POPE'S TREATMENT OF THEOBALD AND CIBBER IN THE DUNCIAD

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the North Texas State University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Marlene K. Gardner, B. A.

Denton, Texas

May, 1984

The purpose of this paper is to investigate Pope's treatment of Lewis Theobald and Colley Cibber in their roles as the king of dunces in the *Dunciad*. After an introductory chapter that treats the battles between Pope and Theobald and Pope and Cibber, the second chapter gives a short factual biography of Theobald emphasizing the events relating to his battle with Pope. The third chapter analyzes the caricature of Theobald in the *Dunciad Variorum*, showing its variations from fact. By comparing Theobald and Cibber, the fourth chapter investigates the extent and effectiveness of the changes made in the *Dunciad* of 1743 to accommodate the change from Theobald to Cibber as the king of dunces. This paper attempts to demonstrate that Theobald and Cibber were treated unfairly by Pope, whose decision to enthrone both was based on a desire for personal revenge.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The events of the battle surrounding the Dunciad covered almost two decades. Although Pope's ill treatment of his enemies and his brooding over their attacks on him continued throughout his career, during the time of the publication of the Peri Bathos and the first two versions of the Dunciad, he was even more preoccupied with retaliation. The battle with Theobald began with the publication of Pope's edition of Shakespeare in March 1725. Pope's carelessness in editing allowed a previously obscure scholar, Lewis Theobald, to gather his own carefully thought-out emendations and present them in rebuttal to Pope's edition. With the publication of Shakespeare Restored in 1726, Theobald firmly established himself as one of the most dangerous kinds of critics of Pope, one whose charges were valid and whose information was irrefutable. Besides Shakespeare Restored, Theobald also offered additional emendations in a letter, submitted by Concanen, to whom it was addressed, to the London Journal in September, 1726 and threatened further corrections in his preface to the Double Falsehood, published in December, 1727.
Pope did not answer Theobald with acceptance of his recommendations but with direct attack. In March, 1728 Pope struck back at Theobald in two works—*A Fragment of Satire* and the *Peri Bathos*—printed in the "last" volume of the Pope and Swift *Miscellanies*. After Theobald's rejoinder in a letter to *Mist's Journal* on April 27, 1728, Pope attacked again more formidable with the *Dunciad* of 1728 in three books. Theobald's response was again limited—a letter to *Mist's Journal* on June 22, 1728. Pope tried to avoid using Theobald's name in the second edition of his Shakespeare in November, 1728, but he could not ignore Theobald's work and appropriated some of Theobald's emendations unacknowledged. Theobald countered with a letter to the *Daily Journal* on November 26, 1728. Pope's most furious response came in 1729 with the publication of the *Dunciad Variorum*, which increased the ridicule of Theobald in its added notes and its prefatory and supplemental material. Theobald's direct reply was again brief, one letter to the *Daily Journal* on April 17, 1729, as he readied what he considered would be his formal answer to Pope's attacks. Theobald's edition of Shakespeare was published in 1734 and was his final response. Pope, however, made two additional attacks on Theobald in the "Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot," in 1735, and in the revised *Dunciad* of 1743,
which still included much of the original Dunciad ridicule of Theobald.

Actually, Theobald was a conscientious scholar who was one of the earliest practitioners of textual criticism. He was of honorable character and maintained discretion and restraint in his battle with Pope. He was not a gifted writer of genius but did write a few critical and popular successes. Although he was a candidate for the laureateship in 1730, he never gained complete financial independence or patronage of the nobility. In editing Shakespeare, he offended Pope by employing the methods of textual criticism which Pope despised to make clever emendations which Pope could not rival.

In contrast to his real merits, the Dunciad character of Theobald is misleading; he is described as one who produces works which no one buys or reads and, successful only in the despicable area of pantomime, does not belong in the writing profession. The Dunciad Theobald is petty, vindictive, and unoriginal--claiming the works of others as his own, as in the dispute over the Perfidious Brother, or assigning his work to others, as in the attribution of the Double Falsehood to Shakespeare.

The only obvious similarity between Theobald and Colley Cibber, his replacement as the protagonist of the Dunciad, is that both were enemies of Pope. Cibber was dynamic, popular, relatively wealthy, but not
well-educated. Although he wrote some successful plays and a popular autobiography, he was not a successful poet. He does hold an important place in the development of sentimental comedy but is often better remembered for his place in the Dunciad.

Although Cibber was attacked in both the Dunciad of 1728 and the Dunciad Variorum of 1729, he did not, at that time, respond to the ridicule in print. Cibber's election as poet laureate in 1730 brought him to the attention of the nation and, once again, of Pope. Cibber was ridiculed again in the "Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot," in 1735, yet five years elapsed before Cibber remarked on Pope in his autobiography. In 1742 in The New Dunciad, a fourth book meant to follow and complete the three books of the Dunciad Variorum, Pope made a reference to the laureate which Cibber interpreted, no doubt correctly, as directed against him. Cibber responded with a letter, A Letter from Mr. Cibber to Mr. Pope, published in July, 1742 as a pamphlet. Early in 1743 Cibber published two more rebuttals, The Egotist and A Second Letter from Mr. Cibber to Mr. Pope, in response not only to Pope's previous references but also to further projected attacks in the revision of the Dunciad. In October of 1743 Pope published the Dunciad in four books, in which Cibber replaced Theobald as the protagonist. Cibber's final response was Another
Occasional Letter from Mr. Cibber to Mr. Pope,
published in January, 1744. The active battle ended
with the death of Pope in May, 1744, followed by the death
of Theobald in September, 1744. Cibber, who lived until
1757, was silent after the death of Pope. While Pope did
change some of the Dunciad of 1743 to accommodate Cibber
as its new protagonist, he did not purge it of references
to Theobald. Close examination of all of this material
reveals that at least part of Pope's motive for the
attacks in the Dunciad was personal grievance and that the
censure was against the characters as well as the literary
inadequacies of Theobald and Cibber. Pope's effectiveness
in the battle varied according to the protagonist he
chose; his ridicule of Theobald was more immediately
effective.

Pope and some of his critics, including twentieth
century scholars Howard Erskine-Hill, Aubrey Williams, and
Robert Root, have insisted that Pope was moved in writing
the Dunciad by a concern for the number of hack writers
flooding the literary market with worthless drivel and
that those attacked deserved the ridicule, at least the
literary ridicule, which they received. "There was, to be
sure, a serious purpose in his book--to save the good
estate of letters and of learning, to which he [Pope] bore
devoted allegiance, from the depredations of pretentious
dullards."1 Most critics do not deny, however, that
those chosen for a place in the Dunciad had done something to offend Pope personally; "the satire of the Dunciad is at the same time general and intensely personal."² Lounsbury, conversely, finds the satire strictly personal: "it was the bitter feeling aroused by Theobald's criticism which converted what would have been a general satire, with personal reflections upon individuals, into a personal satire in which the general subject of the progress of dulness faded into the background."³ However, what began as a personal attack may have been transformed into something of more universal application by the genius of Pope's satire. Careful examination of the Dunciad reveals two undeniable facts, that Pope was, at least partly, motivated by personal pique in choosing his subjects for attack and that the characters he presented of his victims were not factual, but meant as caricatures:

As Pope's personal enemies enter into this poem they are transformed, but the transformation is possible only by a falsification of their real personalities. The dunces are not altogether the same as they were in real life; they have been given a symbolic importance which they lacked in reality. A falsification of personality which, from a strictly moralistic point of view, may be considered reprehensible, can be seen, from a different point of view, as the very source of much of the poem's imaginative power.

Both Theobald and Cibber were chosen for ridicule because of Pope's personal dislike, and in Pope's representation
of each of them in the Dunciad, he distorted the truth.

From all these facts—the first mention of the satire by Pope in his correspondence with Swift, the mysterious subterfuges attending its publication, the frequent alterations made in its form, and lastly, the violent change of its hero—it is evident that the Dunciad cannot be credited with the lofty moral purpose which is claimed for it in Savage's Preface. It must be regarded simply as the culminating incident in a war of authors.
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CHAPTER II

LEWIS THEOBALD

Pope's characterization of Theobald as the prince of dunces in the *Dunciad* probably was the result of his personal animosity toward Theobald rather than the artistic suitability of Theobald as a dunce. In order to make Theobald appear dull, Pope had to disregard the truth in some areas. Little in the life of Theobald shows him to be a dunce; in fact, the evidence is contrary. He was respected by his contemporaries as a scholar of some renown, both as a translator of the classics and a highly-regarded Shakespearean critic. Although Theobald was not a gifted poet or playwright, he was a competent writer and even excelled in one form of drama -- the pantomime. In the *Dunciad* Pope tries to ridicule Theobald for the success of his pantomimes by suggesting that success in that form of drama, because it was not the highest form, was insignificant. But Theobald never sought acclaim for his pantomimes; in fact, in the dedication of *Shakespeare Restored*, he apologizes for their popularity since it reduced the audience for plays like Shakespeare's. Theobald was answering public demand; the public, not Theobald, preferred pantomime to
Shakespeare. Although Theobald's pantomimes were successful, Pope also ridicules Theobald as a totally unsuccessful writer who must practice law to avoid starving; he unfairly describes him as a dunce incapable of producing worthwhile art. According to Pope, Theobald is unsuccessful artistically and financially. But Theobald did make money from his literary pursuits, and while he was never wealthy, he certainly was not indigent. It is true that he continued with his law practice, but not solely because of need.

The effect of untruths about Theobald in the *Dunciad* was marked although not immediate. The caricature of Theobald presented by the *Dunciad* did little damage to his reputation during his lifetime, but after his death in 1744, growing esteem for the *Dunciad* and declining opinion of Theobald's work helped its distorted picture of Theobald become an accepted biographical fact. This perception of Theobald as a true dunce began in the latter part of the eighteenth century and continued through most of the nineteenth century. It was only at the very end of the nineteenth century that close study of Theobald's life and work restored his earlier good repute.

In *The First Editors of Shakespeare*, Thomas Lounsbury furnishes one of the most detailed as well as most flattering accounts of the early life of Theobald.
He points out that Theobald and Pope were contemporaries "in the most exact sense of the word," since both were born in 1688 and died in 1744.\textsuperscript{1} Theobald lived his early life in Sittingbourne, Kent. Because his father died while he was young, Lewis Watson, the Earl of Rockingham, for whom Theobald was named,\textsuperscript{2} gave him his education. Theobald was also a companion of Watson's son. This relationship was an important one for Theobald because the earl helped him financially, and if the son, the Viscount Sondres, had outlived his father and inherited his fortune, there is reason to believe that he might have helped Theobald financially to an even greater extent than his father did.\textsuperscript{3} Indicating his obligation to the family, Theobald dedicated his first published work, a Cowleyan Pindaric ode about the recent union of England and Scotland, to the earl.

Theobald's accomplishments began early. This first poem was published in 1707, when he was only nineteen. The poem was not outstanding, but it was an accomplishment for Theobald to get it into print at such a young age. In May, 1708 Theobald had a play, The Persian Princess, or the Royal Villain, accepted by and acted in the only playhouse in London. The major roles were played by two well-known actors, Robert Wilks and Barton Booth. Although it was not a great success, the mere acceptance of a play by a young, unknown author was noteworthy.
Following his move to London, which took place after the publication of the poem and before the production of the play, Theobald was employed both as a literary hack and lawyer. And though Lounsbury believes Theobald undertook projects of greater significance than the majority of "the literary proletariat which then and later swarmed in that city," Theobald had only "moderate success" and did "respectable" work "solely to meet an immediate demand." Also during this time, he began his work as a translator and produced a triweekly periodical called The Censor, which appeared from April to June, 1715, and from January to June, 1717.

Theobald was a competent and prolific translator. In 1713 he translated Plato's Phaedo for Bernard Lintot and contracted to translate some of the tragedies of Aeschylus. A year later he translated part of the Odyssey. These translations were mocked by Pope in the Dunciad. Ten years after the contract the Aeschylean tragedies were still unpublished, and although Theobald promised in a statement in Shakespeare Restored (1726) to publish them shortly, they never appeared. Pope insinuates in the Dunciad that Theobald not only never planned to publish the translations but, in fact, never finished them. The second charge was untrue. There is evidence that the work was finished a year or so after its contract but was not published because of a lack of subscriptions.
Theobald's translation of Book I of the *Odyssey* annoyed Pope because it was issued by Pope's publisher shortly after Pope's translation of the *Iliad*. Theobald had infringed upon Pope's territory. It has even been suggested that this offense rather than *Shakespeare Restored* was responsible for Theobald's place in the *Dunciad.* However, two experts on Theobald, Lounsbury and Richard Foster Jones, reject this idea. In 1714, in addition to the translations of the first book of the *Odyssey*, Theobald translated two of the tragedies of Sophocles, *Electra* and *Ajax*. In the following year he did *Oedipus Tyrannus* and two works of Aristophanes, *Plutus* and the *Clouds*, as well as Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. He also translated two French works, a treatise on the *Iliad* in 1714 and Monsieur Le Clerc's *Observations upon Mr. Addison's Travels* in 1715.

In 1715 Theobald broke with his publisher Lintot and began work in areas other than translating. He produced the poem "The Cave of Poverty," which Pope satirizes in *The Dunciad*. The poem received good contemporary reviews, however, and its publication across the channel even prompted a correspondence between Theobald and Johann Jacob Bodmer, a fairly well-known German author-critic. Theobald's contemporary reputation at this point in his career was secure. Lounsbury says, "There was a common consent among his contemporaries best qualified to
judge that he was exceedingly well stored with classical
learning," and even though later critics deprecated his
abilities as an author, they "were very cautious as to the
reflections they ventured to cast upon his scholarship."11

Theobald also continued the practice of law as a means of earning his living. He seems, however, to have
considered law "an avocation rather than a vocation," and it soon became "entirely subordinate to other pursuits."12 Between the occasional practice of law and his literary work, Theobald was able to earn at least a comfortable living. Pope's contention in the Dunciad that Theobald was poverty-ridden is a distortion of the facts. Evidence does not exist supporting the "prevalent belief," engendered by Pope's comments in the Dunciad, "that he [Theobald] was ever subjected to the pressure of genuine poverty."13 As well as supporting a wife and child, for a long time Theobald maintained a place of residence in an area of London which was "utterly inconsistent with the idea of indigence."14

The middle part of Theobald's career involved his work on Shakespeare; it was this work which really established his reputation and finances. His most important representative volume was a collection of emendations to the plays published under the title Shakespeare Restored on March 31, 1726. Its contents
are worth note. The full title is Shakespeare restored: Or A Specimen of the Many errors, as well committed, as Unamended, by Mr. Pope in his Late Edition of this Poet. Designed Not only to correct the said Edition, but to restore the True Reading of Shakespeare in all Editions ever yet publish'd. It is dedicated to John Rich, who, with his production of the pantomimes, had done much "towards shutting him [Shakespeare] out of doors; that is, towards banishing him the Benefit of the stage." However, Theobald does not blame Rich but the times and the public for the popularity of pantomime. The introduction lavishly praises Pope but also delineates the reasons Theobald finds for correcting as great an author as Pope. The body of the work consists of corrections of passages in Hamlet, ninety-seven numbered corrections covering one hundred thirty-two pages. Theobald offers the corrections of this play as examples of errors throughout Pope's edition of Shakespeare. The corrections are given with a short explanation of the context of the passage in order to allow the reader to "judge of the Strength and Reason of the Emendation, without a Reference to the Plays themselves." In both his corrections of Hamlet and in the appendix, Theobald supports his emendations with parallel passages from Shakespeare's other writings in which the word or phrase in question is used in the same sense. He
labels all the corrections as either "False Pointing, False Print, Various Reading, Passage omitted, Conjectural Emendation, [or] Emendation."  \(^{18}\)

The appendix deals with the other plays and is "but a Specimen" of his "ample Stock of Matter."  \(^{19}\) The "exceptional Conjectures" are arranged according to:

Where he [Pope] has substituted a fresh Reading, and there was no Occasion to depart from the Poet's Text; where he has maim'd the Author by an unadvis'd Degradation; where he has made a bad Choice in a Various Reading, and degraded the better Word; and where he, by mistaking the Gloss of any Word, has given a wrong Turn to the Poet's Sense and Meaning.

The appendix consists of sixty additional pages of one hundred thirty-seven numbered emendations of lines in thirty-two plays. Theobald ends with a statement that where he is wrong, it will be his "pleasure" to be corrected; he is also sure that Pope will be pleased to be corrected because correction means "Shakespeare receives some Benefit."  \(^{21}\) The emendations are of all sorts, some petty, some important. They include illustrations of Pope's errors in using false pointings, in omitting words or lines necessary to the meaning, and in moving passages "essential to the comprehension of what preceded or followed" into the margin.  \(^{22}\) These errors of Pope, contends Theobald make the text more, not less, difficult for the reader.
That the work is directed at Pope, there is no doubt. Since Pope's edition of Shakespeare was published the year before and *Shakespeare Restored* is printed in a volume which corresponds in size with Pope's edition, it was meant as a companion to Pope's work. The stated purpose of *Shakespeare Restored* is to correct the many errors in the text of Shakespeare which were the result of the "indolence" and "ignorance" of previous editors, namely Pope. Throughout *Shakespeare Restored* Theobald questions Pope's editorial skill. Theobald's concept of an editor was "prophetic of the modern idea"; he began the methodology which later became the accepted means of editing English authors. He sought to clear up difficult passages and to promote an interest in Shakespeare which would lead to continued corrections of the text. Theobald saw the job of an editor also as the job of a critic who "whenever he finds the Reading suspected, manifestly corrupted, deficient in Sense, and unintelligible, . . . ought to exert every Power and Faculty of the Mind to supply such a Defect, to give Light and restore Sense to the Passage." Theobald did admit that emending Shakespeare was, to some extent, guessing. "The Want of *Originals* reduces us to a Necessity of guessing, in order to amend him, but these Guesses change into Something of a more substantial Nature, when they are tolerably supported by Reason or
Theobald took great care in his work as a scholar; he made no "unauthorized assertions" or "random conjectures," and "whenever he erred, it was the error of a scholar, and not of a hap-hazard guesser." Theobald assumes that the worth of his methods will be recognized by his readers and that he will be applauded for his efforts. He says in the introduction to *Shakespeare Restored* that if a critic makes sense of a previously senseless passage by some small alteration, no one "will be so unkind to say, this is a trifling or unwarrantable Attempt" rather than be thankful for the change. As Theobald discovered, there was at least one reader who was not thankful for the changes, correct or not; Pope's reaction showed the naivete of Theobald's belief.

Theobald asserts in *Shakespeare Restored* that he has no personal animosity toward Pope and is not interested in injuring Pope's character: "I am persuaded, I shall stand as free from such a Charge in the Execution of this Design, as, I am sure, I am in the Intention of it." While Theobald does praise Pope in his introduction, other aspects of his work seem specifically designed to attack Pope. The full title of *Shakespeare Restored* identifies Pope as the target of the work. The appendix headings which refer to Pope's substituting unnecessarily, mistaking, and choosing badly certainly are
not complimentary. Theobald hoped to emphasize his own editorial expertise by contrasting his work with Pope's. Shakespeare Restored "furnished him [Theobald] an opportunity to distinguish himself in a field where he could not fail to be aware of his own excellence." Pope was well-known and highly regarded; before Theobald published Shakespeare Restored, Theobald did not have a reputation which would allow him to obtain subscriptions for his own edition of Shakespeare. Therefore, he used the reputation of Pope to ensure attention. Without Pope's careless edition of Shakespeare, Theobald would not have had the chance to show both how he excelled in correcting Shakespeare and how Pope did not. Theobald did seem at least partially to anticipate Pope's reaction to his criticism; he says, "Therefore I must beg Mr. Pope's Pardon for contradicting Some of his Conjectures in which he has mistaken the Meaning of our Author. No other Cause, but This, should provoke me to run so bold a Risque." He did know that he was confronting the foremost literary figure of the time and one who was not likely to appreciate the notice. Although Jones thinks that Theobald was sincere in a "desire for truth rather than victory," evidence in Shakespeare Restored suggests there was a personal motive too.

The impact of Shakespeare Restored in literary circles was pronounced. Although it did not make Theobald
well-known to the masses, among Shakespearean scholars, "who were now beginning to form a recognizable body," it was "welcomed with enthusiasm." In fact, for three or four years following, Theobald was referred to as the "Author of Shakespeare Restored" and the "greatest Shakespearean scholar of the time." Writing early in the twentieth century, Lounsbury believes that Shakespeare Restored is a more interesting and important work than any "of its numerous successors." Although few of the emendations are completely original, those that are, are important; some have even been adopted in modern editions. Even though later emendations have been of equal importance, they do not surpass Theobald's "in felicity and ingenuity." Most of Theobald's contemporaries recognized the importance of his corrections.

Pope did not live up to Theobald's expectations and show gratitude for correction. Lounsbury believes that "the exposure itself of his errors . . . roused the poet's resentment, and not the spirit in which the exposure was made." In the Dunciad Pope belittles Theobald's attention to detail in correcting punctuation. He also criticizes Theobald for not assisting him earlier when he prepared his edition of Shakespeare. Pope was upset primarily because Shakespeare Restored showed his obvious and irrefutable carelessness. One example of
Theobald's correction of Pope's unsupported conjectures has become Theobald's most famous emendation. Theobald corrects a description of Falstaff in *Henry V* from "a Table of green fields" to "a babled of green fields." In his first edition Pope explains the unintelligible phrase as an error in which stage directions order the property manager, Greenfield, to bring in a table. He suggests the instructions to the stage hand had been mistakenly incorporated into the text. But there is no evidence to support the existence of such a person. Rather than trying to explain his guess in his second edition, Pope drops the reference to Greenfield, indirectly giving credibility to Theobald's version. All subsequent editors, with the exception of Pope and Joseph Warburton, have adopted Theobald's emendation. Pope complimented Theobald unintentionally in another instance. He pointed out that an emendation made by Theobald of a corrupted passage in the second folio was the same as the uncorrupted version in the first folio. He meant the remark to ridicule Theobald for never having seen the first folio, but instead he paid Theobald a high compliment by affirming that Theobald's correction was consistent with Shakespeare's original. Pope also inadvertently confirmed that he had not done the careful collating he claimed, or the corrupt passage would not have been in his edition in the first place. Because of
the popularity and genuine worth of some of Theobald's emendations, Pope was forced to adopt them, but he did so grudgingly, and not always with full credit to Theobald. Although it is doubtful that Shakespeare Restored prompted the writing of the Dunciad, it certainly caused Pope to find a prominent place for Theobald in it and also to make alterations in his second edition of Shakespeare.

Shakespeare Restored not only affected Shakespearean criticism but all subsequent criticism of English authors. It has an important place in the history of literary criticism. To his contemporaries, Theobald's work was surprisingly innovative. First, it brought methods of sound scholarship, in which textual evidence was used to support conclusions, to the study of English letters. Second, it showed that English writers were worth the same attention given to classic authors. Good scholarship became as important as ingenuity in making emendations, and since Theobald excelled in scholarship, it became a way for success for him. Theobald made errors; they were not due, however, to "indifference or negligence; they sprang from the lack of knowledge which practically no one at that time possessed" or could hope to gain. Because of the importance of Shakespeare Restored in literary criticism as well as Shakespearean criticism, Pope could belittle it, but he could not ignore it.
The Dunciad was not Pope's first response to Shakespeare Restored. The initial attack on Theobald, which turned him into "Tibbald," came in the "last" volume of the Pope and Swift Miscellanies in 1728. Theobald was ridiculed in two parts of the work. His first appearance was in the "A Fragment of a Satire," which was a reworking of Pope's "Atticus," published in 1722 as a part of a collection of pieces called Cythereia; or New Poems upon Love and Intrigue. "Atticus" was originally written about 1715 and directed against Addison. In "A Fragment of a Satire," Pope directs some lines ridiculing textual criticism against Bentley, whose initials are given, and Theobald, which he spells "Tibbald." Some of the lines which Pope uses to describe Theobald have become the most quoted description of him. "Piddling" Tibbald is one "Who thinks he reads when he but scans and spells, / A Word-catcher, that lives on Syllables. / Yet ev'n this Creature may some Notice claim, / Wrapt round and sanctify'd with Shakespeare's Name." Obviously, it is the association with Shakespeare in Shakespeare Restored which has earned Theobald Pope's recognition. This poem was later revised again and used in the Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot published in 1735. In this last revision Pope alters the lines quoted earlier so that they apply equally to Bentley and Theobald, not just Theobald. The work of major impact
contained in the **Miscellanies**, however, was "**Martinus Scriblerius on the Bathos, or the Art of Sinking in Poetry.**" Theobald is one of only five authors to have two entries in the work. He is referred to, however, by his initials. He appears in Chapter Six, "**Of the several Kinds of Genius's in the Profund, and the Marks and Characters of each,**" which gives a description of authors according to the animals which they resemble. Theobald is one of the swallows, described as "Authors that are eternally skimming and fluttering up and down, but all their Agility is employ'd to catch Flies." He is also one of the eels, "obscure Authors, that wrap themselves up in their own Mud, but are mighty nimble and pert." The work also attacks the recently published **Double Falsehood** (Dec. 1727), a play which Theobald attributed to Shakespeare and claimed to have revised. Three passages from the play are used as examples of bathos. Theobald, at the time, was busy with Shakespeare. In the second edition of **Double Falsehood**, which also appeared before the publication of the **Peri Bathos**, Theobald promised further revisions of Shakespeare. In a letter submitted to **Mist's Journal** on March 16, 1728, by Matthew Concanen, Theobald gives three highly regarded Shakespearean emendations. Perhaps these well-received emendations, along with Theobald's earlier promise of additional ones, reminded Pope of the
humiliation of *Shakespeare Restored*; they appeared as a new threat which Pope felt he had to answer; he responded by ridiculing Theobald in the *Peri Bathos*. In general, the design of the *Peri Bathos* was to provoke attacks on Pope from those satirized. These attacks would then serve as a pretext for Pope's retaliation in the *Dunciad*. The impression created in the *Dunciad* that the response was great is an exaggeration; there were few replies; yet, most later writers have, unfortunately, accepted the exaggerated account in *The Dunciad* as true.49

Theobald did reply directly to the attack in the *Miscellanies* in a letter to *Mist's Journal* on April 27, 1728. In it he did not try to defend himself, but convincingly defended the three passages from *Double Falsehood* which Pope had ridiculed.50 Theobald recognized that he had been attacked because of his work on Shakespeare; in this same letter he again promises to publish more remarks on Shakespeare which will discredit Pope:

> If Mr. Pope is angry with me for attempting to restore Shakespeare, I hope the public are not. Admit my sheets have no other merit, they will at least have this: They will awaken him to some degree of accuracy in his next edition of that poet which we are to have in a few months; and then we shall see whether he owed the errors of the former edition to indigilence or to inexperience in the author. . . . I'll venture to promise without arrogance that I'll then give above five hundred more fair emendations that shall escape him and all his assistants.
This letter is the only known reply made by Theobald to the *Peri Bathos*, and while it does not attack Pope's character, it certainly threatens him and calls attention to his errors. Although Pope accused Theobald of being the author of several other attacks, none of them is now assigned to Theobald. One of the attacks which Pope believed to be Theobald's and the one which upset Pope most was entitled "An essay on the arts of a Poet's Sinking in Reputation," which appeared in *Mist's Journal* on March 30, 1728. The work defends Theobald and ridicules Pope. While Lounsbury believes Theobald to have been incapable of its authorship, Jones mentions four circumstances which make Theobald its likely author.

The *Dunciad* in three books appeared in May of 1728. Its appearance, of course, provoked additional attacks on Pope. Others besides the anonymous author of "An essay on the arts of a Poet's Sinking in Reputation" defended Theobald. Some of these included John Dennis in *Remarks on Mr. Pope's Rape of the Lock*, Concanen in the preface to a collection of the pieces produced in response to the *Peri Bathos*, James Ralph in *Swaney, An Heroic Poem. Occasion'd by the Dunciad*, Edward Ward in *Durgen, or a Plain Satyr upon a Pompous Satyrist*, William Duncombe in *The Judgment of Apollo*, on the
Controversy between Mr. Pope and Mr. Theobald, and Thomas Cooke in *The Battle of the Poets*.55 The attack which upset Pope most, however, was again one by an unknown author. It appeared in *Mist's Journal* on June 8, 1728, and was signed "W. A."; its author reprimanded Pope for attacking Theobald's poverty and said that he found Theobald's correcting of Shakespeare to be without error and certainly superior to Pope's.56 Although in the "Testimonies of Authors" in the *Dunciad Variorum*, Pope assigns W. A.'s letter to Theobald, in the appendix to the poem he lists as authors a group of writers including Theobald, Dennis, "and others."57 In his "Testimonies of Authors" in the *Dunciad Variorum*, Pope carefully noted each response to the *Dunciad*. He not only used these attacks as sources for new material in his notes, but he also exaggerated their number. Representative of the actual contemporary reaction is *The Judgment of Apollo*, where the author, Duncombe, notes that the controversy between Theobald and Pope is the result of *Shakespeare Restored*; he then gives Apollo's judgment in the controversy that although Pope is the superior poet, Theobald is the better editor of Shakespeare.58

Theobald made only one official reply to the *Dunciad* of 1728. In a letter to *Mist's Journal* on June 22, 1728, he condemns personal attacks and responds to only
one of Pope's charges. Pope had insinuated in the *Dunciad* that Theobald was writing for the Tories in his "frequent" contributions to *Mist's Journal*. Theobald denies the charge, saying that he has no affinity for politics, and promises more revisions of Shakespeare.59

In November of 1728 Pope's second edition of Shakespeare was published. Pope did include some of Theobald's emendations, claiming that they totalled only about twenty-five words.60 Theobald responded immediately in a letter to the *Daily Journal* on November 26, 1728, accusing Pope of using one hundred of his emendations. He also names and illustrates, from Pope's work on Shakespeare, five qualities of an editor which Pope lacks:

If want of industry in collating old copies, if want of reading proper authors to ascertain points of history, if want of knowledge of the modern tongues, want of judgment in digesting his author's own text, or want of sagacity in restoring it where it is manifestly defective, can disable any man from a title to be the editor of Shakespeare, I make no scruples to declare that hitherto Mr. Pope appears absolutely unequal to that task.61

Theobald announces that his remarks on Shakespeare, scheduled for December, will be postponed to allow him time to read Pope's edition carefully.62 Before the end of 1728, Theobald completed work on two other projects, both of which were later attacked by Pope. He published William Wycherley's posthumous works and
contributed two complete and four partial notes to Cooke's translation of Hesiod.

The next event in the battle between Theobald and Pope was the publication of the *Dunciad Variorum* in April of 1729. Pope used pieces which appeared in response to the *Dunciad* of 1728 as new sources of material for the notes and, a new section, the "*Testimonies of Authors*" for the *Variorum* edition. The prolegomena, notes, and appendix carried new ridicule and caused a stir similar to the one created by the original *Dunciad* in 1728. As Lounsbury points out, "The notes were in some instances pretendedly philological, occasionally explanatory, but in most cases personal." In regard to Theobald "the main object of the notes . . . was to cast discredit upon . . . [his] labors; to convey the impression that the corrections he made did not touch anything essential to the understanding of the author, but were devoted to petty points of punctuation and orthography." In the *Dunciad Variorum*, Pope gave the reasons for choosing Theobald as its hero. In one note he accuses Theobald of soliciting favors from him while at the same time refusing to assist in his edition of Shakespeare, joining the outcry against him regarding his solicitation of subscriptions for his edition of Shakespeare, and writing articles against him in the journals as listed in "*Testimonies of Authors.*"
In another part of The Dunciad Variorum Pope says that Theobald has been selected because no better hero is to be had.\textsuperscript{67} It is the Variorum edition which Pope considered the final version of the Dunciad (at least until the major revisions of the 1743 edition).\textsuperscript{68} The Dunciad Variorum spelled out names, leaving no doubt who was meant and completing the job of ridicule begun in the Dunciad of 1728. It is also the Variorum edition which has served as the source of errors about Theobald perpetuated by later writers.\textsuperscript{69} Besides the untruths about Theobald, many other falsehoods in the Dunciad were later accepted as facts.

In the dedication of a collection of pieces about the Dunciad, Pope (through Savage) recounts a story concerning the publication of the Dunciad Variorum in which he claims that those satirized were clamoring to prevent its distribution while the booksellers were trying equally hard to obtain it.\textsuperscript{70} Although labeled "ridiculous" by Lounsbury, this exaggeration has been taken as fact by some later critics strictly on the authority of Pope's statement. At the time of his book, Lounsbury pointed out three major misconceptions about the Dunciad which were still regarded as facts by many. First, it is untrue that its dunces were truly dunces. Second, those satirized were not silenced; they responded with greater productivity. And thirdly, Lounsbury finds
no truth in the idea that Pope had noble motives of social satire in writing the *Dunciad.*

Theobald did respond to the new charges in the *Dunciad Variorum.* Lounsbury asserts that although Theobald rarely answered any of Pope's accusations concerning his literary ability, when the charges were against his moral behavior, he felt obliged to respond. He answered Pope's charge in a letter to the *Daily Journal* on April 17, 1729. In response to Pope's accusation that he had been unwilling to help in the edition of Shakespeare at the same time he was soliciting favors, Theobald pointed out that he would have been foolish to give away twelve years of work with no promise of compensation or recognition. Certainly he had never received any favors from Pope. Once again he concluded by pointing out additional errors in Pope's edition of Shakespeare.

While Theobald was busy with work of his own, the battle continued; on April 17, 1729, *A Miscellany on Taste,* satirizing Pope's tastes, appeared in the *Daily Journal.* Although now believed to have been written by Concanen, at the time of its publication it was attributed by many to Theobald. The publication of "Of False Taste" in December of 1731 again caused Theobald to be credited with an attack on Pope which he did not make. Theobald was fighting back in his own way by working on
his edition of Shakespeare; he made no known personal response to Pope between his letter of April 17, 1729, and the publication of his edition of Shakespeare in 1734. In 1730, in addition to his editorial work, he was a candidate for the laureateship awarded to Colley Cibber. Although he was incapacitated for a month in the same year because of a broken arm, Theobald still managed to adapt *Orestes* for the stage and to continue his work on Shakespeare. He also worked on an adaptation of John Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi*, to be called *The Fatal Secret*. Although the play was finished at this time (1731), it was not published until 1735. Since Theobald was spending most of his time preparing his edition of Shakespeare, he had little time to work at making a living. Consequently, in 1731 Theobald experienced extreme financial difficulties. These were at least temporarily relieved, however, by the patronage of John Boyle, the Earl of Orrery, to whom Theobald dedicated all the volumes of his financially successful edition of Shakespeare.

Although Theobald began promising a complete work on the plays of Shakespeare early in 1728, his edition was not published until six years later in January of 1734. Theobald's remarks were originally promised for December, 1728, but were delayed by the publication of Pope's edition in November of that year. Theobald claimed to
have three volumes of emendations completed for press at that time.\textsuperscript{76} Jones and Lounsbury find different reasons for the delay in publishing. Lounsbury suspects that there were not enough subscriptions "to justify sending to the press what he had already prepared" and that Theobald began to see the difficulty of the task he had undertaken and could not complete it satisfactorily in the time originally allotted.\textsuperscript{77} Jones, by contrast, sees the delay as a response to successful subscriptions and increasing encouragement which made Theobald think seriously of including the text with his emendations.\textsuperscript{78} Lounsbury identifies the latter part of 1729 as the time when Theobald first considered an edition of Shakespeare instead of just critical remarks.\textsuperscript{79} At least by the end of 1730, Theobald had firmly decided on an annotated edition and began working on the arrangements. With the help of Lady Delaware,\textsuperscript{80} a contract was made in November, 1731, with Richard Tonson for an edition of Shakespeare by Theobald to appear the following March. The publication was delayed, however, for two years. There were some difficulties in getting workers for the job, but most of the delay was Tonson's. Tonson may have been unwilling "to issue the volumes before he had disposed of Pope's second edition" and, thus, delayed publication.\textsuperscript{81} Tonson's procrastination "exposed Theobald to the charge
of extorting money from subscribers" and gave Pope additional ammunition for attack. But Jones suggests, "there is no doubt that the edition profited by the delay, for Theobald continued at his labors up to the last minute." Although Tonson had been Pope's publisher too, Theobald received 1,100 guineas for his edition in contrast to the £215 which Pope had received. Tonson deliberately outbid all the other publishers interested in Theobald's edition, and not just for Pope's sake. As Jones states, "It is worth noting how eager the publishers were to undertake the 'Dunce's' edition. That a scholar's edition should appear more profitable than a poet's is a significant fact in the history of English scholarship."

Theobald's edition had several unique features which made it important in the history of Shakespearean criticism; however, it also had defects which have continued to hurt Theobald's reputation. Theobald describes his editorial intentions in a letter to Warburton on April 8, 1729:

I ever labour to make the smallest deviations that I can possibly from the text; never to alter at all, where I can by any means explain a passage into sense; nor ever by any emendations to make the Author better when it is probable the text came from his own hands.

Yet even though Theobald had the right intentions, he was
unable to adhere to them unfailingly. Although he did make a serious effort to collate the early editions of Shakespeare's plays, the effort was not nearly so complete as Theobald claimed or as is desirable. He did at least do more collation than Pope had done, a fact evidenced by some of the variant readings he proposed which Pope had missed. Perhaps Theobald's greatest asset as an editor, however, was his wide knowledge of Elizabethan literature, including, according to Theobald, not only "hundreds" of plays but histories and chronicles which had served as sources for Shakespeare. This wide range of reading allowed Theobald to understand and explain much of Shakespeare's language which had seemed unintelligible and to clarify previously unknown allusions. Theobald had also carefully studied all of Shakespeare's work. He knew his author's style well, and he knew the times of his author well. Both areas of knowledge served him in suggesting emendations.

Theobald had another quality which enabled him to be a good editor: he was genuinely concerned about establishing an accurate text, though not necessarily a prettified one. Since Pope believed that too great a respect for the original text was the severest defect of textual critics, he made efforts to disguise the shortcomings, or at least what he viewed as shortcomings, of Shakespeare. Some of what Theobald restored involved
anachronisms and other kinds of "inferior" passages which called Shakespeare's learning or skill into question; this type of "correction" evoked Pope's ridicule. Pope and Theobald had different conceptions of the purpose of an edition; Theobald's principles are similar to twentieth-century standards, whereas Pope's match those of most of his contemporaries. In his preface, Theobald identifies three areas of editorial responsibility, "the Emendation of corrupt Passages; the Explanation of obscure and difficult ones; and an Inquiry into the Beauties and Defects of Composition." While Pope's main emphasis was in the third area, Theobald did very little of this kind of criticism and identifies the first two as "the proper Objects of the Editor's Labour." Although Theobald caused some confusion by not numbering scenes, his scene division was more in line with that adopted by modern editors than Pope's was; Theobald also made the plays more readable with more than two hundred explanatory notes and improved punctuation. But Theobald's main contribution was a new attitude toward the duties of an editor, expressed in his introduction to Shakespeare Restored and the preface to his edition of Shakespeare. "The secret of this [Theobald's] method was the insistence upon proof for any conclusion. . . . There was less of random guessing, haphazard arrivals at conclusions from isolated points or insufficient evidence."
The changes in Theobald's edition added new knowledge to Shakespearean criticism. Theobald made approximately one thousand alterations of earlier texts, four hundred and twenty-nine of which were derived solely from Theobald's learning and genius, not the authority of earlier texts. One hundred and fifty of these are still acceptable. Theobald identified some of Shakespeare's sources for the first time. "He was the first to discover how closely Shakespeare followed Holinshed. He also was the first to point out Whetstone's Promus and Cassandra as the source of Measure for Measure, [and] ... the Historica Danica of Saxo Grammaticus as the original source of the Hamlet story"; he suggested "the indebtedness of Troilus and Cressida to Wynkin de Worde" and was "seemingly the only scholar of the time who was acquainted with the medieval story of Troy."

Theobald's edition met with immediate and continued success. Perhaps the surest sign of Theobald's reputation is his list of subscribers, slightly superior to Pope's in number and quality. "There were four hundred and twenty-eight . . . , who took nearly five hundred copies, as against four hundred and eleven to the edition of . . . [Pope], who took about four hundred and fifty copies." Theobald's list also contains more members of the nobility and more well-known men in science and the arts.
Theobald's edition is a landmark in Shakespearean criticism, but it is not without glaring faults, one of the most obvious being its harsh treatment of Pope. Theobald announces his intentions toward Pope in the preface:

> It is not with any secret Pleasure that I so frequently animadvert on Mr. Pope as Critick; but there are Provocations which a Man can never quite forget. His libels have been thrown out with so much Inveteracy, that not to dispute whether they should come from a Christian, they leave it a Question whether they could come from a Man. . . . I shall be willing to devote a Part of my Life to the honest Endeavour of quitting Scores: with this Exception however, that I will not return those Civilities [flagrant civilities by Pope referred to earlier] in his peculiar Strain, but confine myself, at least, to the Limits of common Decency. I shall ever think it better to want wit, than to want Humanity: and impartial Posterity may, perhaps, be of my Opinion.

Theobald's references to Pope seem to show the secret pleasure he denies. He not only appears to take delight in pointing out Pope's errors, but he also fails to give Pope credit when he adopts Pope's corrections. While both of these practices were common, Theobald set a precedent in negative criticism which did more damage to his own reputation when it was employed against him by his successors than it ever did when he used it against Pope.

The faults in Theobald's edition are the result of his poor judgment. He sometimes emphasizes his learning to excess. He also commits some errors of fact
and in some instances takes "unjustifiable liberties with the text." His greatest errors were, however, the result of his deference to others. He includes changes made primarily by two men, "one his violent enemy [Pope] and the other his professed friend [Warburton]." Theobald's heaviest borrowing is from Pope's attempts to regularize Shakespeare's verse; while some of these changes have been accepted today, many more are unnecessary alterations. From Warburton, Theobald borrowed notes; a few were valuable in explaining the text, but most obscure and unneeded. Through the encouragement of Warburton, Theobald committed one of his greatest errors of judgment. Theobald wanted to put some of his unpublished emendations of the Greek classics in his preface but worried that their inclusion would make him seem pedantic. With Warburton's urging, he included them. Ironically, the result was exactly what he had feared: he was labeled pedantic, both then and later.

Theobald continued to work on Shakespeare's minor poems after his edition of the plays was published. He published some samples of his emendations of the poems, and these were well received. In response, in a letter to Warburton, he announced plans to publish an edition of the poems. Although the work seems to have been completed, it was not published. At one point Theobald indicated that he was waiting on an alteration of the
copyright laws before publishing not only the poems but also his long-promised translation of Aeschylus. The law was not passed when he expected, and, perhaps as a result, neither work was ever published. Theobald's failure to publish these two editions was an example of the course of his later life, which seems a series of projects begun but not finished. One of the reasons Theobald had trouble completing his projects may have been a lack of confidence. He lost his most important champion when Warburton abandoned him, and he also seemed to develop doubts about the value of editing English authors, believing that work on the Greek and Latin classics was the occupation of the true scholar.

In 1740 a second edition of Shakespeare Restored was printed. In the same year, an eight volume second edition of Theobald's Shakespeare was also published. After Theobald's death, subsequent editions of his Shakespeare appeared in 1752, 1757, 1762, 1772, 1773, and 1777. In 1742 Theobald had entered into an agreement with Tonson to publish an edition of Beaumont and Fletcher, for which he enlisted two assistants, Thomas Seward and a Mr. Sympson, of whom little is known. This edition was published in 1750, after Theobald's death. Theobald did not complete the work but was responsible for all of Volume I, part of Volume II, and part of Volume III. Although the edition is not outstanding, Theobald's
contributions display his care and learning and are often valuable. What is known of Theobald's last days is reported by John Nichols. They "were embittered by a severe disease," and after suffering from a jaundice for several months, it terminated in a dropsy, and he met a peaceful death on September 18, 1744. Attended by only one friend, he was buried in St. Pancras cemetery on September 20.

Theobald died no longer the hero of the Dunciad; he had been replaced by Colley Cibber in the revised 1743 Dunciad in four books. Pope did not, however, end his attacks on Theobald with the Dunciad Variorum in 1729. Few of the contemporaries of Theobald and Pope came to Pope's defense when post-Dunciad (1728) attacks were made against Pope; they recognized that Pope was the aggressor in the controversy. Most of those who did write in praise of Pope made laudatory comments on his work and character without assailing his enemies. Thus, Pope sought a means of attacking his enemies anonymously and found that means in the Grub Street Journal. Although he was closely involved in beginning the production of the Grub Street Journal, which was published from January, 1730, through December, 1737, Pope was careful not to be identified with the periodical, even professing to dislike it. However, initially, "it had little reason for its existence save to celebrate the
poet [Pope] and to assail the writers he disliked or hated.\textsuperscript{112} It "began as an organ of Pope[,] . . . a continuation of The Dunciad."\textsuperscript{113} When Pope first began contributing to the Grub Street Journal, he attacked Theobald. On October 8, 1730, he accused Theobald of taking subscriptions for work he never planned to complete. Another attack with the same theme appeared on April 8, 1731. "But as Theobald made no reply to these reflections upon himself, the controversy lacked the stimulus that springs from counter-attack."\textsuperscript{114} Theobald resolved when Pope first began his abuse to respond only with his work and depend on the truth of his case for vindication. He retained this posture throughout the controversy. Pope, however, who had depended unsuccessfully on direct ridicule to eliminate his opponent, began to shift his attack. "He was wise enough to know that it was only by indirect methods and glittering generalities that he could hope to break the force of the disclosure which had been made [in Theobald's work] of his negligence and incompetence."\textsuperscript{115}

Pope's reputation and position among his contemporaries was of a strength acquired by few other writers. Pope's genius earned him the admiration of all, even those who did not admire his character. Lounsbury analyzes Pope's methods for obtaining even greater influence. Following the Dunciad Variorum, Pope made
efforts within his works to establish the strength of his moral character in the public mind. Lounsbury finds many of these efforts to be less than honorable:

There was no form of equivocation to which he [Pope] would not resort, no kind of misrepresentation in which he would not indulge, no meanness of trickery to which he would not stoop. There is no author of his rank and genius who ever engaged in more disreputable devices to raise his own reputation.

Even though Pope's means were questionable, his efforts were successful in establishing a reputation for uprightness in his moral character. One example of these questionable means was the method Pope used in publishing his correspondence. With Pope's knowledge, some of his letters were delivered to and published by Edmund Curll in 1735; yet Pope denied any connection with the edition following its publication, and, in 1737, put out his own edition of the letters to eliminate the "errors" of the "unauthorized" version. Before publication of his edition, Pope altered the letters to make himself appear more profound and moral than he had actually been in casual correspondence. The alterations were not revealed; the edition was presented as containing the genuine letters. The character of Pope suggested by his correspondence caused his contemporaries to regard him as a man of virtue, not simply a poet of genius. While these contemporaries recognized the merit of Theobald's work,
their respect for Pope's genius and increasing valuation of his character ensured their approval of Pope's edition of Shakespeare. Thus in an effort to find a value in Pope's edition which Theobald's lacked, Pope's critics labeled his edition "tasteful" and Theobald's as "tasteless." Because Pope's edition was tasteful, it could then be regarded as superior to Theobald's, even though close comparison of any measurable aspect of the editions showed Theobald's to be better. Theobald had hoped that truth would prevail; Pope hoped only to prevail, and in the end he did prevail, not in actual superiority in editing, but in his reputation for it.

Theobald's contemporary reputation among those capable of judging was secure, however, even against the ridicule of the Dunciad, and his work on Shakespeare continued to be admired. The publication of the many subsequent editions of Theobald's Shakespeare from 1740 to 1777 shows its continued favorable reception. However, while Theobald was not regarded as a true dunce, he was unable to compete with the growing reputation of Pope. The contemporary attitude toward the methods of textual criticism also promoted Pope's reputation while depreciating Theobald's. The tasks of the editor who sought to establish the authority of the text were considered "dull and drudging pedantry" and were unworthy pursuits for those of intellect and taste.
Theobald's reputation deteriorated rapidly after his death. His work was quickly forgotten as his accomplishments were appropriated by others. Pope's work was not forgotten, however, and his *Dunciad* portrait of Theobald was accepted as true by those who had not known Theobald personally and were unaware of the circumstances of the controversy. Later editors of Shakespeare adopted Theobald's readings without acknowledgment, ignored his merits, and dwelt upon his errors or supposed errors. Dr. Samuel Johnson, who succeeded Pope as the most admired writer of his time, also helped to perpetuate Theobald's reputation as a dunce. Because of his own great admiration for Pope, Johnson sustained Pope's prejudices where he did not have strong feelings of his own. Having been helped in his early career by Pope, always Theobald's foe, and Warburton, Theobald's former friend turned foe, Johnson found it easy to choose sides. Johnson's influence maintained the image of Theobald as dunce into the nineteenth century.

A "gradual awakening among Shakespearean scholars to the value of Theobald's services" began with the publication of the variorum Shakespeare edition of 1821. And although its editors recognized the value of Theobald's work, they still regarded Theobald as "dull." Yet Theobald's reputation among students of Shakespeare continued to rise. He was praised in the
1854 Richard Grant White edition of Shakespeare and, in the 1860s, was given an "impressive tribute" by the editors of the Cambridge Shakespeare. They called him "incomparably superior to his predecessors and immediate successors." While opinion had begun to shift in mid-century, Theobald is still reported to be a dunce in an 1889 edition of Pope. Theobald was not vindicated completely by Shakespearean scholars until the later part of the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth centuries. In addition to Lounsbury and Jones, at the turn of the century, J. Churton Collins in 1895 and Ronald McKerrow in 1933 gave him due credit as an important editor of Shakespeare. However, since few study the history of Shakespearean scholarship and many read the works of Pope, Pope's caricature of Theobald will continue to prevail; the reputation of genius will continue to overshadow the truth. Theobald's hope that objective posterity would share his opinion of the controversy is lost in the genius of Pope.
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CHAPTER III

THE DUNCIAD VARIORUM PORTRAIT OF THEOBALD

The timing of Pope's Dunciad suggests that his satiric presentation of Theobald was a response to Theobald's Shakespeare Restored. The first Dunciad was published in 1728, only two years after Theobald's Shakespeare Restored, which questioned Pope's abilities as an editor. Pope's treatment of Theobald is substantially the same in the first Dunciad of 1728 and the Dunciad Variorum of 1729, except that in the latter version Pope adds notes and other material both to increase and justify the ridicule of Theobald.

Pope begins rationalizing his actions in the "ADVERTISEMENT" to the Dunciad Variorum by declaring that the names of those satirized have been given in full to prevent mistakes made when only initials are given. The names are "now not only set at length, but [their use is also] justified by the authorities and reasons given."¹ The author's motive in using real rather than fictional names "was his care to preserve the Innocent from any false Applications" and to prevent the errors of earlier keys to his work where "he was made . . . to hurt the inoffensive " (p. 317). It is implied that his
intention is to hurt the offensive. Pope goes on to explain why he has added detailed notes on those satirized:

Of the Persons it was judg'd proper to give some account: for since it is only in this monument that they must expect to survive, (and here survive they will, as long as the English tongue shall remain . . . ) it seem'd but humanity to bestow a word or two upon each . . . (p. 317)

Pope is adding the ridicule not to answer offenses but to give biographical information on some of the obscure writers, in an ironically humane effort to keep them from being forgotten. But of the "chief Offenders," certainly including Theobald, "a word or two more are added . . . only as a paper pinn'd upon the breast, to mark the Enormities for which they suffer'd; lest the Correction only should be remember'd, and the Crime forgotten" (p. 317). Pope sentences them to infamy because of their "crimes."

In the prefatory "A Letter to the Publisher," actually written by Pope but signed as by William Cleland, Pope seeks to justify the satire as the only means he had of dealing with dull authors. He says the satire is the result of "reading some of the abusive papers lately publish'd" (p. 318); they are a response against "the first Aggressors" (p. 318), who had sought to make Pope and his friends appear "Bad Men" long before
Pope called them "Bad Writers" (p. 319). It is these bad writers, not Pope, who have revived long-forgotten slanders. However, in the "Testimonies of Authors Concerning our Poet and his Works," Pope clearly shows himself as the one who is reviving obscure attacks. He plans to "gather [not] only the Testimonies of such eminent Wits, as would of course descend to posterity, . . . but [also] . . . with incredible labour [to] seek out for divers others, which, but for this . . . diligence, could never at the distance of a few months appear to the eye of the most curious" (p. 325). Thus, what would or should be forgotten will be revived by Pope's diligence so that, not only what deserves remembrance will be preserved, but everything, no matter how obscure, that ridicules him will be brought to public attention. Conveniently forgetting the Peri Bathos, Pope claims that he has done nothing to "incense" these dull authors; Pope has only told the truth—that they are dull, a fact they themselves prove constantly with their writing (p. 319). Not only have these writers abused Pope by trying to make him the dunce, but, capitalizing on the curiosity of the public, they have attempted to increase sales of their pamphlets by using the notoriety the Dunciad has given them. Pope, speaking as Cleland, emphasizes that it is not Pope's writings "(which we [Cleland] ever thought the least valuable part of his
character) but the honest, open, and beneficent Man, that we most esteem'd and lov'd" who must be defended (pp. 319-20).

Pope also answers some of the objections raised in response to the first Dunciad. He does not know the ridiculed writers by sight and has had great difficulty in locating copies of their writings, a fact which acknowledges the first objection to the inclusion of such writers in the Dunciad—-that these authors "are too obscure for Satyre" (p. 320). In response, he insists that his motives are unselfish and designed for the protection of society; these writers are "more dangerous" because of their obscurity since it puts them beyond the reach of the law and leaves "no publick punishment . . . , but what a good writer inflicts" (p. 320). The second objection answered is that the authors are poor, to which Pope responds that when poverty is the result of the lack of an "honest livelihood" (p. 320), it becomes a suitable subject for satire by being the result "of vice, prodigality, or neglect of ones's lawful calling" because it increases the public burden (p. 321). In fact, it is "charitable" to ridicule these writers out of the business of writing although the poem may, paradoxically, have increased their sales by making them infamous (p. 321). Thus, Pope ironically characterizes his role in producing the satire as not only humane but also charitable in giving the ridiculed authors the little "fame" they have.
Next, Pope contrasts his admirable character with the low character of the authors he has satirized. Pope considers these authors jealous of his "success with the publick" (p. 322) and resentful of his "contempt" for their writings. Once again, Pope says that he is not motivated by desire for personal retribution but, rather, by concern for the public good:

[The authors] are not ridicul'd because Ridicule in itself is or ought to be a pleasure; but because it is just, to undeceive or vindicate the honest and unpretending part of mankind from imposition, because particular interest ought to yield to general, and a great number who are not naturally Fools ought never to be made so in complaisance to a few who are. (p. 322)

Pope says he will no longer write satires of dull authors and would not have done so at all if those concerned had been anything other than "obscure and worthless persons" (p. 323). Pope concludes with two misrepresentations: he says he "has not been a follower of fortune or success" but "has lived with the Great without flattery," and he has never written, under any provocation, a line "he was ever unwilling to own" (p. 323). James Anderson Winn's characterization of Pope contradicts this first claim about flattery; Winn says that Pope cultivated, with flattery, his friendships with important people in order to use them and their positions. And there is no doubt among modern scholars, as there was little doubt
among Pope's contemporaries, that this second statement about Pope's acknowledging all authorship is false.

Pope's inclusion of the "Testimonies of Authors Concerning our Poet and his Works," which quotes attacks on Pope by various authors, indicates that Pope was preoccupied with those who had written against him. As stated earlier, Pope included pieces long forgotten by everyone else. He says that the testimonies are included to help the reader "reflect" not only on the "critical" but also the "moral" qualities of the "Person as well as Genius, and of the Fortune as well as Merit, of our Author" (p. 325).

In the preliminary matter of "Martinus Scriblerus, of the Poem," Pope again defends his writing of the Dunciad. He tries to elevate its status by tracing the Dunciad back to historical roots in Homer. In the persona of Scriblerus, Pope says he was "moved" to the work by the "deluge" of poor authors who besieged the public for "applause" and money (p. 344). Pope, being "an honest satyrist," conceived the work "to dissuade the dull and punish the malicious, the only way that was left" (p. 344). The work was "the greatest service he was capable ... to render his dear country" (p. 344). He also explains his selection of Theobald as its hero: "A Person must be fix'd upon to support this action [that of the Dunciad] who" is a party writer, a dull poet, and a
"wild" critic; he must have "been concerned in the Journals, written bad Plays or Poems, and published low Criticisms" (p. 345). According to Pope, Theobald best fulfilled these criteria.

Throughout the text of the poem, Pope reiterates the generosity of his motives. In Book I, Pope says he shows "Candour and Humanity . . . to those unhappy Objects of the Ridicule of all mankind, the bad Poets" (I.41n). He attributes the wretched works of those satirized "not so much to Malice or Servility as to Dulness; and not so much to Dulness, as to Necessity; And thus at the very commencement of his Satyr, makes an Apology for all that are to be satyrized" (I.41n). In the final note to Book I, Pope again sees himself as humane, representing the case of the bad authors "moderately" (I.258n). In Book III, Pope says he has treated Theobald in a "Christian-like" manner and has exhibited "great good nature and mercifulness" (III.16n). This mercy is reiterated in Pope's claim that he has removed an author previously ridiculed in the edition of 1728 because the author was proved innocent of attacks against Pope (III.146n). Pope says he will likewise remove any others who have not written "scurrilously against him" (III.146n). As shown by Pope's use of the "Testimonies," much of the "scurrilous" writing was only in Pope's imagination. Whether Theobald's faults are real, Pope
does say that Theobald was selected as the hero because there was "no better to be had" (III.319n).

In his comments in the "Errata," Pope says that he was moved to the work by a "Love of Truth" and that his desire was "to provoke no Man" (p. 427). Again in Appendix I, Pope says he saw an "Opportunity of doing good, by detecting and dragging into light these common Enemies of Mankind" (p. 431n). He hopes that these authors will either be shamed into silence or forced into it by the booksellers. Pope pretends to protect the innocent, not by using a fictitious hero who could be thought a symbol for many different authors, but rather by removing any doubt who is meant by choosing Theobald (p. 433).

In both subtle and direct ways, Theobald is made pedantic. Pope's notes are often parodies of Theobald's notes in Shakespeare Restored. Many of the notes are phrased or styled like Theobald's; others are directly attributed to him. Pope begins this imitation with a note to the title of the poem which discusses the spelling of the word Dunciad (p. 349). Pope facetiously questions his own spelling in a note which reviews Theobald's quibbles about the spelling of Shakespeare. The discussion is continued and exaggerated until the point becomes ridiculous. After a reference to "the Restorer of
Shakespeare," this portion of the note is assigned to "Theobald."

Although the first note to the text of Book I (I.1n) refers to James Ralph, author of Sawney, and is attributed to Scriblerus, its second paragraph seems a direct parody of Theobald's style in Shakespeare Restored. Pope's use of "Conjectural Emendation" in this place recalls Theobald's use of the term. It occurs again in the third paragraph of a later note (I.28-31n). The last paragraph of this note announces the inclusion, in Appendix IV, entitled "VIRGILIUS RESTAURATUS . . . ," of emendations on Virgil—done as a direct parody of Theobald's Shakespeare Restored. A "Burlesque" allusion to scripture in line 48, justified by the explanation that Shakespeare frequently alluded to scripture in a merry way, is another parody of Theobald (I.48n). More examples than necessary, each of them lifted from Theobald's Shakespeare Restored, are cited to establish Shakespeare's frequent use of scripture in this sacrilegious manner. The second half of the note is attributed by Scriblerus to Theobald. This piecemeal attribution of notes and parts of notes to other writers mimics Theobald, who was always careful in his own work to acknowledge all the contributions of others. In the beginning of a second note on line 104 concerning Dennis,
Pope takes Theobald's statement about Dennis (in Pope's defense) and uses it to make Theobald appear ridiculous and vindictive (I.104n). Later, Pope suggests that Shakespeare's works would have fared better if untouched by Theobald because Theobald revealed Shakespeare's anachronisms and obscure sources, making Shakespeare seem less educated because he used Caxton and Wynkyn de Worde instead of Homer or Chaucer (I.166n). Finally in Book I, Pope mocks Theobald's style in emending the Greek and Latin classics (I.191n).

The parody continues in Books II and III. Pope gives his opinion of textual criticism in a note preceding the notes on Book II (p. 371) and then imitates Theobald's methods in *Shakespeare Restored* in the second half of the note by saying he has made a change in the last passage of Book I because it is a better reading; it is his "just right" as a critic to find the "true reading." Another note (II.175n) in Book II is partly attributed to Theobald; in Theobald's style, it gives a variant reading for the line supported by examples from Homer. Pope's remark in the note, "I am afraid of growing too luxuriant in examples, or I could stretch this catalogue to a great extent," is a direct restatement of Theobald's remark in *Shakespeare Restored.* In the note to line 179, which follows, Pope ridicules textual critics, expressly implying Theobald, who "conjecture into nonsense, correct
out of all correctness, and restore into obscurity and confusion" (II.179n). He refers to the irony of the "dull" Theobald's correcting Shakespeare, who was one of the "sprightliest wits that have written" (II.179n). In Book III Pope again attacks the methods of textual criticism and thus of Theobald. In a note to line 188, he compares textual critics to quacks. In a second note on line 272, Pope first discusses Theobald's claim that the Double Falsehood is Shakespeare's and then cites some corrections for it done in a manner imitating Theobald's method in Shakespeare Restored (III.272n).

The inclusion of "M. Scriblerus Lectori" and the "Errata" as appendices to the Dunciad is a direct attack against textual criticism and, specifically, Theobald. In "M. Scriblerus Lectori," Pope laughs at the concept of restoration:

"... Certain Censors [meaning Theobald in Shakespeare Restored] do give to such [accidental errors of the press] the name of Corruptions of the Text and false Readings, charge them on the Editor, and judge that correcting the same is to be called Restoring, and an Atchievement that brings Honour to the Critic. (p. 426)

The appendices and other appended material also attack Theobald's methods. Appendix III is a copy of the preface to William Caxton's translation of Virgil, which is included to make Theobald's reference to Caxton as the source for a passage in Shakespeare seem silly. Appendix
IV, "VIRGILIUS RESTAURATUS . . . ," is meant as a direct parody of *Shakespeare Restored* (p. 440) and Theobald's methods. The *Dunciad* ends with further ridicule of Theobald's methods of textual criticism. In "By the Author a Declaration," Pope commands "Haberdashers of Points and Particles, . . . Critics and Restorers," meaning Theobald, not to change anything in the work, it being corrected and established as authentic by the author (pp. 458-59). The final note in the work is a ridicule of Bentley and Theobald's use of Theobald's methods of textual criticism (p. 459).

The text of the *Dunciad Variorum* not only parodies Theobald's methods and notes to make him seem pedantic, but it also quotes from his works in ways which make him seem a poor, dull, even ridiculous writer. Beginning in Book I, Pope depreciates the entertainments at Smithfield as "the Taste of the Rabble" and suggests that current pantomimes are the same entertainments moved from the fair to the theater by Theobald and "others of equal Genius" (I.2n). In a reference to Theobald's poem "The Cave of Poverty," Pope couples the poverty and poetry of the dull poet, specifically of the hero, Theobald (I.32). The description of how tragedy and comedy are joined and farces and epics jumbled and metaphors confused (I.65-76) is accompanied by a note which refers the reader to Theobald's pantomime *Harlequin a Sorcerer* as a good
example of the "Transgressions of the Unities" by such writers as Theobald (I.68n). Pope also makes fun of one of Theobald's corrections in Shakespeare Restored which refers to Caxton, rather than Homer, as Pope suggested, as the source of Shakespeare's "Sagittarye" (I.129n). The description of Theobald's burning his works in sacrifice to the goddess Dulness returns to two more of Theobald's dramatic works. First Pope calls Theobald's play the Perfidious Brother "a play written between T. and a Watchmaker" (I.208-09n), referring to a dispute over its authorship. He also mocks Theobald's farce the Rape of Proserpine because it includes stage directions for Ceres to burn a cornfield. Pope makes this incident and this play seem ridiculous by suggesting that the playhouse was in danger of being burned down because of attempts to follow these instructions (I.208-09n). Later in Book I, Pope ridicules Theobald's translation of Plato as well as his poem "the Cave of Poverty"; he alludes to the conclusion of the poem and its wish that Theobald or "some great Genius" seek starvation so that he can "celebrate" the power of poverty (I.226n).

Book II does not mention Theobald's works, but there are references again in Book III. Suggesting that Theobald's writing is not worth printing, Pope attacks Brown and Mears who are "Booksellers, Printers for Tibbald, . . . or any body" (III.20n). An incident in Theobald's farce the Rape
of Proserpine in which Hell is raised is denounced as a "monstrous absurdity" (III.233n). Next, Pope attacks Theobald's play the Double Falsehood (III.272n), mentioned earlier as published by Theobald, who names Shakespeare as the author. Pope questions the attribution to Shakespeare, and referring to Theobald's letter in Mist's, which justifies a line ridiculed by Pope with parallels from Shakespeare, says Theobald has proved "Shakespeare to have written as bad." In effect the note denounces Theobald for injuring the reputation of Shakespeare with this proof of bad writing. Pope labels Theobald's pantomime the Rape of Proserpine as one of the "miserable farces" which "spoil the digestion of the audience" (III.307n). He then again refers to the burning incident in this same farce, making it seem even more ridiculous by claiming that the rival playhouse burned down a barn in a performance to compete with the spectacle (III.310n). Attacking the "specimens" published separately as illustration of Theobald's translation of Aeschylus, Pope recounts that one of the notes compares Prometheus to Christ crucified (III.311n).

While Pope parodies Theobald's notes to make him seem pedantic and ridicules several of Theobald's works to make him appear dull, most of the attack is directed against Theobald the man. Following a description of Dulness and her realm, Theobald is introduced. Dulness views the line
of succession of the dunces; "In each she marks her image full exprest, / But chief, in Tibbald's monster-breeding breast" (I.105-06). Theobald sits "supperless," surrounded by his books and "sinking from thought to thought, a vast profound!" (I.112). Pope explains that Theobald is "monster-breeding" because he creates extravagant gods and demons in his farces (I.106n) and is supperless because "the true Critic prefers the diet of the mind to that of the body" (I.109n). In Pope's biographical sketch of Theobald, Theobald is characterized as the "Author of many forgotten Plays, Poems, and other pieces, and of several anonymous Letters in praise of them in Mist's Journal" (I.106n). While the first part of the statement is certainly doubtful, the second part is completely untrue. Theobald did defend his work in a signed letter to Mist's Journal, but he did not praise it anonymously. Next, Pope quotes an attack by Dennis on Theobald's translation of Ovid. This account is followed by a flattering comment of Giles Jacob on Theobald's "Cave of Poverty" (I.106n), a poem Pope has already ridiculed earlier in the text (I.32). The effect of including this compliment after the earlier ridicule is to make Theobald seem even more absurd because he is complimented on a poem which Pope has already presented as poor and nonsensical. According to Pope, in this biographical note, Theobald's translation of the first book of the Odyssey was poorly
received and may still be found, unsold, in the shop of its publisher, Lintot, but there is no evidence to support Pope's allegation. Pope next makes his only direct reference to Shakespeare Restored: he quotes from the June 8, 1728, letter to Mist's Journal, attributed to Theobald in the "Testimonies," which says that it is "impracticable" to find any errors in Shakespeare Restored. Even though there is no evidence that Theobald wrote the letter, Pope's insinuation that it is his makes Theobald seem vain. And to make Theobald seem selfish and ungrateful, Pope accuses Theobald of soliciting favors in his correspondence with him while refusing to assist Pope in his work on Shakespeare. Both statements have been shown to be erroneous. In another false allegation, Pope identifies Theobald as the culprit who raised opinions against Pope for allegedly obtaining excessively high subscriptions for his edition of Shakespeare. Pope found this action particularly offensive and says that this accusation, if not Theobald's activities in pamphlets and journals, described in "Testimonies," was what elevated Theobald to his status as king of dunces (I.106n). Either reason indicates that Pope chose Theobald for the role simply in personal retribution for these imaginary offenses.

Theobald as a bad poet is described by references to his thoughts and to his library. Pope compares his
thoughts to those of the Devil in Milton's *Paradise Lost* (I.115n). The bad poet, Theobald, also has a library to match his dulness (I.120n), the description of which has not always been recognized as fictional (I.121-36). Theobald is said to choose books either because they fit the space, are gilded, or contain illustrations. Most of them are old, voluminous, and dull. Theobald selects works from his library, including his own "unsullied"--unread works (I.138), as a burnt offering for the goddess Dulness. As he lights the pyre, Theobald recounts his activities in behalf of the goddess, "... I unlucky moderns save [Shakespeare], / Nor sleeps one error in its father's grave, / Old puns restore, lost blunders nicely seek, / And crucify poor Shakespear once a week. / For thee [Dulness] I dim these eyes, and stuff this head / With all such reading as was never read" (I.161-66). He goes on to say that he has supplied "notes to dull books" and "prologues to dull plays" while writing about the same things over and over again (I.167-74).

Whether Theobald's work is indeed dull or not, the comment that he "crucified" Shakespeare weekly is poetic license; between *Shakespeare Restored* and his edition of Shakespeare, Theobald published only a few letters containing emendations of Shakespeare's plays.

There is additional ridicule of Theobald in the last part of Book I, where Theobald is made to wonder whether
he should return to his original profession, law, now that the empire of Dulness has died with Settle (I.190). Since a note refers to law as his "first" profession, the implication is that he is only secondarily a writer and one who perhaps does not qualify in this secondary occupation (I.190n). Next, Pope insinuates that Theobald is a party writer for Mist's Journal (I.194). Theobald did have two letters published in Mist's before 1729, but they were not political, and he certainly was not a major contributor. Pope also implies that Theobald has taken subscriptions for a translation of Aeschylus with no intention of completing it (I.210n.) and further denounces the work by quoting an epigram which ridicules the translation: "Alas! poor Aeschylus! unlucky Dog! / Whom once a Lobster kill'd, and now a Log" (I.210n). Dulness notes the sacrifice Theobald has made, appears to him, and puts out the fire. She shows Theobald her realm and foresees him as its king. Grubstreet shouts, "God Save King Tibbald!" (I.260).

Although Theobald sits on his throne in Book II to watch the games, decreed by Dulness, which ridicule publishers, politicians, and authors, there is only one direct reference to Theobald in the book. Pope quotes from Theobald's letter of June 22, 1728, which decries bringing elements of private character into any argument (II.132n). The way in which Pope quotes the remark,
however, makes it seem that Theobald rather than Pope is interested in dealing with private characters. Book II closes with all present asleep following the prescribed reading of two dull works. Book III opens with Theobald still dreaming in Dulness's lap. In the dream Theobald sees scholars, including himself, "who like Owls see only in the dark" and have "A Lumberhouse of Books in . . . [their] head[s], / For ever reading, never to be read" (III.188-90). Next, Theobald sees himself perform wonders of dullness in the future (III.269-72), and the ghost of Settle shows Theobald, who is still dreaming, how he can go beyond what Settle accomplished in promoting dulness (III.275-314). At the end of the dream Dulness, with the help of Theobald, conquers all (III.356).

Theobald is made to seem vindictive and petty, not only as presented in the poem, but also in the supplemental material of the Dunciad Variorum. In the "Testimonies of Authors" under the heading "MR. LEWIS THEOBALD," Pope quotes a compliment given his Homer in Theobald's Censor (p. 330). He then, however, quotes a contrary opinion from the March 30, 1728, letter to Mist's which he attributes to Theobald. Although Theobald was not the author of this letter, Pope uses it to make him seem inconsistent, vindictive, and ridiculous. The next section, "MIST'S JOURNAL, JUNE 8," quotes remarks on the Iliad supposedly made by Theobald in a letter signed "W.
A.," but no proof exists to show Theobald the author of this letter either. Additional sections of the Dunciad Variorum refer to this letter, sometimes citing its date and sometimes, Theobald's name, quoting remarks which attack the character and editorial ability of Pope. One of these references quotes an accusation against Pope in his conduct of subscriptions (p. 331); Pope later in the text repeats this accusation (I.106). In another section entitled "MR. LEWIS THEOBALD" (p. 336), Pope refers to a letter which Theobald did write, but he twists the words of the quotation to make Theobald seem jealous and threatening (p. 337). In the section "MR. THEOBALD" Pope, with the purpose of making Theobald seem hypocritical, cites a quotation from Shakespeare Restored announcing Theobald's admiration for Pope and his reluctance to attack Pope's character (p.337). The last section of the "Testimonies" referring to the June 8 letter in Mist's (p. 339) uses quotations from the letter, erroneously assigned to Theobald, which are contradictory and make its author seem silly. In the last section of the "Testimonies," Pope twists a line from Theobald's April 27, 1728, letter to Mist's which defines profundity so that the letter is made to say that the Peri Bathos is dull (pp. 341-42). The next paragraph again quotes "W. A.'s" letter, saying that it is Pope rather than Theobald
who deserves ridicule as a dull, poor writer—again making Theobald seem vindictive (p. 342).

In Appendix II only one of the three works listed as appearing before the *Dunciad* of 1728 and attributed to Theobald was really his, and only the June 22 letter attributed to him in the section "AFTER THE DUNCIAD, 1728" was his. Theobald's remarks are twisted again in Appendix VI, "A PARALLEL OF THE CHARACTERS OF MR. DRYDEN AND MR. POPE," to accuse Pope of "cackling" politics (p. 453). This appendix also contains a quotation deriding the *Dunciad* from "W. A.'s" letter, as if the letter were Theobald's (p. 453).

Although Pope made numerous attempts to justify his treatment of Theobald in the *Dunciad* and to assure the reader that he had no personal motives for the ridicule, his treatment of Theobald is in no way charitable or humane. It is more than simply Theobald's role as the hero of the *Dunciad* which makes him seem ridiculous. Pope parodies Theobald's notes and methods to make him seem pedantic. Quotations from Theobald's works emphasize his lack of wit and incompetence as a writer, and attacks on Theobald's character show him to be vindictive and silly. Not only the poem but also the supplementary material of the *Dunciad Variorum* portray Theobald as an unforgivably dull writer and worthless character.
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CHAPTER IV

CIBBER AS THE REPLACEMENT FOR
THEOBALD AS KING OF THE DUNCES

Colley Cibber, chosen by Pope as the hero of the revised *Dunciad* of 1743, was Theobald's opposite in several important respects. Cibber was no scholar; he had limited schooling and confined his reading primarily to plays offered for production. Cibber's fame centered on his career as an actor and theater manager; he was not a highly regarded playwright or author, at least before writing his autobiography in 1740. By contrast, Theobald was a serious, solitary man with limited finances. The kind of scholarly work which he pursued required long, lonely hours of study and produced only limited financial rewards. Even Theobald's correspondence with friends concerns his studies; most of his letters to Warburton discuss emendations of Shakespeare. Although Theobald was known and respected by some of the nobility, he was not much in their company nor invited into their homes. Theobald was well known only among serious scholars. Cibber, on the other hand, sought and enjoyed the company of some of the best-known men of the day. His profession as an actor constantly put him before the public so that
he was known by everyone. Although he was a man with few close friends, Cibber had many influential acquaintances. After his retirement from the stage, he spent his time following the rich and well known; he was received into the best company in England. In 1730 both Theobald and Cibber were candidates for the laureateship, which carried with it a secure income; Cibber was chosen for the position. Unlike Theobald, Cibber was able, after a difficult start, to continue increasing his income. Theobald desired money because it brought the freedom for continued, uninterrupted study; with a secure income, he could pursue his studies without worrying about earning a living. Cibber's attitude toward money was quite different; he desired the ease and power which money brought. While Theobald avowed no interest in politics, Cibber supported the Hanoverians in his play The Non-Juror, which gained him support at court and which may have helped him defeat Theobald in the contest for the laureateship. Theobald's primary vices were his blind loyalty to friends and his excessive display of learning. Theobald's unwavering loyalty sometimes kept him from seeing things clearly, as in the case of Warburton an inconstant friend, whose advice Theobald overvalued; Theobald's excessive displays of learning sometimes made him seem pedantic. Cibber did not deny his own vanity,
and he was reputed to be jealous of actors who received better parts; Cibber was also a notorious gambler. Theobald's vices were excesses of virtue; Cibber's vices were excesses of corruption. Cibber was not without admirable qualities, however, and was likable in spite of his vices. By contrast, Theobald inspired respect rather than affection. In the *Dunciad* of 1743, Pope replaced a quiet, serious, pedantic, poor, little-known scholar with a vivacious, shrewd, vain, financially secure, well-known comedian. The change caused major problems in the overall structure and effect of the *Dunciad*.

Even though Pope's attacks on Theobald in the *Dunciad* of 1728 and the *Dunciad Variorum* were often unjust and based on untruths, the satire was designed for Theobald; and his character, as interpreted by Pope, did fit the design of the *Dunciad*. However, the same was not true of Cibber. Although Pope did make deletions of and additions to the material in the *Dunciad* of 1743 to make the ridicule more readily applicable to Cibber, the basic characteristics of the hero as presented in the *Dunciad Variorum* remain unchanged and, thus, inappropriate for Cibber. The effect of Pope's writings on the reputation of the two men also varied somewhat. Because few people, other than serious students of literature, knew the true character of Theobald, Pope's characterization was widely accepted, especially after the death of Theobald.
However, Cibber was well known by everyone and outlived Pope by thirteen years. Few, other than Pope, chose to ridicule Theobald; but Cibber, as the inept laureate, was a "stale joke." In view of the fundamental differences in character between Cibber and Theobald, the change of heroes in the _Dunciad_ of 1743 also changed the satiric effect.

Pope may have had valid reasons for the change. Cibber suggests several possible motives in his _A LETTER FROM Mr. CIBBER TO Mr. POPE, Inquiring into the Motives that Might Induce Him in His Satyrical Works, to be so Frequently Fond of Mr. Cibber's Name_. Since Cibber did not fit the character of the hero previously established in the _Dunciad Variorum_, Pope's decision to change heroes must have been based on strong motives to have made the complications of the change desirable. As Cibber suggests, this new ridicule of Cibber may have been vindication for personal injury. Yet because the incidents which Cibber offers as provocation occurred before the publication of the _Dunciad Variorum_, they do not explain why Pope did not make the change then but waited fifteen years for retribution. Cibber suggests in his autobiography, _An Apology for the Life of Colley Cibber_, that Pope had often ridiculed him because Pope wanted a well-known name to increase sales of his works.
may have decided that since Cibber as laureate had been a good joke, the use of Cibber in the Dunciad would be appropriate because the laureate was more nearly a leader of taste than an obscure scholar. In "Ricardus Aristarchus of the Hero of the Poem," Pope states his public motives. After saying that the hero must be found and exalted rather than made, he compares the epic and mock-epic hero, giving the characteristics of the mock-epic hero as "Vanity, Impudence, and Debauchery, from which happy assemblage resulteth heroic Dulness, the never-dying subject of this our Poem" (p. 713). To demonstrate Cibber's vanity, Pope quotes a passage from Cibber's autobiography in which Cibber admits his vanity and other "follies." To establish Cibber's courage, in the form of impudence, Pope quotes a remark in which Cibber says that he glories in his follies, one of which is his poor writing (p. 714). According to Pope, Cibber's debauchery is the result of perverted "Gentle Love," evidenced in Cibber's remark in A Letter to Mr. Pope regarding men and their whores (p. 714). So, "from Vanity, Impudence, and Debauchery springeth Buffoonry, the source of Ridicule" (p. 715).

After a sarcastic quotation of another remark in Cibber's autobiography, Pope explains that a suitable hero must have not only "admirable" qualities of his own, but also the patronage of the great just as the ancient
heroes had the assistance of the gods. Cibber has the required patronage since he is "a professed Favourite and Intimado of the Great" and can, thus, subvert the great to dulness (p. 715). Pope says he did not find the hero; the hero identified himself. When Cibber read the line "Soft on her lap her Laureat son reclines," published in the new Dunciad in 1742 (p. 716), he assumed the line referred to him and protested. In referring to Cibber's complaints about being used as the subject of the poem, Pope says Cibber "ROAR'D (like a Lion)," one of Cibber's favorite metaphors. Cibber objected to being depicted as asleep, laziness being inconsistent with his character. Pope counters by claiming that the sleep referred to is the sleep of immortality and, therefore, is desirable (p. 716). Finally Pope has chosen Cibber the player rather than one of Cibber's more noble patrons because Cibber believes himself great (pp. 716-17). Pope cites several of Cibber's comparisons, made in his autobiography, between himself and great men (p. 717) as proof that Cibber is great. While not the offspring of gods or goddesses, Cibber has a divine lineage because he is the son of Caius Cibber the sculptor, a maker of heathen gods and goddesses (p. 717). Cibber's divinity is further proved in a twisted remark from Cibber's autobiography which says that Cibber is the son of no one and, thus, must be divine (p. 718). Pope continues
twisting quotations from Cibber's autobiography to make Cibber appear dull and foolish; Cibber is characterized as "an artful Gamester" who "will never change or amend" and who looks upon his "Follies as the best part of . . . [his] Fortune" (p. 718).

Cibber had not been excluded from ridicule in the Dunciad Variorum. He is mentioned in Book I; he appears among Dulness's subjects who, with "Less human genius than God gives an ape," revive works by "Plautus, Fletcher, Congreve, and Corneille," transforming them into "new piece[s]" of "Cibber, Johnson, or Ozell" (DV I.239-40). Pope then juxtaposes a flattering description of Cibber with a satiric depiction of him as an unoriginal author, "particularly admirable in Tragedy" (DV I.240n). Cibber is not mentioned in Book II but is attacked again in Book III. The first reference there is to Cibber's infamous son, Theophilus (DV III.131-34). Later Cibber and Booth, as managers of the Drury Lane Theater, are attacked for bringing in some of the ridiculous machinery used to increase the spectacle of plays (DV III.262-64). Also in Book III Cibber is alleged to have participated in the entertainments at Smithfield Fair that led to the production of pantomimes on stage (DV III.289-90). In the dream world of Dulness, Cibber serves as "Lord-Chancellor" of Plays, a satiric reference to his frequently poor judgment in determining which plays to
produce (DV III.320). Thus, in the Dunciad Variorum, Cibber is characterized as dull and foolish; he is ridiculed indirectly for having an infamous son and, as a theater manager, for arbitrarily choosing poor plays and degrading the stage by promoting pantomimes.

Even though Cibber was attacked in the Dunciad Variorum, the ridicule of him was certainly slight compared to that of many others. In transferring Cibber to his role as hero in the revised Dunciad of 1743, Pope greatly increased the ridicule of Cibber. As mentioned, the section "Ricardus Aristarchus of the Hero of the Poem" explains the choice of Cibber as hero and depicts him as vain and foolish. Changes in the "ADVERTISEMENT TO THE READER" are made to accommodate Cibber's promotion. The earlier use of Theobald as hero is called a "defect" but excused because, at the time, there was no better (p. 709). Since then Cibber has been chosen Laureate and is one "who from every Folly (not to say Vice) of which another would be ashamed, has constantly derived a Vanity; and therefore was the man in the world who would least be hurt by it" (p. 710). Cibber is thus elevated to the throne of dulness and Theobald deposed. Following the "ADVERTISEMENT TO THE READER," under the title "BY AUTHORITY," Theobald is labeled a "Pretender, Pseudo-Poet" and is banished from the work (p. 710). While Pope does
greatly increase the ridicule of Cibber in the 1743 edition, he does not "banish" Theobald.

The "ARGUMENT TO BOOK THE FIRST" is slightly altered from the Dunciad Variorum, but it retains parts of the action of the Dunciad Variorum more applicable to Theobald than Cibber. In this summary the hero sits "pensive among his books" (p. 719), and instead of seeking the legal profession or politics, as Theobald did (p. 347), he considers the "Church, or . . . Gaming, or Party-writing" (p. 719). This part of the hero's description has been ably altered to apply to Cibber. He was originally destined, by his parents, for the church; he was a notorious gamester, and he did support Whig views in his play The Non-Juror. However, the description of the pensive hero still applies to Theobald, not Cibber. Next, Cibber, like Theobald in the earlier version, is seen lighting an altar on which is heaped his unsuccessful writing. The application of the adjective unsuccessful may be partially true of both Theobald and Cibber, though in slightly different ways; however, it is entirely true of neither.

Book I of the Dunciad of 1743 contains the most extensive changes; it also applies most directly to Cibber. Ridicule of Cibber has been added, but much of the attack on Theobald has been retained. Pope maintains the ridicule of Theobald contained in the first note in
the *Dunciad Variorum* (pp. 719-20n) and adds new information to make the dispute over the spelling of Shakespeare seem even more ridiculous. In the note which follows, supposedly by Bentley, Pope points out the reasons why Cibber is the true hero (p. 720). Two of the original lines (1.2 and 6) from the *Dunciad Variorum* are retained in the first eight lines of the *Dunciad* of 1743. Pope's new interpretation of bringing the "Smithfield Muses to the ear of Kings" (I.2) makes the action apply to Cibber rather than Theobald (p. 720), both of whom have brought "Shews, Machines, and Dramatical Entertainments" (*DV* I.2n) from the fair to the theater. Even though he did not write successful pantomimes, Cibber was as guilty as Theobald in encouraging pantomimes because he condoned, if he did not promote, their performance, and, as Laureate, was more at the King's ear. Pope's new reference to "the Great" in the third line is explained as applicable to Cibber, "the Peculiar Delight and Chosen Companion of the Nobility of England," while inappropriate for Theobald (p. 720). The sixth line is also unchanged from the *Dunciad Variorum* but interpreted in a new way. "Still Dunce the second reigns like Dunce the first" is explained as a reference to Cibber and his son (p. 720) rather than George II's succeeding his father (*DV* I.6n). The eighteen lines following line 8 are unchanged except that a new note is added to line 15, in
which Pope broadens the definition of dulness to "all Slowness of Apprehension, Shortness of Sight, or imperfect Sense of things" (I.15n). This broader definition is meant to explain, in a way which will apply to Cibber, the reference to the "laborious, heavy, busy, bold, and blind" goddess (I.15), originally described in a way designed to link her with Theobald. In a note to the line, Pope includes a quotation from Cibber that compares Pope's persecution of the dull writers to the swatting of flies (I.15n). Lines 29-33 are new and refer to Cibber's father. Folly's throne is established at Bethlehem Hospital for the insane, where two of Caius Cibber's statues are placed (I.31n). Line 34, however, is unchanged; the description of "The Cave of Poverty and Poetry" still refers to Theobald's poem "The Cave of Poverty" (I.34n). The reference is inappropriate for Cibber, who is neither poor nor a professed poet. The reference to the drowning out of birthday odes by the accompanying music is not new but is made to apply to Cibber rather than Eusden, who was poet laureate at the time of the publication of the Dunciad Variorum (I.44n). Pope again transfers ridicule of the laureate used against Eusden in the Dunciad Variorum (DV I.102) to Cibber in the Dunciad of 1743 by reprinting a derogatory epigram concerning Cibber's appointment (I.104n).
There are other references to Theobald retained in Book I of the *Dunciad* of 1743, originally used in the *Dunciad Variorum*, which have not been altered to apply to Cibber. Pope does not delete a quotation regarding Dennis (I.106n) originally used to make Theobald appear petty in the *Dunciad Variorum* (DV I.104n). However, two lines later Theobald's "monster-breeding breast" (DV I.106) is changed to "Bays's monster-breeding breast" (I.108), and a new section describing Cibber follows (I.109-17). Pope ridicules Cibber as an actor, an author, a swearer, and a gambler. A twisted quotation from Cibber's 1742 *A Letter to Mr. Pope* makes Cibber regard himself as perpetually dull (I.109n). Like Theobald in the *Dunciad Variorum*, the hero in the *Dunciad* of 1743 is "supperless," a condition due in Cibber's case to gambling (I.115n). While the explanation of why Cibber is supperless may make sense, the idea of the poor poet (Theobald) unable to afford dinner and wishing to think only of pursuits of the mind, not the body, seems more appropriate for a dunce-hero. The unaltered reference to the hero "Sinking from thought to thought, a vast profound!" (I.118) is also appropriate to the pensive poet Theobald, but not to Cibber. Perhaps Pope believed these lines too witty as written for revision or deletion, or he may have overlooked them. The description of the hero's library (I.121-40) has been
altered to fit Cibber, but not entirely convincingly. The ridicule of Cibber in this section centers on his stealing parts of plays from other authors for his own work and on his inadequate adaptations of other plays. In a reference to "hapless Shakespeare," Pope seizes the opportunity to recall Theobald and twist a quotation in which Theobald promised to find five hundred overlooked emendations (I.133n). Cibber's library, like Theobald's, contains mainly works selected either for the way they fit on the shelves or for their attractive pictures or adornments (I.134-40). Cibber's collection is described as dull (I.141-54), but with phrases which still seem more appropriate to Theobald. There are unchanged references to the works of Greece and Rome, "the Classics of an Age that heard of none" (I.148), and to Caxton and Wynkyn de Worde (I.149). Even though Pope attempts to explain the contents of Cibber's library as chosen completely for show (I.147n), Cibber had a limited knowledge of the Greek and Latin classics, no knowledge of classics in "the Age that heard of none" (certainly referring to the mass of medieval and early Renaissance literature read by Theobald), and specifically no respect for Caxton and Wynkyn de Worde, used by Theobald to illustrate Shakespeare. The lines still apply to Theobald and are in no way appropriate for Cibber. "Withers, Quarles, and Blome" (DV I.126) have been changed to "Settle, Banks,
and Broome" (I.146) to parallel three roles of Cibber: the laureate who writes unintelligible poems, the tragic playwright who imitates exactly but is still unsuccessful, and the playwright who constantly contributes parts to plays but can claim few complete works of his own (I.146n). A pile of sacrificial works is again burned, but instead of being topped with Theobald's Ajax (DV I.143), it is topped with one of Cibber's birthday odes (I.161). Pope adds a line about Sir Fopling's periwig (I.167-68) and quotes an anecdote about the wig from Cibber's autobiography (I.167n); the incident is included to offer an example of Cibber's vanity.

The section in the Dunciad Variorum which refers to Theobald's occupation of crucifying Shakespeare, reading dull works, and writing notes to dull books and prologues to dull plays (DV I.164-76) has been deleted, and a shorter section (I.177-80), with a reference to a coxcomb, has been inserted. An additional insertion (I.187-88) ridicules Cibber's poetry, prose, and acting. Cibber casts aside his Fletcher (I.190) instead of Theobald's Flaccus (DV I.189), and he contemplates a profession in the church (I.200) in contrast to Theobald's in law or politics (DV I.190). A new section of about fifty lines (I.201-42) contains almost all new material. References are made to Cibber's gambling (I.202), his association with the nobility (I.203), his swearing (I.204), and his
strong party support based on the desire for advancement rather than principles (I.205). The reference to Theobald's "cackling" to the Tories has been deleted and a reference to Walpole (I.212) added. Then as the gazetteers desert their profession, Cibber is left by himself to proceed with "Cibberian forehead, and Cibberian brain" (I.217-18). Other new lines in the section refer to the social extremes of Cibber's acquaintance; he is a companion of both the nobility and the patrons of bear-baiting (I.222). In the final part of the new section (I.225-42), Cibber speaks to his works as he watches them burn. They were brought forth in folly (I.225) to support the financial needs of his growing family (I.228n). Instead of the "Un-stall'd, Unsold" works of Theobald (DV I.198), Cibber's are "Unstain'd, untouch'd" (I.229). Musing over them, Cibber hopes none of his works will produce a fruit-pelting audience at the theater (I.236). The last lines of the new section (I.212-42) again ridicule Cibber's heritage as poet laureate (I.238-42). After a short section unchanged from the Dunciad Variorum, Pope adds more new material ridiculing Cibber's works (I.250-54). Cibber's tragedies were "printed, acted, and damned" (I.250n) and his The Non-Juror "threshed out of Molière's Tartuffe" (I.253n). Pope twists a quotation from Cibber to show that Cibber so highly regarded his own work The Non-Juror that Cibber
believed that Pope disliked it only because of a "disaffection to the Government" (I.253n).

The next thirty-seven lines (I.255-92) are unchanged. The line which originally included "Cibber, Johnson, or Ozell" (DV I.240) is altered to include Theobald instead of Johnson (I.286). The lengthy biographical note on Theobald included in the Dunciad Variorum (DV I.106n) is shortened to a description of Theobald as the author of "forgotten Plays, Translations, and other pieces" and the inclusion of two derogatory quotations (I.286n). The end of Book I does contain new ridicule of the laureate (I.278-300 and 303-04) as well as a reference to "Cat-call[s]" (I.302), swearing (I.308), and gaming (I.310), all of which apply to Cibber. Several different quarters of London, from the Chapel Royal, to White's, to Drury Lane, to the center for bear baiting, and, finally, to the devil, a pun on a tavern frequented by Cibber (I.319-26), hail the king of dunces. The last four lines of the book are unchanged, concluding with "God Save King Log" (I.330).

Like Theobald before him, Cibber has only a minor role in Book II; most of the ridicule falls on others. Book II is essentially unaltered from the Dunciad Variorum; approximately thirty new lines are added; six lines are slightly changed, and a few names are changed. The most significant change is the shift from Lintot to
Osborn in the contest with Curll. Pope has again added some new material about Cibber but retained some of the Dunciad Variorum ridicule of Theobald. He still begins Book II with a note attacking textual criticism (p. 736n) which ridicules Theobald's practices and is inappropriate for Cibber. Pope also retains a reference to Theobald in the note to line 140 (II.140n) as well as several notes first printed in the Dunciad Variorum as parodies of Theobald's notes (II.183n). The new material added concerning Cibber occurs in a note to line 140, where Pope indirectly compliments Cibber's The Careless Husband (II.140n).

There are several alterations in Book III, but most of its satire of Theobald remains; a few new references to Cibber are inserted. The "ARGUMENT TO BOOK THE THIRD" is changed slightly to emphasize Dulness's victories at the court and in the theaters. Two notes still ridicule Theobald. The first refers to his publishers, Brown and Mears (III.28); the second continues to be partly ascribed to him, while satirizing his methods of emendation (III.36n). A reference which ridicules Theophilus Cibber (III.139-42) is unchanged from its appearance in the Dunciad Variorum. Pope's criticism of textual critics who have "A Lumberhouse of books in ev'ry head, / For ever reading, never to be read!" (III.191-92) seems still directed at Theobald, reminiscent of lines used to
describe him in the *Dunciad Variorum*: "For thee [Dulness] I dim these eyes, and stuff this head, / With all such reading as was never read" (DV I.165-66).

Cibber is depicted as especially vain in some new lines (III.231-32) illustrated by a quotation from his autobiography (III.232n). The reference in the *Dunciad Variorum* to Theobald's ridiculous pantomime devices is carried over (III.237n). The mention of the burning cornfield in one of Theobald's pantomimes is kept as well (III.312). Pope does, however, delete the lines and accompanying lengthy note regarding Theobald's play *The Double Falsehood* (DV III.271-72n). He also eliminates some lines about politics (DV III.283-86). To compensate, Pope inserts four lines of satire on Cibber's gambling, whoring (III.303-06), and translating of an opera (III.305n).

Book IV, written more than ten years after the *Dunciad Variorum*, does little to ridicule Theobald, with the exception of one reference (IV.249-52); it also contains few and sometimes inappropriate attacks on Cibber. There are only five express references to Cibber. Pope quotes from Cibber's *A Letter to Mr. Pope*, in which Cibber points out that Pope's characterization of him drowsing on Dulness's lap is inaccurate since he is by nature brisk and active (IV.20n). In spite of Pope's attempt to discredit it, Cibber's criticism seems
accurate. A reference to the debate on the Licensing Act of 1737 does not report all the facts and makes Cibber's testimony in the case seem pompous and vain (IV.43n). Later in Book IV Cibber is attacked as laureate and as theater manager; a reference to those who "give from fool to fool the Laurel crown" (IV.98) again ridicules the succession of laureates. As theater manager, Cibber is accused (IV.326) of trying to manage not only the theater but also "youths" under his guidance; there is little evidence for this accusation. Finally the "Cibberian" forehead is mentioned again (IV.532).

In addition to the references in the poem, Pope has inserted an excerpt from Cibber's letter to Pope in the prefatory "Testimonies of Authors Concerning our Poet and his Works" (p. 339). He has also added a section to the appendix titled "VI. OF THE POET LAUREATE," which gives a "history" of the awarding of the laurel and Pope's suggestions for future ceremonies. The section is said to have been written before the award of the laurel in 1730, when Eusden's successor was still unknown. Pope begins with Stephen Duck, the leading candidate, and then labels Theobald a thief (p. 804) and Cibber as vain (p. 804) and ridiculous (p. 804n).

Pope's ridicule of Cibber in the Dunciad of 1743 shows that he had carefully read both An Apology and Cibber's A Letter to Mr. Pope. Since An Apology appeared
in 1740 and seemed to raise the literary reputation of Cibber, it might well have produced the notoriety for Cibber that led Pope to intensify his ridicule of Cibber by making him the hero of the *Dunciad*. Pope published Book IV of the *Dunciad* separately as the *New Dunciad* in 1742. Book IV actually contained few specific references to Cibber, but there are enough to change the thrust of the earlier *Dunciad* and suggest that Pope planned a revision of the *Dunciad* with Cibber as hero. Pope may have been testing the reception for this change much as he tested the possible reaction to the first *Dunciad* with the *Peri Bathos*. The publication of Book IV did have an effect similar to that of the *Peri Bathos*; it provoked a reply, Cibber's *A Letter to Mr. Pope*, dated July 1742. If Pope had any reservations about revising the *Dunciad* with Cibber as its hero, they were eliminated by Cibber's reply. This letter and Cibber's autobiography must have been responsible for Pope's actions, not Cibber's personal offenses against Pope, which occurred much earlier are recounted in Cibber's autobiography.

An analysis of *An Apology* reveals little that would be of obvious offense to Pope. Cibber may be making a subtle threat to Pope when he points out the more immediate effectiveness of ridicule delivered on the public stage as compared with that in pamphlets.
However, Cibber realizes he cannot expect exemption from criticism; he is willing to be judged by the criterion he suggests for others: "If I should be ask'd, why I have not always, my self, follow'd the Rules I would impose on others; I can only answer, that whenever I have not, I lie equally open to the same critical Censure."\(^{11}\) Even though he takes note of Pope's frequent attempts to ridicule him, Cibber is highly complimentary to Pope.\(^{12}\) Cibber honestly admits that he has follies,\(^{13}\) which include lack of higher education and lack of discretion,\(^{14}\) an inability to write good poetry,\(^{15}\) and a tendency toward dullness.\(^{16}\) While Cibber does omit certain incriminating events in this account of his life, the work generally impresses with its honesty. Cibber appears likable. Pope could have been offended only by the acclaim the book received, not by the book itself.

Cibber's *A Letter to Mr. Pope* (1742) is harsher in its treatment of Pope. Cibber questions Pope's need to take revenge on dull authors much his inferiors,\(^{17}\) and he accuses Pope of being jealous of Cibber's social connections with the nobility.\(^{18}\) Cibber labels Pope's accusations against him as groundless\(^{19}\) and recounts an anecdote to make Pope appear a hot-tempered, petty man. According to Cibber, Pope had been angered by Cibber's satiric comment, made in
the character of Bays in *The Rehearsal*, which ridiculed Pope's play *Three Hours After Marriage*. In response, Pope swore at Cibber and threatened to have John Gay cane him. Cibber's answer was a promise to deliver the same remark whenever the play was performed.\(^{20}\) The other event which Cibber recounts as provocation for Pope's attack occurred in a bawdy house. Pope had been taken there with Cibber and some others by a certain nobleman who thought it would be a good jest to see what Pope would do. At the critical moment Pope was saved by Cibber from catching the pox.\(^ {21}\) In another Cibber anecdote, Pope is again characterized as vindictive while Cibber appears magnanimous. Cibber had subscribed to Pope's Homer; returning the favor, Pope made an insincere request, meant as a joke, for tickets to Cibber's *The Non-Juror*.\(^ {22}\) While Cibber notes Pope's attack on him in *The Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot*,\(^ {23}\) he compliments the work\(^ {24}\) and says he never deserved to be Pope's enemy\(^ {25}\) but desired to forgive the ridicule and be his friend.\(^ {26}\) Most of the last part of the letter is a reply to the specific references Pope made to Cibber in Book IV of the *Dunciad*. After showing how Pope has misquoted him,\(^ {27}\) Cibber wonders how his slight offenses against Pope can have earned such harsh retribution.\(^ {28}\) In concluding, Cibber does realize that the smooth verse of Pope has an
advantage over his own "humble Prose" in that it is skillfully wrought even if untrue. But like Theobald, Cibber trusts to the truth of his work and the common sense of the public to know what is true and what is false to vindicate him. He suggests that Pope's malice may cast a harsher light on Pope than on himself and may even evoke sympathy instead of contempt. Finally, he suggests that Pope is a fit subject for satire with a mind "sour'd by Ill-nature, personal Prejudice, or the Lust of Railing." The Dunciad of 1743 was not the final word in the Pope-Cibber battle. Cibber had endured Pope's ridicule silently until 1742. Although Helen Koone points out that it is impossible to know whether Cibber retaliated from the stage, he had never replied in print, except possibly in some subtle references in The Non-Juror, to any of Pope's attacks. It was not characteristic of Cibber to rebut his attackers. Pope was not the only writer who attacked Cibber; Cibber was the frequent target of newspaper and pamphlet ridicule; he left these attacks unanswered. Cibber "had too much self-assurance to be deeply hurt or permanently embittered." Although Cibber says, "no criticism can possibly make me worse than I really am; so nothing I say of myself can possibly make me better," his writing of his autobiography in 1740 indicates a concern for his reputation. He explains
his reason for his previous silence: "If their [the critics'] Censure is just, what Answer can I make to it? If it is unjust, why should I suppose that a sensible Reader will not see it as well as myself?" He also points out—prophetic of the Dunciad battle—that a reply may provoke a rejoinder and that he might yet lose. Cibber believes he will be judged as well by what he says himself in his writings as by what others say of him in theirs.

Following The New Dunciad in 1742 and attacks on Cibber by Pope's friends, Cibber had replied again in January of 1743 after his initial letter to Pope (1742) in a pamphlet entitled THE EGOTIST: OR, COLLEY upon CIBBER, BEING His own Picture retouch'd, to so plain a Likeness, that no One, Now, would have the Face to own it, But HIMSELF and then in February in A Second Letter from Mr. Cibber to Mr. Pope. In Reply to Some Additional Verses in His Dunciad, Which He Has not yet Published. After the Dunciad of 1743 was published in October, Cibber had the final word in January 1744 in his ANOTHER OCCASIONAL LETTER FROM Mr. CIBBER TO Mr. POPE. WHEREIN The New Hero's Preferment to his Throne, in the Dunciad, seems not to be Accepted. And the Author of that Poem His More Rightful Claim to it, is Asserted. WITH an Expostulatory Address to the Reverend Mr. W. W____n, Author
of the new Preface, and Adviser in the Curious
Improvements of that Satire, which treated Pope
more harshly and attacked Warburton.

Cibber had the last but not the more lasting word.
He fared better in the battle of his reputation against
the Dunciad than Theobald did, probably because of the
popularity of his autobiography, but Pope still prevailed.
Like Theobald, Cibber overestimated the value of truth and
underestimated the power of genius.
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CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

There is no doubt that personal animosity existed between Pope and Theobald, and there is no doubt that Theobald's true character was completely unlike that presented of him in the Dunciad. Cibber's character in the Dunciad of 1743 is also a caricature; none of the portraits in the Dunciad is designed to be complete or accurate. They were meant as personal satire, not as fact or as social satire. The Dunciad caricatures are detailed, personal satiric attacks on specific, real individuals. If the application of the attack has broadened through literary history, it is a consequence of time, not the design of the Dunciad. Pope's most brilliant satire is personal rather than social.

When Pope made Theobald the protagonist of the Dunciad of 1728 and of the Dunciad Variorum, he was answering what he viewed as a personal attack in Theobald's Shakespeare Restored. However, "... since we know that the poem was projected and partly written some months before the publication of Shakespeare Restored, it is clear that it was not originally devised merely for the humiliation of Lewis
While Pope may not have designed the entire work as personal retribution against Theobald, he certainly designated Theobald as its protagonist for the purpose of personal retribution. Theobald's questioning of Pope's abilities as an editor of Shakespeare was certainly a personal affront to Pope. Pope's satire of Theobald in the *Dunciad* was intensely personal, attacking not only Theobald's literary abilities but also his character. Pope ridiculed Theobald's works, mimicked his style of annotation, and vilified his character. Even though Pope falsified the materials, the detail and imagery of Pope's caricature present a picture of Theobald as a dunce which must be admired even today. If Root has accurately assessed Pope's idea of a dunce as one not characterized by "stupidity or ignorance, but a perverse misapplication of intelligence, learning without wisdom," then Theobald is an ideal choice as a dunce. Theobald had intelligence and learning, but his close attention to minute and seemingly unimportant detail as a textual critic would make him seem, to Pope, pedantic, one without discretion in the use of learning. Thus the *Dunciad* attack on Theobald was an attack on pedantry and textual criticism as represented in the person of Theobald.

Pope's attack on Theobald in the *Dunciad* had both immediate and long-term effects. The popularity of the
Dunciad immediately brought Theobald to the attention of large numbers of people, and the caricature of him was accepted as true by those unfamiliar with his work in Shakespeare Restored. As time passed, the Dunciad continued in popularity but the audience for Theobald's works on Shakespeare narrowed to only serious students of Shakespeare. Thus the historical facts about Theobald have been clouded by his portrait in the Dunciad. Pope's reputation as a literary genius has overshadowed Theobald's renown among Shakespearean scholars. So, while the Dunciad did not assure Pope's immediate victory over Theobald, it did procure long-term success for Pope. Pope achieved both his immediate personal vindication and, by his brilliance, a broader, long-lasting effect.

Pope's decision to substitute Cibber for Theobald as the protagonist in the Dunciad of 1743 seems based on fewer personal motives and is also less powerfully vindictive. Because Cibber had not attacked Pope personally in print, Pope's ridicule of Cibber had to be more than a personal vendetta. Pope may have believed he had achieved complete victory over Theobald so that the satire could be altered to achieve a different, broader effect. However, because Cibber was totally unlike Theobald, not a man of great learning and intelligence and unquestionable character, he did not fit the caricature of the dunce designed for Theobald in the original Dunciad.
Cibber was an actor and theater manager, not the pedantic critic which Pope had made Theobald. Even though Cibber was foolish and sometimes ridiculous, he was not dull. Pope was attacking what Cibber, in his position as poet laureate, represented, not the man himself. In this instance, Pope may have had some of the social motives he claims in his preface to the Dunciad. As poet laureate Cibber reflected the debased literary taste of the day. The example he presented was that of a ridiculously poor poet, of somewhat questionable character, and an actor, a practitioner in a questionable profession. He certainly lowered the standards of poetry with his odes; he debased the state of the theater with his promotion of pantomime, and, with his vanity and gambling, he gave the public a character not to emulate. His worst fault was that he was successful, both critically and financially. Not only was Cibber popular among the masses, who could be expected to have low tastes, but he was also much in the company of the nobility and best-known men of the day. In an office which should represent high achievement in poetry was, at least to Pope, a man who was to be despised. It was Cibber's undeserved success and popularity, perhaps of a kind which eluded Pope, not personal attacks against Pope, which caused Pope to ridicule Cibber harshly in the Dunciad of 1743.
Pope was less effective in his victory over Cibber than he had been in the battle with Theobald. Because the changes which Pope made in the *Dunciad* to elevate Cibber to the height of ridicule were relatively few, and because Cibber was unlike Theobald, for whom the protagonist's role had been fashioned, the portrait of Cibber in the *Dunciad* of 1743 is not as clear and immediately effective as the earlier caricature of Theobald had been. Cibber was extremely popular, and the direct responses which he made in print to Pope's attack were widely read; thus in the immediate battle Pope was not the clear winner. However, the long-term victory has been Pope's. Although Cibber has a secure place in the history of drama, it is a small niche known primarily to scholars. Pope's importance and the significance of the *Dunciad* of 1743 have allowed Cibber to be placed prominently among the infamous. The change of protagonists, however, resulted in a patchwork which somewhat mars the overall effectiveness of the portrait of the protagonist in the *Dunciad*.

Even though the *Dunciad* contains obvious untruths and is not historically authentic, it does reflect the tastes and activities of its age. And while a comparison of the character of Theobald and the caricature of him in the *Dunciad* reveals that Pope maligned him unfairly, the
satire itself is so well done that it evokes admiration. It is the brilliance of Pope's satire which ensures the place of the *Dunciad* in literary history; his way with words rather than their truth impresses in a reading of the *Dunciad*. Theobald has a place in the history of Shakespearean scholarship, as Cibber does in the history of drama, but both have better known places in the infamy of the *Dunciad*. Because Pope's continued prominent place in literary history seems assured, it is Cibber and Theobald's reputed contagious dulness which will most often be remembered. While the careful reader may recognize that Pope did not, perhaps, deserve such a victory, he will also be forced to acknowledge the beauty and genius of Pope's satire in the *Dunciad*. What began as personal vindication has been broadened through time to support the social motives Pope professes in the *Dunciad*.

Pope once said, "Middling poets are no poets at all. There is always a great number of such in each age, that are almost totally forgotten in the next. A few curious inquirers may know that there were such men, and that they wrote such and such things; but to the world they are as if they had never been." Because in one sense, such was the fate of Theobald and Cibber, Pope had partial victory. But in his letter of November 26, 1725, Swift warns Pope, "Take care the bad poets do not outwit you, as they have . . . the good ones in every Age, whom they have
provoked to transmit their names to posterity. . . . [T]he difference between good and bad Fame is a perfect Trifle." And in this way Theobald and Cibber have found a form of victory. They are remembered, albeit as the objects of ridicule, by a broader audience, some of whom may be led to investigate the characters of Theobald and Cibber to determine their rightful places in literary history.
CHAPTER V

NOTES


2 Root, p. 15.
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