Against Hypocrisy and Dissent

Marcus Walsh

‘The only Source of the true Ridiculous’, wrote Henry Fielding, in the early 1740s, ‘is Affectation’. Affectation, Fielding tells us, arises ‘from one of these two Causes, Vanity, or Hypocrisy’, and of these hypocrisy is much the worse, setting us ‘on an Endeavour to avoid Censure by concealing our Vices under an Appearance of their opposite Virtues’.[[1]](#footnote-1) Fielding makes his familiar remark about affectation as a chief foundation for satire in a novel itself much concerned with vanity and hypocrisy, including vanity and hypocrisy in matters of belief and worship. The charge of hypocrisy could be levelled against men of different kinds of cloth (Fielding’s Trulliber and Thwackum not least), but dissenters of various stripes had been a particular target for many decades before Fielding wrote. Religious satire had become a major literary mode as rival factions, civil and religious, battled for influence and power through the successive events, debates and crises of the post-Restoration years, and the reigns of William and Anne: the Clarendon Code and Act of Uniformity, the Popish plot, the Monmouth rebellion, the Exclusion Bill, the Glorious Revolution, the Act of Toleration, the Test Act. Satire thrives, structurally and verbally, on difference, such as characterises hypocrisy: difference between appearance and reality, profession and performance, promise and fulfilment. In their attack on sectarianism, writers of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century made hypocrisy, and its close relatives dishonesty, deceit, simulation, and dissimulation, a central and telling theme. Many satires written against dissent employ Juvenalian anger as well as Horace’s sly, polite, insinuating style; many employ the stereotypes which arise out of prejudice or polarised preferences; many employ a rhetoric which verges on, and trespasses into, the violent and the obscene. This essay considers the pot’s perspective; there are of course many books and essays, written and to be written, from the perspective of the kettle.

Samuel Butler

The most developed and extended poetic satire on dissent published in the latter half of the seventeenth century is also the most original and the least typical. Samuel Butler began composing his mock-heroic, mock-romance poem *Hudibras* only two years before the Restoration. Its first Part was published by December 1662; the second Part appeared (with the revised first Part) in 1674; and the third Part in 1677. It tells the tale of Hudibras and his Squire, Ralpho; though neither can be said properly to be heroes, and no-one ever read *Hudibras* for its narrative. A superannuated knight riding forth in search of adventures, Hudibras is evidently a quixotic figure. He is altogether less deluded, however, and more knowing, than Cervantes’ hero.

The poem presents itself from its opening lines as historical, describing the times ‘When *civil* Fury first grew high’.[[2]](#footnote-2) Its targets are specific, limited, political: the two factions, Presbyterian and Independent, who vied for power through the Civil War period, but adopted and stood for two different forms of Church government. For a statement of that struggle, heavily inflected by Church of England sympathies and understanding, and broadly in line with Butler’s, a modern reader might usefully turn to Jonathan Swift. Swift explains that though there were episcopally ordained Puritan bishops and preachers during the reign of James I, and at first under Charles I, there was no ‘separate Species of Religion’. However,

soon after the Rebellion broke out, the Term Puritan gradually dropt, and that of Presbyterian succeeded; which Sect was, in two or three Years, established in all its Forms ... And, from this Period, the Church continued under Persecution until Monarchy was restored ...

In a Year or two after, we began to hear of a new Party risen, and growing in the Parliament, as well as the Army; under the Name of Independent: It spread, indeed, somewhat more in the latter; but not equal with the Presbyterians, ... until some Time before the King was murdered. ... this Independant Party, upon whom all the Mischief is charged by their Presbyterian Brethren, ... during the whole Usurpation, ... contended by Degrees with their Parent Sect, and ... shared in Employments; and gradually, after the Restoration, mingled with the Mass of Presbyterians; lying ever since undistinguished in the Herd of Dissenters.[[3]](#footnote-3)

In Butler’s poem, Hudibras himself is a satiric version of a Presbyterian, Ralpho of an Independent. The action of the poem displays the ill-matched pair herding, and contending, together. The details of significant arguments of Civil War and Protectorate political and religious history are set out in a series of extended dialogues between Hudibras and Ralpho.

Satires are never purely historiographical however; their business is always more current. So it is with *Hudibras*. Zachary Grey, who produced an edition of *Hudibras* in 1744 with extensive illustrative, and highly tendentious, notes, praised Butler for exposing ‘the Hypocrisy and Wickedness of those, who began and carried on the Rebellion, under a Pretence of promoting Religion and Godliness’.[[4]](#footnote-4) Butler did so, however, less to explore historical sins, than to warn his Restoration contemporaries of the continuing danger posed by Presbyterianism in particular, as well as by dissent in general. The first years of the Restoration saw a crucial debate about the proper status and treatment of dissenters, not least about how far Presbyterians could be trusted and tolerated in worship and governance in the new order. An extensive body of writing in the 1660s set out to demonstrate how undependable, and how dangerously opposed to monarchy, nonconformists remained. Hard-line Anglicans argued that Presbyterians should be excluded from the Church of England, and from civil power; the success of that argument rested in part on associating them with more radical dissenting sects, not least the Independents.[[5]](#footnote-5) Just such an unholy non-conforming alliance is allegorised, and made discursive, by the pairing of Hudibras and his squire.[[6]](#footnote-6)

The main satiric targets of *Hudibras* are what Butler considers the frank deceptions and hypocrisy of dissent. Hudibras and Ralpho conduct a series of arguments, but neither can lay claim to disinterested scholarship, reason, or honesty. Hudibras himself is presented as a logic-chopping pseudo-Aristotelian, learned always in self-justifying and self-serving ways. The Presbyterians are described from the beginning as paradoxical, contradictory, radically unsatisfied:

More peevish, cross, and spleenatick,

Than Dog distract, or Monky sick:

That with more care keep holy-day

The wrong, then others the right way.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Hudibras is a knight errant, but not of a romantic kind. He is a warrior not wandering but erroneous. No seeker of disinterested truth, he is one of those who

... build their Faith upon

The holy Text of *Pike* and *Gun*;

Decide all Controversies by

Infallible *Artillery*;

And prove their Doctrine Orthodox

By Apostolick *Blows* and *Knocks*.[[8]](#footnote-8)

Though the Bible only was the religion of Protestants, and more especially of the Anglican Church, Hudibras’s scripture is military force. His theological criteria are those notoriously attributed to Rome by Anglican controvertists, the Vatican’s exercise of secular power, the Pope’s claim to infallibility, the reliance not on holy writ but on apostolic tradition Rome claimed to trace back to St Peter.

Ralpho is a tradesman, as many sectarians were, but his genealogy presents him ambiguously, and mock-heroically. His working pose as a tailor is ‘cross-legg’d’ like that of knightly effigies; providing made-up garments on credit he is ‘fam’d’, like the crusaders, for his ‘faith’; he pricks lice with his needle as he sews, at war ‘against the bloudy Caniball’.[[9]](#footnote-9) His learning is more personal and individual than his master’s, deriving not from study or experience but from the saint’s claimed inner light:

Some call it *Gifts*, and some *New light*;

A Liberal Art, that costs no pains

Of Study, Industry, or Brains.[[10]](#footnote-10)

Such solipsism, uninformed by and untestable against worldly or textual knowledge, gives unchallengeable certainty: ‘Whate’re men speak by this *new Light*, / Still they are sure to be i’th’ right’.[[11]](#footnote-11)

Hudibras trades in materialistic deceit. One of many sectarian behaviours at odds with sectarian spiritual profession is an ungodly interest in the things of this world. In Canto One of the Third Part, Hudibras is subjected to an interrogation by ‘Furies and Hobgoblins’ sent by the wealthy widow he has been pursuing. Asked during the course of his catechising why he chose to set himself up in *‘that cursed Sin, Hypocrisie’*, he replies that it is ‘the Thriving’st Calling’:

*What makes all Doctrines Plain and Clear?—*

About two Hundred Pounds a Year.

*And that which was prov’d true before,*

*Prove false again?*—Two Hundred more.[[12]](#footnote-12)

Tangible profit serves as motive and justification for violence and duplicity. It removes all contradictions, explains all complexities, allows all forms of dishonesty.

The abuse of plain and honest language and understanding is a regular engine and aspect of hypocrisy. Hudibras from the beginning is described as an expert in the obscure. He speaks in ‘a *Babylonish* dialect, / Which learned Pedants much affect’. His vocabulary is full of new coined and counterfeit words, designed to deceive the vulgar: ‘And when with hasty noise he spoke ’em, / The Ignorant for currant took ’em.’[[13]](#footnote-13) Grey’s note to these lines aptly cites Addison’s remark that ‘those Swarms of Sectaries that over-ran the Nation in the time of the great Rebellion, carried their Hypocrisie so high, that they had converted our whole Language into a Jargon of Enthusiasm.’[[14]](#footnote-14)

Ralpho’s views on the uses of language and the stability of meanings are most fully explored in his astonishing extended disquisition on the licence given to the Saints to lie and to break promises.[[15]](#footnote-15) One of the most famous and most quoted lines in Hudibras is Ralpho’s assertion that ‘*Oaths* are but *words*, and *words* but *wind*’;[[16]](#footnote-16) this is not an isolated apothegm, but an integral part of one of the poem’s most significant arguments, with general ethical as well as particular political implications. Christ had instructed his first disciples to ‘Swear not at all ... But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay’.[[17]](#footnote-17) ‘Our late *Apostles*’, however, as Ralpho explains, take the view that ‘W’are not commanded to forbear / Indefinitely, at all to *swear*’. Indeed, to break an oath once made is ‘but a kind of *Self-denying*’, and therefore ‘a *Saint-like virtue*’. Ralpho provides a whole series of examples from Commonwealth history to demonstrate this ‘constant *Rule* and *practice*’. Among those who ‘broke *Oaths* by *Providence*’ was Cromwell, who justified the Commons motion to proceed capitally against the King, in contradiction of previous Parliamentary claims to be fighting ‘for the KING’s *safety*, and his *Right*’, by arguing that ‘*Providence*, and Necessity had cast them upon it’.[[18]](#footnote-18) The sectarian approach to vows and promises becomes the central instance of special pleading. Ralpho achieves a triumph of sophistry, arguing that oaths, like Old Testament Law, are meant to control not the enlightened saints, but the ‘Moral Cattle’ of more conventional Anglican belief.[[19]](#footnote-19) A Saint is ‘of th’heav’nly Realm a *Peer*’; Peers swear on their honour, which is their own property, and of which they may therefore dispose as they think fit. The breaking of a sworn oath, Ralpho concludes, is logically ‘no *perjury*’, but ‘a breach / Of nothing, but a form of speech’.[[20]](#footnote-20) Nor does swearing on the Scriptures constrain:

The *Saints* have freedom to digress,

And vary from ’em, as they please;

Or misinterpret them, by *private*

*Instructions*, to all *Aims* they drive at.[[21]](#footnote-21)

The Bible becomes for the sectarians not a text whose meaning might be a rule of faith, but a waxen nose, twisted to conform to their desires. Grey’s note to these lines invokes Walker’s *History of Independency*: ‘they professed their Consciences to be the Rule and Symbol both of their Faith and Doctrine. By this *...* they interpret, and to this they conform the Scripture; not their Consciences to the Scriptures.’ Indeed, the sectarians are accused at a number of points in Butler’s poem of using the Bible as it proves most convenient to their interests. Ralpho’s world view is informed by a useful and far-fetched literalism in biblical interpretation; what the Bible does not authorise must be forbidden. He justifies the duo’s attack on the bear-baiting by denouncing that recreation as ‘Antichristian’: ‘For certainly there’s no such word / In all the *Scripture* on record’.[[22]](#footnote-22) (This version of Puritan literalism would find a further literary life in Swift’s Jack.) Taking a different position, but equally conveniently, Hudibras explains his breaking of his oath to his Lady by professing himself a sceptic in matters of plain textual understanding: ‘Oaths are not bound to bear /That *Literal Sense*,the words infer’.[[23]](#footnote-23)

John Dryden

In John Dryden’s major satires of the early 1680s, sectarians, pretended sectarians, and alleged sectarians are frequently a target. Anti-dissenting satiric themes made familiar by earlier writers appear in a richer poetic context. In his poem *The Hypocrite* John Caryll had accused the Earl of Shaftesbury of taking on a new role and appearance, the ‘action, looks and garb’ of Puritan hypocrisy; in *The Medall* Dryden alleges that Shaftesbury, for equally selfish purposes, ‘cast himself into the Saint-like mould’, and ‘Groan’d, sigh’d, and pray’d, while Godliness was gain’.[[24]](#footnote-24) Butler had accused the Presbyterians of choosing those sins they could construe as righteous; Dryden finds that Shaftesbury failed in his role as Saint because of his (probably falsely) alleged sexual licence:

His open lewdness he cou’d ne’er disguise.

There split the Saint: for Hypocritique Zeal

Allows no Sins but those it can conceal.[[25]](#footnote-25)

Dryden’s attack on dissent and its fellow travellers has a political dimension, as Butler’s has and Swift’s would have, but Dryden’s occasion is more immediate and more urgent. In *Absalom and Achitophel* the opportunistic and dissembling Shaftesbury/Achitophel, the tempter of Monmouth / Absalom, is an appropriate leader and provoker of the English crowd, ‘a Headstrong, Moody, Murmuring race’, infected with ‘publick Lunacy’. This ‘*Solymaean* Rout’ are described in a telling oxymoron as ‘well vers’d of old / In godly faction’. In the Civil War years they had tried Gods ‘of every shape and size’, and executed a king. Now they resume ‘their Cant, and with a Zealous Cry, / Pursu’d their old belov’d Theocracy’.[[26]](#footnote-26) Now they would challenge the authority of Charles II himself.

Dryden was especially concerned with the sectarians’ uses, and abuses, of Scripture. Before the Reformation Rome had controlled access to and interpretation of the Bible: ‘*Scripture* was *scarce*, and as the Market went, / Poor *Laymen* took *Salvation* on *Content*’.[[27]](#footnote-27) The translation of the Bible into vulgar tongues, however, had as bad a consequence. Mere tradesmen, like Ralpho the tailor, or guildsmen, might gall ‘the tender Page with horney Fists’. Interpretative privilege might be appropriated by readers who, like Ralpho, had given no labour to formal scholarship and had graduated to no qualification, but claimed the authority rather of individual inspiration:

The *Spirit* gave the *Doctoral Degree*:

And every member of a *Company*

Was of *his Trade*, and of the *Bible free*.

...

*Study* and *Pains* were now no more their Care;

*Texts* were explain’d by *Fasting*, and by *Prayer*.[[28]](#footnote-28)

The Bible was meant for spiritual food; fly-blown, the text produces the whimsical and ephemeral maggots of the sectarian mind. Worse, Dryden accuses the sectarians of ‘rack[ing] Scripture to confess their cause’, torturing its sense to make it agree with their beliefs. As Ralpho had argued for the right of the Saints to misinterpret Scripture ‘by private / Instructions to all aims they drive at’, so Dryden accuses them of seizing ‘this talking Trumpet’ to their own use, to ‘make it speak whatever Sense they please!’ This is an exercise in subjective, uncontrolled interpretation, the operations of the spirit working only in reverse: ‘the Text inspires not them; but they the Text inspire’.[[29]](#footnote-29) Honest appeal to a text as a potentially stable rule of faith gives way to the personal and party motive. Scripture becomes a vehicle not of salvation but damnation: ‘the Fanaticks, or Schismaticks, of the *English* Church’ have used the translated Bible ‘as if their business was not to be sav’d but to be damnd by its Contents’.[[30]](#footnote-30) Sectarian perversions of biblical guidance, and sectarian duplicities, are intimated elliptically in Dryden’s satiric puns. In *Absalom and Achitophel* Corah is named for Korah, who led a rebellion against Moses (Numbers, 16. 1-40). Dryden’s prophetic Corah is repeatedly and emphatically referred to as a ‘witness’, a word with double implications. ‘Witness’ is used in the New Testament of those who testify to Christ’s divinity, and particularly of John the Baptist, sent ‘to bear witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe’.[[31]](#footnote-31) At the same time Dryden’s reiterated ‘witness’ mocks the lying evidencer Titus Oates, ‘Arch-Attestor’ of the Popish Plot.[[32]](#footnote-32) In the Bible, Shimei is the kinsman of Saul who cursed David (2 Sam. 16. 5-12). In Dryden’s poem Shimei is the frugal Slingsby Bethel, leather seller and Whig Lord Mayor of London, who, though he notoriously refused to give the hospitality his office required, ‘yet lov’d his wicked Neighbour as himself’, thus satisfying, in his own terms, the second of Christ’s great commandments (Mark 12. 31). Christ had promised the apostles that ‘where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them’ (Matt. 18. 20); cursing the King, like his biblical original, Dryden’s Shimei keeps Christian fellowship with a difference:

When two or three were gather’d to declaim

Against the monarch of *Jerusalem*,

*Shimei* was always in the midst of them.[[33]](#footnote-33)

Such allusive doubleness expresses in compressed and telling form the hypocrisy, and the blasphemy, of these two dissenting leaders.

Jonathan Swift

Jonathan Swift had a strong historical sense of the importance, and to his mind the dangers, of sectarianism. His first satiric masterpiece, the *Tale of a Tub* volume which first appeared in 1704 and comprised not only the *Tale* but also *The Battel of the Books* and *The Mechanical Operation of the Spirit*, aimed at a broad range of present and past Protestant dissent. In the allegorical narrative of the *Tale*, Anglican Martin is beset by his brothers Peter, who represents the Pope and Romanism, and Jack, who represents an extremely diverse range of Protestant sects and leaders: John Calvin, John of Leyden (an Anabaptist tailor, and one of the leaders of the Muenster rebellion of 1534[[34]](#footnote-34)), the Family of Christ, the Sweet Singers of Israel, the Huguenots, the Quakers, the Independents, and both the English and Scottish Presbyterians: ‘the little Boys in the Streets ... would call Him, *Jack the Bald;* sometimes, *Jack with a Lanthorn;* sometimes, *Dutch Jack;* sometimes, *French Hugh;* sometimes, *Tom the Beggar;* and sometimes, *Knocking Jack of the North*.’[[35]](#footnote-35) For Swift, as for Butler, the Presbyterians were a substantial target. Swift’s own early clerical career in Ireland had brought him unwelcome familiarity with immigrant Scottish Presbyterians, driven from their own country by the famine years of the mid 1690s. Swift’s choice of the name Jack has a particular resonance, invoking the phrase ‘Jack Presbyter’ as used in seventeenth-century polemic.[[36]](#footnote-36)

In the *Tale* volume Swift attacks many of what he and other Anglicans took to be the characterising affectations of sectarian worship, the eyes rolled up as a mark of sanctity, the droning nasal tone and distorted facial features of the preacher, the ‘jargon’ or ‘Babel’ of their language of devotion. He devotes a lengthy passage of the *Tale* to sectarian biblical literalism. Scripture is for Jack ‘Meat, Drink, and Cloth’: ‘his common Talk and Conversation, ran wholly in the Phrase of his Will.’[[37]](#footnote-37) ‘The Mechanical Operation of the Spirit’ contains an inventive running conceit on the long-alleged connection and similarity of religious zeal and sexual licence. Swift’s persona insists on the ‘fundamental Point’ amongst the fanatics of their belief and practice of ‘the Community of Women’, and observes (‘with wonder’, though scientifically) the attraction of ‘all Females’ to ‘Visionary or Enthusiastick Preachers’, usually supposed to be the result of ‘Considerations, purely Spiritual, without any carnal Regards at all’. This much is certain, Swift’s persona concludes; ‘however Spiritual Intrigues begin, they generally conclude like all others; they may branch upwards towards Heaven; but the Root is in the Earth.’[[38]](#footnote-38)

At the centre of Swift’s satire, however, is a concerted attack, taking highly extended and developed forms, on a central theological issue, the dissenting claim to the private inspiration of individual believers by the Holy Ghost, variously labelled ‘zeal’ and ‘enthusiasm’. Such claims, deluded and deliberately deluding in Swift’s view, are reduced to mechanical fundamentals. Jack, in Swift’s new religious mythology, turns out to have been the ‘Author and Founder’ of ‘the most Illustrious and Epidemick Sect of Aeolists’, who ‘maintain the Original Cause of all Things to be *Wind*, from which this whole Universe was at first produced.’[[39]](#footnote-39) Learning is understood by the Aeolists to be mere wind, for (and here Swift follows Butler’s parodic syllogism) ‘*Words are but Wind; and Learning is nothing but Words;* Ergo, *Learning is nothing but Wind.’* The modern tub-preacher, a committed Aeolist, performs his mysteries and rites as the ancient oracles did, with equal show, deceit, and persuasive power:

… the Virtuoso’s of former Ages, had a Contrivance for carrying and preserving *Winds* in Casks or Barrels … ascribed to *Æolus* himself. … this Sect … have to this Day preserved great Numbers of those *Barrels,* whereof they fix one in each of their Temples …; into this *Barrel …* the Priest enters; … a secret Funnel is also convey’d from his Posteriors, to the Bottom of the Barrel, which admits new Supplies of Inspiration from a *Northern* Chink or Crany. … In this Posture he disembogues whole Tempests upon his Auditory, as the Spirit from beneath gives him Utterance.[[40]](#footnote-40)

Northern European, British, and especially North British enthusiasm operates by insufflation, through the anus of the dissenting preacher, emerging not as sacred truth but eructation.

Swift’s attack on enthusiasm reaches its satiric and poetic apogee in the ‘Fragment’ included with the *Tale*, ‘A Discourse Concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit’. The ‘Discourse’ parodies the ‘Letters’ written to the Royal Society, and published in the *Philosophical Transactions*. The scientific discovery that the persona of the ‘Discourse’ has to communicate is that there are not three but four different modes of inspiration. The first three are well known: ‘the immediate Act of God, ... called, *Prophecy* or *Inspiration*’; ‘the immediate Act of the Devil, ... termed *Possession*’; ‘the Product of natural Causes, the effect of strong Imagination, violent Anger, Fear, Grief, Pain, and the like’. The fourth, however, is distinctively and purely ‘an Effect of Artifice and *Mechanick Operation*’. [[41]](#footnote-41) ‘Mechanick’ is a word that suggests the mechanical systems of the circulation of the blood, or the motions of the planets, but it calls to mind also the vulgar trades which, as Anglican satire so gleefully insisted, so many of the sectaries pursued. Mechanical enthusiasm, which has benefited from many ‘Advancements and Refinements’ in the modern world, is ‘performed’ by the dissenting preachers who are ‘our *British Workmen*’.[[42]](#footnote-42) The ‘Discourse’ treats specifically, and exclusively, of this fourth, mechanical, mode of inspiration. Swift, or his persona, acknowledges that ‘It hath continued these hundred Years an even Debate, whether the Deportment and the Cant of our *English* Enthusiastick Preachers, were *Possession*, or *Inspiration*’, and therefore is resolved to make clear that ‘this Mystery of venting spiritual Gifts is nothing but a *Trade*, acquired by as much Instruction, and mastered by equal Practice and Application as others are’.[[43]](#footnote-43) Amongst the dissenters inspiration comes not from God or the Devil, but is the merchandise of tradesmen, whose mystery is not sacred truth but learnt craft. Religious devotion becomes a huckster’s performance, governed not by the need for understanding and clear communication but by the practised jargon and patter, the hypnotic chant and cant of the salesman:

without a competent Skill in tuning and toning each Word, and Syllable, and Letter, to their due Cadence, the whole Operation ... misses entirely of its effect on the Hearers ... For ... in the Language of the Spirit, *Cant* and *Droning* supply the Place of *Sense* and *Reason,* in the Language of Men.[[44]](#footnote-44)

No great harm might ensue, perhaps, if this exercise in dishonesty and delusion were confined to the enthusiasts themselves. Unfortunately, however, as Swift argues in his ‘Digression concerning the Original, the Use, and Improvement of *Madness* in a Commonwealth’, the frenzy which characterises the Aeolists is a necessary distemper of those who propagate ‘New Religions’, as it is of those who establish ‘New Empires by Conquest’, and ‘New Schemes in Philosophy’. It is an essential qualification of all those who would sponsor new systems in the intellectual, political and religious worlds, ‘For, what Man in the natural State, or Course of Thinking, did ever conceive it in his Power, to reduce the Notions of all Mankind, exactly to the same Length, and Breadth, and Heighth of his own?’ The result of the sleep of reason is the eviction of common sense, of communal understanding, in the individual, and then in his sectarian followers:

when a Man’s Fancy gets *astride* on his Reason, … and common Understanding, as well as common Sense, is kickt out of Doors; the first Proselyte he makes is Himself, and when that is once compass’d, the Difficulty is not so great in bringing over others.[[45]](#footnote-45)

This process of proselytising in Swift’s view is characteristic of all shades of dissent, and threatens the safety of the spiritual and secular state. Swift was no advocate of thought control; we all have liberty of conscience, the right to our own private beliefs, which, ‘properly speaking, is no more than the liberty of possessing our own thoughts and opinions, which every man enjoys without fear of the magistrate’.[[46]](#footnote-46) If men publish their thoughts to the world, however, ‘they ought to be answerable for the effects their thoughts produce upon others’.[[47]](#footnote-47)

This line of reasoning has a remarkable and challenging consequence for Swift’s views of hypocrisy in relation to religion. Much of his satire against the sectarians turns on the exposure of hypocritical difference, between the appearance of chastity and the indulgence of the flesh, between the claim of truly divine inspiration and the reality of mechanical operation of the dissenting spirit. A different kind of hypocrisy, however, a hypocrisy which leads to quiet, security and peace rather than histrionics, tumescence and violence, might be considered not only permissible but essential to Church and State. Swift’s *Project for the Advancement of Religion, and the Reformation of Manners* (1709) seems at least at first sight as serious and unironic a piece as he was capable of writing. That he titled the work ‘a Project’, and chose to publish it under the authorial identity of ‘a Person of Quality’ might raise some suspicion.[[48]](#footnote-48) Swift or his persona asserts that ‘the Nation is extreamly corrupted in Religion and Morals’; ‘hardly One in a Hundred among our People of Quality, or Gentry appears to act by any Principle of Religion’, and the common people are almost as bad. These are credibly Swiftian complaints. The pamphlet proposes as a solution that the sovereign should take steps to make it ‘every Man’s Interest and Honour to cultivate Religion and Virtue’, and in particular to make appointment to offices of state dependent upon virtuous behaviour and religious observance. This would have a valuable practical effect:

There is no Quality so contrary to any Nature, which Men cannot affect, and put on upon Occasion, in order to serve an Interest, or gratify a prevailing Passion. ... How ready therefore would most Men be to step into the Paths of Virtue and Piety, if they infallibly led to Favour and Fortune?[[49]](#footnote-49)

The projector understands very well ‘that the making Religion a necessary Step to Interest and Favour, might encrease Hypocrisy among us’, but insists that the price would be worth paying ‘if One in Twenty should be brought over to true Piety by this, or the like Methods, and the other Nineteen be only Hypocrites’. Hypocrisy in such a cause is a relative good: ‘Hypocrisy is much more eligible than open Infidelity and Vice; it wears the Livery of Religion, it acknowledgeth her Authority, and is cautious of giving Scandal’.[[50]](#footnote-50) These arguments may seem disingenuous. They are inflected at least by the shifting ironic tone of the Swiftian voice, and an almost Gulliverian optimism about the moral and practical efficacy of good examples. They are nevertheless consistent with Swift’s regular argument that behaviour, not sentiment, is the key to public quiet. The Swift of the *Project*, like the Swift of the sermons, is a believer in authority, obedience, and the truth and importance to civil order of Anglican belief and the Anglican Church Established. The hypocrisy of even a feigned orthodox belief is for him altogether preferable to the hypocrisy of the fanaticks.

Satire, reception, interpretation

The public reaction to Swift’s *Tale of a Tub*, following its first appearance in 1704, provides an unusually fully documented instance of the opposition and misunderstanding encountered by authors of religious satire. Strikingly, there are few responses from the ostensible targets of Swift’s satire, Romanist or dissenting. Daniel Defoe attacked a key element of Swift’s satire against dissenting notions of the operation of the spirit as ‘a mistaken Notion of *Wind*, which … flew upward in blew Strakes of a livid Flame call’d *Blasphemy*, which burnt up all the Wit and Fancy of the Author, and left a strange *stench* behind it’.[[51]](#footnote-51) Some commentators suspected the author of the *Tale* of being one of those ‘Profane and debauched Deists’, who claim in their writings ‘to expose the Abuses and Corruptions of Religion’, but in reality ‘indeavour to ridicule and banter all *Humane* as well as *Divine* Accomplishments’.[[52]](#footnote-52) The most common theme amongst critics of the *Tale* was that its anonymous author consistently indulged himself in levity and indecency wholly inappropriate to his subject, and in doing so ridiculed and attempted to bring into disrepute not only his apparent romanist and dissenting targets, but all Christianity, including the English Church. William King, in the persona of a night-soil man, spelled out the four apparent purposes of the author of the *Tale* volume: ‘the … first … is, to be Prophane. … The Second is to show how great a Proficient he is, ... at Cursing and Swearing. … His Third is to exceed all Bounds of Modesty … His next is a great Affectation for every thing that is nasty … almost every Part has a Tincture of such Filthiness’.[[53]](#footnote-53) John Dennis accused the *Tale*’s author of being ‘a Priest … who mad’st thy first Appearance in the World like a ... spiritual Buffoon, an Ecclesiastical *Jack Pudding*, by publishing a Piece of waggish Divinity, which was writ with a Design to banter all Christianity’.[[54]](#footnote-54)

Such suspicion of indecorous and jesting expression of all kinds in relation to religion had a very long history. The Bible had itself provided ample warrant. Seventeenth- and eighteenth-century divines and homilists regularly referred to Peter’s prophecy that ‘there shall come in the last days scoffers’ (2 Pet. 3. 3), and, more especially, to Paul’s warning that the saints must avoid ‘filthiness’, ‘foolish talking’, and ‘jesting’ (Ephes. 5. 4). The issue was taken seriously, and discussed with rigour and nuance, by major theologians. Isaac Barrow devoted a long sermon to Ephesians 5. 4, in which he suggested that Paul’s words, like other ‘seemingly formal prohibitions’, should be received only as a ‘sober caution’. There is a difference, Barrow insists, between mere ‘foolish talking’ (Paul’s Greek is ω), and facetiousness used as a ‘proper instrument for exposing things apparently base and vile in due contempt’. Indeed, Barrow would appear to license just the kind of parabolic invention that characterises Swift’s *Tale*:

If it be lawfull, (as by the best authorities it plainly doth appear to be,) in using Rhetorical schemes, Poetical strains, ... Allegories, Fables, Parables, and Riddles, to discoast from the plain and simple way of speech; why may not Facetiousness, issuing from the same principles, directed to the same ends, serving to like purposes, be likewise used blamelessly?

Though parables, fables and allegories are permitted in the service of virtue, however, Barrow’s sermon provides no licence for Swift’s jesting in matters of religion, or for his sexual and coprophilic satire, that ‘filthiness’ at which even William King’s night-soil man would turn up his nose. Barrow insists that ‘All profane Jesting, all speaking loosely and wantonly about Holy things, ... making such things the matters of sport and mockery ... is certainly prohibited’, and indeed that on all subjects ‘it is very culpable to be facetious in obscene and smutty matters’.[[55]](#footnote-55)

When the *Tale* was published in its revised fifth edition, in 1710, Swift prefaced an ‘Apology’ which sought explicitly to answer his contemporary critics, and, less explicitly, to situate and defend his work against the long-standing Anglican suspicion of the application of the methods of satire to religious argument. He was not the first, nor would he be the last, ironising satirist to find the need to explain himself. Daniel Defoe’s *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters* (1702) responded to debate concerning the Bill ‘to Prevent Occasional Conformity’, which had just been passed by the Commons. Defoe’s method was to make ‘other Peoples thoughts speak in his words’,[[56]](#footnote-56) exaggerating violent and immoderate High Tory anti-dissenting rhetoric, especially that of Henry Sacheverell’s ‘Oxford Sermon’ of June 1702. Not altogether surprisingly, Defoe’s bodiless voice and barely flagged ironies upset all parties, the Dissenters who thought themselves attacked, and the High Churchmen who thought themselves travestied. Defoe promptly published *A Brief Explanation of a Late Pamphlet* ([1703]), to make a ‘Declaration of his real Design’, though he complained that ‘If any man takes the pains seriously to reflect upon the Contents, the Nature of the Thing, and the Manner of the Stile, it seems Impossible to imagine it should pass for any thing but an Irony’.[[57]](#footnote-57) A dozen years later, Francis Hare published his *Difficulties and Discouragements which attend the Study of the Scriptures* (1714), which presents itself as a letter from an older Anglican cleric, warning a ‘Young Clergyman’ against the ‘free, serious, impartial, and laborious Study of the Scriptures’, on the grounds of the difficulty of the text, the impossibly wide range of knowledge required, and the numerous and challenging languages to be learnt. Close study of the Bible is neither safe nor profitable for a clergyman, who does better ‘to study the *Tradition of the Church*’.[[58]](#footnote-58) Such a preference is paradoxical for a clergyman of the Anglican Church, which like other Protestant churches had insisted on the primacy of Scripture as a Rule of Faith, and urged both the clergy and the laity to ‘search the Scriptures’. Hare’s letter writer is in fact intended as a burlesquing personation of conservative churchmen, and their condemnation of Samuel Clarke’s *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity* (1712), which had argued that careful examination of the holy writings revealed no clear authority for orthodox Trinitarian belief. Fearing that his ironic *reductio* might be misunderstood, or misapplied, or taken seriously, Hare appends, even with his first edition, a Conclusion, in which he explicitly and formally denies allegiance to this ‘strange Paradox, ... that Clergymen should lay aside what *ought* to be their *chief Study*’.[[59]](#footnote-59)

It is striking that one of the key points Swift felt impelled to make in his ‘Apology’ is that ‘there generally runs an Irony through the Thread of the whole Book, which the Men of Tast will observe and distinguish, and which will render some objections that have been made, very weak and insignificant’.[[60]](#footnote-60) Another point, closely related and equally striking, is that ‘the judicious Reader cannot but have observed, some of those Passages ... which appear most liable to Objection are what they call Parodies, where the Author personates the Style and Manner of other Writers, whom he has a mind to expose’.[[61]](#footnote-61) These are optimistic claims: the reception history of satire shows of course (as Swift knew and acknowledged) that not all readers may observe and distinguish irony and parody. Claiming that it is Peter who is represented in the *Tale* as repeating ‘Oaths and Curses’, Swift attempts to escape the accusation that he himself used ‘Prophane or Immodest Speech’;[[62]](#footnote-62) but Peter is not the only such voice in the *Tale*, nor would the absolute prohibition of such speech by Barrow amongst others be reasonably circumvented even if he were.

It might credibly be argued therefore that, despite his protests, the Swift of *A Tale of a Tub* remains vulnerable to Anglican objections, made before or in his own time, against such rhetorical methods. Swift however makes more consequential claims about the substance and targets of his satire. Insisting that his book ‘Celebrates the Church of *England* as the most perfect of all others in Discipline and Doctrine, it advances no Opinion they reject, nor condemns any they receive’, he undertakes ‘to forfeit his life, if any one Opinion can be fairly deduced from that Book which is contrary to Religion or Morality’.[[63]](#footnote-63) A recent commentator has characterized Swift’s challenge as ‘bravado’;[[64]](#footnote-64) Swift’s gage however has to do with the *meaning* of his book.It poses an *interpretative* question, which can only be answered by interpretative methods. If it were merely an act of bravado, it might be expected that Swift’s challenge would have been decisively taken up and defeated. No such decisive refutation has ever appeared. It is true that such contemporaries as Richard Blackmore and Matthew Tindal, for instance, accused Swift of making himself ‘pleasant with the Principles of the Christian’ and ‘talking ridiculously about Religion in general’,[[65]](#footnote-65) but no quantity of such assertions could amount to *interpretative* evidence. We know that King and Dennis, Blackmore and Tindal, and many others, charged the *Tale of a Tub* with heterodoxy; but the question is whether their charges were well-founded in any valid understanding of the words of Swift’s book.

The most extended and testing contemporary examination of the *Tale*, William Wotton’s ‘Observations upon the *Tale of a Tub*’, was published within a year of the first edition of the *Tale*.[[66]](#footnote-66) Wotton stands out as a serious critic of the *Tale*. He pays detailed and sustained attention to his text. He does not, however, as a matter of method, drive home his attacks hermeneutically. Wotton alleges, for instance, amongst many allegations, that the number of the three sons, Peter, Martin, and Jack, ‘looks asquint at the TRINITY’ (but Wotton does not show how).[[67]](#footnote-67) He denies that ‘any Christian [would] compare a *Mountebank’s Stage*, a *Pulpit,* and a Ladder together’ (but the pulpit Swift mocks—or rather, the pulpit his hack-persona ‘esteems’—is ‘That made of Timber from the *Sylva Caledonia*’, that is, the pulpit of Presbyterian and dissenting worship).[[68]](#footnote-68) Wotton particularly objects to Swift’s satire against enthusiasm, which in Wotton’s eyes, though Swift’s target was dissent, causes extensive collateral damage:

all extraordinary Inspirations are the Subjects of his Scorn and Mockery, whilst the Protestant Dissenters are ... the most directly levelled at ... [e]nthusiasm with him is an Universal Deception which has run through all Sciences in all Kingdoms, and every thing has some *Fanatic Branch annexed to it*.[[69]](#footnote-69)

Certainly Swift’s attack on enthusiasm permeates the whole; but he is explicit, not only in the ‘Apology’ but also in the meat of his text, about the contrived and simulated kinds of enthusiasm which are the objects of his satiric derision. Wotton’s ‘Observations’ are marked throughout by his unwillingness or refusal to engage with or recognise shifts of voice in the *Tale*, his obtuseness to irony, his hostility to coarser kinds of satiric humour, and the biases of his involvement in controversial battle with Swift during the briefly bloody Ancients and Moderns debate. His general insistence that to direct ‘Scorn and Mockery’ against any branch or sect of religion is to attack all religion, and his constant complaints against what he considers Swift’s blasphemy and profanity, are coherent given his stated principles, and in line with Anglican writing on the proper uses of wit in controversy. Wotton’s ‘Observations’ do not, however, at any single point, demonstrate that the *Tale* promulgates any opinion contrary to Anglican belief and observance.

Wotton’s ‘Observations’ offer a paradigm case for the reading of religious satire. Swift hoped for, and possibly expected, readers of candour and discrimination, as he understood those qualities. Readers of parodic and ironic texts, however, have not always had the generosity to suppose good meanings, or the interpretative discernment to distinguish true meanings. Swift had reason to complain, as Defoe had done, that ‘Ignorance, or Prejudice has led most Men to a hasty Censure of the Book’, and to insist, as Defoe had done, on the ‘Native Genuine Meaning and Design’ of his work.[[70]](#footnote-70) These are complaints about the misreading of satires which employ irony as a structural as well as a local tool. Satire is a genre, and irony is a mode, notoriously liable to misunderstanding. They are particularly liable to misunderstanding when their targets are deeply held, and complexly constructed, spiritual beliefs and observances.
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