Sentence-Length in Words for Swift, Controls and Unknowns	248
7b.	Values of D for Swift, Controls and Unknowns, with Means indicated	253
7c.	Three-Discriminator Profile of the Style of Swift, Controls and Unknowns, including <i>Letter C</i> , all Values expressed as Percentages of Swift's Average	258

INTRODUCTION

I have always loved Swift's work. The playfulness, the irony and ultimately the seriousness engaged me in that order. His toying with language, especially in the third book of *Gulliver's Travels* and in particular the language frame (so reminiscent of a computer programmed to "generate" English sentences), struck me as the perception of a man to whom the mysterious relation between symbol and thing was intuitively clear. The effectiveness of his own writing, the author's obvious ranking of grammatical propriety below the conveyance of meaning, reinforced my admiration for his intelligence. Then I became aware of his reputation as a purist and aware also of his occasional pronouncements about propriety and decorum in language. It seemed impossible to reconcile these formalistic tendencies with my earlier estimate of the man, though the idea of the master ironist pulling his reader's leg did not fail to occur to me. But there was no escaping the paradox: Swift the writer and Swift the rhetorician were two different persons.

To account for this division, I speculated that except for the superficial traits of composition the writer wrote without the approval of the rhetorician; almost in spite of him, wrote the way he would because he could not help it. In other words, I postulated the possibility of a writer's style as an unconscious reflection of his mind and personality. In the case of Swift, these influences were bound to be so forceful and constant that they would permeate all his writing more or less uniformly, except when the rhetorician was in the writer's seat, as in the *Proposal for Correcting . . . the English Tongue*. If this hypothesis was correct,

the uniformity of the style might be detected by a close examination of those features over which the rhetorician had been unable to exert his influence, namely, the grammatical structure. It is not surprising that Swift consciously respected his own literary judgment. But it is surely curious that he thought of himself as Swift the rhetorician and equally strange that his contemporaries and a long line of commentators down to the present day have shared this mistaken opinion.

The regularity with which Swift's style has been accepted at his own valuation of praiseworthy writing moved me to wonder whether these critics, in commenting on his style, has said anything which could be observed and verified. I found almost nothing but adjectives: *clear, simple, direct, masculine, hard, round, salty, nervous, lucid*, and the like evasions. There was agreement that Swift's style was good but the agreement was uninformative and the criticism without interest. It seemed to me that these readers had formed partial responses to his work on the basis of passages that impressed them. I wondered whether it might not be possible to discard the picture of Swift the rhetorician and address myself to the writer's work exclusively. This I proposed to do on the basis of my assumption about the unconscious nature of a mature writer's style. The style, I suggest, contains a uniform and constant diffusion of his mind and personality, expressed through certain grammatical categories which may be measured objectively.

These categories are grammatical, rather than lexical, because the rhetorician has his eye on the diction and is always to be found issuing pronouncements about it or fussing with it after the writer has laid the words on the paper. An author's favorite expressions, in any case, are dear to him and after he has made them up, he is likely not only to use them but to persuade his friends to do likewise: Swift was very proud of his belittling prefix "hedge". The opportunity to use such favorites may not always occur, of course; the same is true of his vocabulary at large. This is in a large degree dictated by the context and the genre of composition. Any study of vocabulary, therefore, is likely to result in a predictable but useless variability. Grammatical

categories are not affected in the same way. During his period of apprenticeship, a writer develops a certain variety of structures, strictly his own, which he continues to use and re-use with scarcely any change during the period of his mature writing. It is like his handwriting, unmistakably his but almost beyond his power to modify to any significant extent. In his grammar lies the key to his style, provided the proper categories for investigation can be developed.

That finding these should be easy is hardly to be expected. The writing process is still very mysterious; very little is known about it and it seems unlikely that the solution should be simple. But that at least a preliminary solution can be found seems to me inevitable. Such a solution would comprise an objective description of these submerged characteristics of the style in quantitative terms, precise enough to enable the student to identify the writer. Thus, I would expect to be able to separate Swift from Johnson and even from Addison.

The use of quantitative methods, supported by the use of an electronic computer, and with an apparatus of figures, tables and charts, raises an issue of some importance. For though it has become unnecessary to apologize for the quantitative approach – it has shown its usefulness even in fields to which it formerly was strange – the implication that the artist's work can be compassed in measurable quantities needs to be faced.

It is not my belief that everything of importance about a writer's performance can be identified, much less measured. I am even willing to admit that the measurable may turn out to be peripheral or secondary, though I would hope that this were not so. But I would say in my defense that the process of measuring is not autotelic: its ends are literary, bound to a fundamental interest in the writer and his work. And the mechanical process is always preceded by a knowledge of the text and accompanied by a devotion to its literary qualities. Moreover, in this method, before anything is counted or measured, the same critical intellectual process, the same sort of intuition, takes place, as in the usual literary study.

As my reader knows, measurement is nothing new in literary

work. Every responsible scholar who makes a statement about the density of metaphor in Shakespeare or the number of military characters in his plays, makes some kind of numerical estimate about his material. Even a reference to likelihood, casually or seriously made, implies a numerical probability. The substitution of precise for approximate statements of quantity cannot be considered a very serious failing.

Nor should it be inferred that I have reduced the writer to the status of a mere unconscious producer, with no control over his mind's intention and effect. In an important sense Swift the writer is always under the influence of Swift the stylist, a happy derivative of Swift the rhetorician. In certain aspects of composition, the unconscious writer rules, but I have no wish to deny him his autonomous conscious role in the selection and design of his work. It is this conscious forceful being who is after all the subject of any Swift study.

Appropriately enough, this study opens with a review of the criticism elicited by Swift's style from his time to ours. The many senses in which the word *style* has been used during that period lead to an attempt at definition in the second chapter. After a formal statement of my own assumptions and the procedure which is based on them, I proceed to the examination of the style itself, moving from the most clearly observable phenomena to those which require the most delicate nicety of technique. The sum of my observations about the style of Swift and his literary peers is tested by reference to the case of a contested work, *A Letter of Advice to a Young Poet*, which has been admitted into the canon, ejected from it, and finally relegated to a limbo of dubious attributions by successive editors of Swift. It is my hope to add a measure of certainty to the status of this piece.

But whether I succeed in carrying conviction on this point or not, I shall feel that I have succeeded in my aims if I have collected a body of verifiable information about Swift, as well as about those who are his companions in this research, and if by my proposed method I have forwarded by even one step the study of style and the study of Swift.

The stress on method is evident in my title "A Quantitative

Approach to the Style of Jonathan Swift". I have not hoped to give a full or a conventional literary description of Swift's style. My intention has been deliberately partial and quantitative because only within those limits could I hope to accomplish what I had set out to do.

I. THE REPUTATION OF SWIFT'S PROSE STYLE

The style of Jonathan Swift has always attracted attention and the reputation of his prose, purely as language, has had a comforting stability. Not all reputations fare so well. Many authors, during their lives and later, fluctuate in public esteem like commodities on a financial exchange. But Swift and especially his prose have maintained the status of blue chips. This is not to say that their level has always been the same, but it has always been high in the opinion of most readers and critics.¹ Though Addison in one period, Johnson in another, and doubtless others at various times, have achieved the topmost place, Swift has always been among the leaders, and during the twentieth century his prose has surely received more praise than any other in English. The most cursory inspection of anthologies, histories of literature, manuals and guidebooks, not to mention specialized studies of English prose, must surely lead to such a conclusion. An anthology of English prose which did not award Swift a major place would be inconceivable today.² It is probable that no great prose writer

¹ See Donald M. Berwick, *The Reputation of Jonathan Swift, 1781-1882* (Philadelphia, 1941), *passim*.

² A survey of some twentieth-century collections will support this position. Henry S. Pancoast, ed., *Standard English Prose*, 2d. rev. ed. (New York, 1905), gives Swift 24 pages, compared with 15 for Addison, 13 for Dryden, 25 for Johnson, 26 for Burke and Carlyle, 28 for Arnold, and 53 for Macaulay. Herbert Read and Bonamy Dobrée, ed., *The London Book of English Prose* (London, 1932), in selections of a page or two, give 4 to Swift, Gibbon, Hazlitt, Johnson, Milton, Newman and the Bible, but only one to Addison. In *An Oxford Anthology of English Prose*, ed. Arnold Whitridge and John Wendell Dodds (New York, 1937), Swift receives 38 pages, Addison 10, Johnson 23, Gibbon 5, Hazlitt 40, Carlyle

has been more widely read.³ In the words of Herbert Read, "the continued vitality of [his] style is a great consolation to the theorist",⁴ even though that vitality may be nourished largely in the nursery.

But critics since Swift's day have not been content merely to praise his prose style: they have in a variety of ineffective ways attempted to characterize, describe and analyze it. For the most part, they have gone about it with directness and assurance.

Lord Orrery sounded the dominant themes for most of his successors: clarity, propriety, simplicity. Because he had known Swift personally and because he was first in the field, his comments carried great weight. Nothing, however, could have been more damaging to an accurate understanding of Swift's literary style than his Olympian praise:

His style was masterly, correct, and strong: never diffusive, yet always clear; and, if we consider it in comparison with his predecessors, he has outdone them all, and is one, perhaps the chief, of those few select English writers, who have excelled in elegance and propriety of language.⁵

Orrery did not offer to particularize these points of praise because he felt secure that they would not be challenged. In this aspect of Swift's reputation, as in others, Orrery's word became almost the gospel.⁶ Before Johnson, one writer and critic after

75, and Arnold 62. In a recent anthology, *Eighteenth-Century Prose, 1700-1800*, ed. D. W. Jefferson (Harmondsworth, 1956), which consists of short extracts, Swift is represented by six pieces, more than Addison, Fielding, Hume, Goldsmith, Gibbon or Johnson. It is surely significant, too, that these editors all select different passages.

³ Apart from the Bible (a translation), there is generally only one book which it is possible to suppose that everyone in the English-speaking world has read and that book is *Gulliver's Travels*. It must be admitted that *Robinson Crusoe* is a contender for the honor and at one time *Pilgrim's Progress* would have outstripped both.

⁴ *English Prose Style* (Boston, 1955), p. xiii.

⁵ John, Earl of Orrery, *Remarks on the Life and Writings of Dr. Jonathan Swift* (London, 1752), p. 234.

⁶ Orrery's book was extremely popular and influential. Berwick (p. 7) wonders whether the nineteenth-century view of Swift as inhuman could have developed if Orrery's book had not been published.

another dutifully echoed Orrery's laudatory generalities, with barely noticeable variations and scarcely any difference of opinion.⁷ Only two detractors, Goldsmith and Hume, dared to deviate from the tradition, and they raised interesting issues.

Goldsmith, in a passage in which he compares Swift to Charles D'Avenant and a certain Trenchard, both political pamphleteers of the period, takes a position far from the main road:

They were followed by Dean Swift, who, though in other respects far their superior, never could arise to that manliness and clearness of diction in political writing for which they were so justly famous.⁸

Goldsmith adds that all three were exceeded by Bolingbroke, whose style was excellent, though he did not understand the subjects he wrote on. It is questionable whether Goldsmith's implied definition of style has much to contribute to this investigation. But the slurs on both the clarity and the manliness of Swift seem to require explanation. Why did Goldsmith wish to deny to Swift what everyone so readily granted him? Like Johnson, he may have transferred a dislike of Swift the man to his works; or he may, at least with respect to the "manliness", have been alluding to the theory of Swift's physical impotence.⁹ At any rate, since Goldsmith does not offer any elucidation of the unmanly diction, the comment may be disregarded in its substance and merely recorded as an instance of the perverseness of impressionistic descriptions of style.

Scarcely any more importance attaches to Hugh Blair's comment, which returns to Swift the manliness that Goldsmith would have denied him, but Blair is at least in the center of the tradition:

He is esteemed one of our most correct writers. His Style is of the

⁷ "On one point . . . most commentators agree. The excellence of Swift's dry, severe, concise style, his superb control of word and tempo, are only once questioned in the pre-Johnsonian era – and then by the Scotchman, David Hume" (Berwick, p. 16). Goldsmith must be added to this minority, but he was an Irishman. Among those who continued in Orrery's wake were Delany, Deane Swift, Beattie, Shenstone and Gray.

⁸ Oliver Goldsmith, *The Bee*, No. VIII, in *The Works of Oliver Goldsmith*, ed. P. Cunningham (New York, 1881), III, 138.

⁹ This was first suggested in print by Orrery, p. 113.

plain and simple kind; free from all affectation, and all superfluity; perspicuous, manly, and pure. These are its advantages. But we are not to look for much ornament and grace in it.¹⁰

By the time of Blair, praise of Swift's style included references to his lack of ornament and elegance, qualities which the writings of Johnson and Gibbon were thought to contain.¹¹

Although Gibbon in his *Decline* did not try to write like Swift, he formed his style on those of Swift and Addison:

By the judicious advice of Mr. Mallet, I was directed to the writings of Swift and Addison; wit and simplicity are their common attributes: but the style of Swift is supported by manly original vigour; that of Addison is adorned by the female graces of elegance and mildness.¹²

It may be that this tribute to Swift's manliness is only the consequence of Gibbon's love of antithesis, but the praise of simplicity and vigor is by now standard.

A self-consciousness about Scotticisms and a great interest in language doubtless made Hume a severer critic than an English Hume might have been, and it is understandable that he castigated Swift in defiance of the English.¹³ Some of his criticisms, however, merely anticipate the Johnsonian formulation:

I know your affection for *wherewith* proceeds from your partiality to Dean Swift, whom I can often laugh with, whose style I can even approve, but surely can never admire. It has no harmony, no eloquence, no ornament and not much correctness, whatever the English may imagine.¹⁴

¹⁰ *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, 4th ed. (London, 1790), II, 144. This book was first published in 1783.

¹¹ According to the findings of William Kenney, the preferred quality of prose during the late eighteenth century was energy. Addison was considered especially deficient in this, his style being variously called "weak", "feeble", "enervated", whereas Johnson's was "vehement", "forcible", "nervous". In this context, Johnson's praise of Addison must be recognized as lukewarm ("Addison, Johnson, and the 'Energetick' Style", *Studia Neophilologica*, XXXIII (1961), 103-114).

¹² *The Memoirs of the Life of Edward Gibbon*, ed. G. B. Hill (London, 1900), p. 122.

¹³ A discussion of the interesting question of Scotticism may be found in the apparatus of *Boswell's Life of Johnson*, ed. G. B. Hill, rev. L. F. Powell (Oxford, 1934-1950), I, 439, fn. 2 and Appendix G, p. 549.

¹⁴ *Letters of Hume*, ed. J. Y. T. Greig (Oxford, 1932), II, 194.

The most interesting item in this list of aspersions is that dealing with correctness. For the most part, Swift was accepted as a model of propriety, although a number of grammarians took exception to some of his constructions.¹⁵ Hume's keen awareness here may have originated from his study of English as "a dead language", a procedure that often yields a higher notion of correctness than is common among vernacular speakers.¹⁶

Despite their literary eminence, neither Hume nor Goldsmith had much personal effect on the course of Swift's literary reputation. But Johnson's measured praise of Swift's style revealed that a change of critical ideals of prose style had taken place, a change which must entail the consequent revaluation of Swift as a stylist:

In his other works [aside from *A Tale of a Tub*, which Johnson considers unique and above Swift's other productions] is found an equable tenour of easy language, which rather trickles than flows. His delight was in simplicity . . . He studied purity; and though perhaps all his structures are not exact, yet it is not often that solecisms can be found; and whoever depends on his authority may generally conclude himself safe. His sentences are never too much dilated or contracted; and it will not be easy to find any embarrassment in the complication of his clauses, any inconsequence in his connections, or abruptness in his transitions.

His style was well suited to his thoughts, which are never subtilised by nice disquisitions, decorated by sparkling conceits, elevated by ambitious sentences, or variegated by far-sought learning. He pays no court to the passions; he excites neither surprise nor admiration; he always understands himself, and his reader always understands him: the peruser of Swift wants little previous knowledge; it will be sufficient that he is acquainted with common words and common things; he is neither required to mount elevations nor to explore profundities; his passage is always on a level, along solid ground, without asperities, without obstruction.

This easy and safe conveyance of meaning it was Swift's desire to attain, and for having attained he deserves praise, though perhaps

¹⁵ Hugh Blair, Horne Tooke and others may be found mentioned in Sterling A. Leonard, *The Doctrine of Correctness in English Usage, 1700-1800* (Madison, 1929), pp. 251 ff.

¹⁶ This tendency is equally observable in foreign students of English, whose knowledge of formal grammar is usually superior to that of native speakers. The point about English as a dead language is made in the material referred to in footnote 13.

not the highest praise. For purposes merely didactic, when something is to be told that was not known before, it is the best mode, but against that inattention by which known truths are suffered to lie neglected it makes no provision; it instructs, but does not persuade.¹⁷

From 1781 to the latter end of the nineteenth century, this conception of Swift's style as *merely* pure, simple and clear stands out against a generalized background of praise in the older tradition.¹⁸ To Johnson, Swift's virtues as a writer are virtues of little consequence, virtues it was not worth cultivating. But even Johnson, for all his reservations, felt that these virtues were generally recognized and had achieved the force of a received opinion.

With an irony that Swift might have appreciated, the low point in the reputation of his style coincided with the notable edition of his works produced by Walter Scott in 1814. The Augustans were no longer admired or even much read.¹⁹ The great period of English prose was now seen to be the Jacobean, and the special heroes of the Romantic period were Taylor, Hobbes, and Barrow.

Coleridge, though willing to do justice to Swift, was fully in accord with this trend, against what he considered to be the prevailing opinion: "From the common opinion that the English style attained its greatest perfection in and about Queen Anne's reign I altogether dissent."²⁰ Though Hooker and Taylor could not be matched, in a lower sphere Swift might be recognized: "Swift's style is, in its line, perfect; the manner is a complete expression of the matter, the terms appropriate, and the artifice concealed. It is simplicity in the true sense of the word."²¹ The

¹⁷ Samuel Johnson, "Swift", in *Lives of the Poets*, ed. G. B. Hill (Oxford, 1905), III, 51-52.

¹⁸ "Much the same sentiments [about the excellence of Swift's style] have been repeated time and again since . . . The idea of 'proper words in proper places' becomes a shibboleth in the history of Swift criticism; and the student eventually grows to welcome even the slightest defection from the common opinion" (Berwick, pp. 47-8).

¹⁹ "Addison and Swift are now not at all read; Johnson and Gibbon very rarely; — yet Swift is the best writer that ever was, in his peculiar style." Robert James Mackintosh, ed. *Memoirs of the life of . . . Sir James Mackintosh* (London, 1835), II, 475, entry dated 1830.

²⁰ Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Select Poetry and Prose*, ed. Stephen Potter (London, 1933), p. 319.

²¹ *Ibid.*

term "perfect" is new but will continue to be seen in this context. Simplicity, true or other, has hardly had a moment's respite.

The reviewer of Scott's edition in 1816 espoused less elevated but similar ideals: "Junius and Johnson [were] the first who again familiarized us with more glowing and sonorous diction – and made us feel the tameness and poorness of the serious style of Addison and Swift."²² Although Jeffrey admits that Swift was the most vigorous writer of his time, he goes further than Johnson in denigrating his style:

Of his style, it has been usual to speak with great, and, we think, exaggerated praise. It is less mellow than Dryden's – less elegant than Pope's or Addison's – less free and noble than Lord Bolingbroke's – and utterly without the glow and loftiness which belonged to our earlier masters. It is radically a low and homely style – without grace, and without affectation; and chiefly remarkable for a great choice and profusion of *common* words and expressions.²³

However out of fashion Jeffrey's comment may seem today, it is recognizably in accord with the critical tendency of his epoch and it has an interior consistency. But De Quincey's perverse and capricious argument, though it proceeds from the same aesthetic source, seems to court illogic in order to discredit Swift's merits. Arguing that Swift's style was not a model of excellence, De Quincey proposes three points: Swift's merit is merely "vernacularity", or lack of artifice; whatever excellence he had was shared by his contemporaries (Defoe, Dampier); like them, he wrote on subjects specially suited to his simple, dull, unadorned style. But if he had had to emulate Taylor or Browne, his real limitations would have appeared.²⁴ After this, the trend to detraction more or less ends and the standard view proceeds unhampered till modern times.

In retrospect, all these commentators, praisers and detractors alike, have some things in common. They seem to agree in the terms they apply to Swift's style (*simple, clear, vigorous*), though

²² Francis Jeffrey, *Edinburgh Review*, XXVII (September 1816), p. 8.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 56.

²⁴ Thomas De Quincey, *Tait's Magazine* (September 1847), in *Collected Works* (London, 1890), XI, 17-18.

none go to any trouble to specify the extension of these figurative terms²⁵ or even to illustrate with examples. It is difficult not to conclude that they agree mainly because of their preconceptions, their willingness to accept the prevailing opinion without trying to verify it by a detailed examination of the style itself. The perpetuation of the tradition that Swift's style was simple, clear, vigorous, by means of a self-hypnotic unconscious plagiarism can be explained by reference to three factors.²⁶

The difficulty of discussing style except as synonymous with diction is evident in nearly all these writings. That this is a consequence of the classical division of styles according to the level of the words is equally self-evident. Consequently, the vaguest references to certain abstract qualities (for example, simplicity) satisfied all concerned. When a more individual judgment was required, some metaphors could be invoked (grace, manliness). But the necessity of specifying qualities which were difficult to isolate was circumvented by the simple proceeding of identifying the style that one approved of with the ideals of style then current. Swift's style was called simple, clear and vigorous in part because there was general agreement that Swift's style was good and because simplicity, clarity and vigor were good qualities for a style to have. When these qualities were no longer valued so highly and Swift's style was no longer quite so well thought of, denigratory variants of these qualities were applied: *homely*, *common*, *plain*, *poor*. At no time was an attempt made to discover what simplicity in style consisted of or how it could be illustrated with quotations

²⁵ Descriptions of style almost by necessity use terms figuratively. A *low* style, for example, is not such by virtue of anything it contains but only by comparison with some imagined scale. If a *simple* style were one which consisted of simple sentences, that would be a literal description. But since a simple style is intended to be compared to other simple ("once-folded") things, as distinguished from complex (or "braided") things, it may be seen that the metaphorical extension is considerable. When the terms used involve such non-literary conceptions as limpidity, masculinity, energy, nervousness, the interpreter's task is beyond aid.

²⁶ Sometimes the plagiarism could be overt. William Monck Mason, in *The History . . . of St. Patrick* (Dublin, 1820), presents as his own a condensed version of Johnson's comment in *The Life of Swift* (ed. cit., p. 51) on the variety of Swift's style (pp. 431-2). Berwick quotes this without comment (p. 82).

from the pages of Swift's works. This was felt to be unnecessary because the whole issue had been settled by Swift himself. In a variety of places in his works, Swift had allowed himself to express his ideals of style: "that Simplicity, which is one of the greatest Perfections in any Language",²⁷ "Their Stile is clear, masculine, and smooth, but not Florid; for they avoid nothing more than multiplying unnecessary Words, or using various Expressions",²⁸ "They are expressed in the most plain and simple Terms",²⁹ "I should be glad to see you the Instrument of introducing into our Style, that Simplicity which is the best and truest Ornament of most Things in human Life . . .",³⁰ "I rather chose to relate plain Matter of Fact in the simplest Manner and Style . . .",³¹ "Two Things I will just warn you against . . . flat, unnecessary Epithets; and . . . old, thread-bare Phrases . . ."³² The fact that personal ideals of style need not coincide with actual practice regularly escapes all those who consider an author the best critic and final authority on his own work. Ideals of style are goals toward which the writer is striving, not accurate descriptions of his practice. Moreover, as will be shown, the mechanism of style-production is mainly unconscious and beyond the reach of any voluntary modification resulting from the application of abstract ideals. In view of these factors, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that most of the criticism of Swift's style until the twentieth century has been of very little value.

In the late nineteenth century, the impressionistic descriptions take on more color but they make no especial contribution to the understanding of Swift's style. To be sure, the themes of simplicity, clarity and vigor continue to be heard but the combinations give the appearance of novelty. There is the beginning of an awareness that the old tradition of generalities is useless, but the new material

²⁷ *Proposal*, in *The Prose Writings of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Herbert Davis (Oxford, 1939-in progress), IV, 15. All citations of Swift, unless otherwise indicated, are to this edition (hereafter called *Works*).

²⁸ *Gulliver*, *Works*, XI, 121.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 120.

³⁰ *Tatler*, 230, *Works*, II, 177.

³¹ *Gulliver*, *Works*, XI, 275.

³² *Letter to a Young Gentleman*, *Works*, IX, 68.

comes from the same old bin. Samuel Butler, surely a disciple of Swift in spirit, with typical perversity dismisses the necessity of taking pains with style: "I never knew a writer yet who took the smallest pains with his style and was at the same time readable."³³ But he admits that the writer should be concerned about the reader's convenience. Though he points out that a terse style may be more fatiguing than a diffuse one,³⁴ a point applicable to an understanding of Swift, he concludes more or less in the usual fashion: "Swift is terse, he gets through what he has to say on any matter as quickly as he can and takes the reader on to the next."³⁵

Twentieth-century criticism begins tamely enough with a few comments by G. A. Aitken in *The Cambridge History of English Literature*. Aitken re-introduces the notion of perfection, dormant since Coleridge but soon to have a great vogue, in addition to the usual reference to clarity and precision. He also borrows some terms applicable to the person of Swift to describe the style, which he calls forceful and grave.³⁶ This kind of transfer or interchange between the qualities of the man and his work, though practiced in a small way by Goldsmith, Gibbon and their contemporaries, is now to provide a device for seeming to talk about style without actually doing so. For example, Brownell comments on the lack of warmth he perceived in Swift's character.³⁷ His comment departs from convention when he notices that Swift's "simplicity is more highly organized than superficially appears".³⁸ This observation represents such a break with tradition that it is easy to understand why it passed unnoticed. It is far from rejecting the attribute of simplicity, but it is a start toward understanding.

Herbert Read's study of English style, which appeared midway between the World Wars (not a period of great sanity), supports

³³ *Samuel Butler's Notebooks*, ed. Geoffrey Keynes and Brian Hill (London, 1951), p. 290. A conjectural date for these comments is 1897.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 66. In the context in which it occurs, this point seems unrelated to the Ciceronian-Senecan opposition.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 287.

³⁶ "Swift" in *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, ed. A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller, IX (Cambridge, 1912), 128.

³⁷ William C. Brownell, *The Genius of Style* (New York, 1924), pp. 112-3.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 112.

a claim for Swift's rank as a stylist of unrivalled power and interest with a compound of references to simplicity, clarity and purity illustrated with examples. His main statement is remarkably sweeping and the appositive in the second sentence remarkably obscure:

Swift is the only one of [those] prose writers in whom we may confidently expect no organic and inevitable lapses. The prose style of Swift is unique, an irrefrangible instrument of clear, animated, animating and effective thought. English prose has perhaps attained here and there a nobler profundity, and here and there a subtler complexity; but never has it maintained such a constant level of inspired expression.³⁹

Behind the "irrefrangible instrument" and "animated, animating" thought are two things: a desire to claim a measure of perfection for Swift and an inability to do so with existing means of description. If the result is obscurity, there is at least a gain over the easy "simple" explanation. The use of telling examples is a step toward objective description. All in all, however, the yield is not substantial in facts about Swift's style. For some of these it will be necessary to examine the results of more professional scholars. The findings of those who take up style on the way to something else are alike in their failure to produce anything concrete.

A herd of impressionistic images elbow each other in the critical biography of Swift by W. D. Taylor, the tenth chapter of which purports to be (but is not) entirely about Swift's style: "it is hard round crystalline", "like an athlete sweated down to sinew and muscle who knows how to reach his goal"; "it is *the* nervous style".⁴⁰ This is not very informative, and one concludes after reading that Taylor had a high opinion of Swift's style but no very good idea of how to express it. But to read the comments of the novelist Maugham is to wonder whether he is talking about another writer altogether. Maugham is explaining how he trained himself to become a good writer by practising on *A Tale of a Tub*:

The prose of Swift enchanted me. I made up my mind that this was

³⁹ *English Prose Style*, p. xiii.

⁴⁰ W. D. Taylor, *Jonathan Swift* (London, 1933), p. 255.

the perfect way to write . . . [But] it is a tiresome allegory and the irony is facile. But the style is admirable. I cannot imagine that English can be better written. Here are no flowery periods, fantastic turns of phrase or high-flown images. It is a civilized prose, natural, discreet and pointed. There is no attempt to surprise by an extravagant vocabulary. It looks as though Swift made do with the first word that came to hand, but since he had an acute and logical brain it was always the right one, and he put it into the right place. The strength and balance of his sentences are due to an exquisite taste . . . I found that the only possible words were those Swift had used and that the order in which he had placed them was the only possible order. It is an impeccable prose.

But perfection has one grave defect: it is apt to be dull. Swift's prose is like a French canal . . . Its tranquil charm fills you with satisfaction, but it neither excites the emotions nor stimulates the imagination. You go on and on and presently you are a trifle bored. So, much as you may admire Swift's wonderful lucidity, his terseness, his naturalness, his lack of affectation, you find your attention wandering after a while . . .⁴¹

And so, allowing Swift to bore him, Maugham takes up Dryden whom he proceeds to describe impressionistically.

But it may be unfair to expect critical responsibility from an admitted amateur critic. On the other hand, when a writer presents himself with the credentials of an expert and writes a book called *Style*, as F. L. Lucas does, it may be just to expect something more than mere imagery. However, only imagery is provided:

Luckily for us, the style of Swift himself was a good deal more than proper – or improper – words in proper places. Into its ruthlessly swept and garnished body there entered the spirits of scorn and hate and pride and indignation, but also of courage and independence, of frustrated affection and even of something like compassion.⁴²

It cannot be supposed that these "spirits" can actually be detected as formal elements in the style; one must assume that Lucas put them there. He proceeds to lament Swift's lack of those images that charm rather than wound: "That is partly why, to me, he is

⁴¹ W. Somerset Maugham, *The Summing-Up* (New York, 1957 [1938]), pp. 20-1.

⁴² (London, 1955), p. 126.

on the whole an unattractive writer – bleak, monotonous, and depressing, though impressive, like a Pennine moorland – not like the Highlands.”⁴³ As is easily seen, Lucas’s fondness for imagery is betrayed in each of these comments; he does not so much criticize Swift’s prose for what it is as he rebuilds it as he would like it to be, most plainly when he denies that he is doing so, as in this final comment:

It is idle to wish, as Swift trots like a lean gray wolf, with white fangs bared, across his desolate landscape, that he were more like a benevolent St. Bernard; he would cease to be Swift. Being what he was, he made a striking addition to the infinite variety of the world; but one Swift seems to me quite enough. And his style is of interest as showing both what trenchancy the presence of imagery can give, and how much charm and colour its absence takes away.⁴⁴

The vagueness of this kind of criticism is not mitigated by the false concreteness of animal or landscape similes. Nothing is told that is of any value. It is not because it is subjective that it is valueless but because the subjectivity is irresponsible, general and misty.

After a string of disconcerting generalities,⁴⁵ it is a welcome surprise to find in Wilson Knight’s criticism of Swift’s irony several concrete references to the actual details of style: “Swift’s narrative may seem colourless [in *A Tale of a Tub*], but the materials within are not. The plainness consists rather in continual emphasis on noun and verb with rejection of the *qualifying* adjective.”⁴⁶ In fact, Swift’s satire operates in a simple description of action: “Having the right nouns ready, he has only to attach the verb.”⁴⁷ Swift’s “fine use of the active verb”⁴⁸ is everywhere evident, the best point being made in action statements. In *Battle of the Books*, he relies on “concrete nouns and active verbs with

⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 209-210.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 210.

⁴⁵ “Swift’s prose is noted for control and reserve. He is a master of lucidity and understatement.” G. Wilson Knight, “Swift and the Symbolism of Irony”, *The Burning Oracle* (London, 1939), p. 115.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 117.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 119.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 122.

scarcely an adjective to assist".⁴⁹ It is good to come finally to nouns and verbs and adjectives, even though Knight has no figures to assist his observations. Does he mean that Swift uses nouns and verbs and fewer adjectives than average? Are active verbs merely transitive verbs? How many is *scarcely* and are qualifying adjectives descriptive or limiting? Obviously there can be no answer to these questions because Knight's reference to these grammatical details is the result of subjective impression and not of exact study. Still the realization that style must be talked about in terms of its actual mechanisms constitutes a significant advance, however unsatisfactory the immediate results. At least there is an awareness that Swift used verbs, nouns, and adjectives rather than simplicity and purity and clarity as the vehicles of his expression.

Interest in the particulars of style, however, does not make much progress in the work of those who might be called theoretical students of style — those who take up the matter of Swift's style incidentally or as subsidiary to some larger purpose, those at any rate who are not considering style as a practical matter. It is necessary to look to those who have an axe to grind if we are to find much regular or systematic reference to grammatical categories and to particular words or expressions. These are the students of Swift's canon. Their purpose is the attribution of some new work to Swift (or the rejection of an accepted or dubious work) by internal evidence.

Despite the appearance of exactness produced by the citation of relevant passages and the sometimes extensive parallels offered as evidence, most scholars are suspicious of the method of internal evidence and resort to it only in desperation. The general distrust of internal evidence usually attaches to the method itself but it actually arises in all probability from the practices of those who have used it. That this distrust has some basis can be shown by considering the demonstrations offered in connection with the few canon problems in Swift bibliography.

About Swift's major productions there is now scarcely any doubt. To be sure, Johnson questioned whether Swift could have

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 130.