

Richard I. Cook

DEFOE AND SWIFT: CONTRASTS IN SATIRE

IN 1702 DANIEL DEFOE published anonymously his pamphlet entitled *The Shortest Way With Dissenters*. In it, Defoe, the staunch Nonconformist, argued with convincing zeal that Dissenters who persisted in their sins should be hanged. First accepted at face value, it caused much alarm; then, when the identity and satiric purpose of the author became known, there came high indignation, and exaggerated punishment followed. Some twenty-seven years later in 1729, Jonathan Swift, also anonymously, wrote the tract which appeared in full title as *A Modest Proposal For Preventing The Children of Poor People in Ireland From Being a Burthen to Their Parents or Country, and For Making Them Beneficial to the Public*. Dean Swift, viewing with concern starvation and poverty among the Irish lower classes, modestly proposed that the infants of such people be suitably butchered and sold as a new table delicacy to those gourmets affluent enough to afford them. The satiric purpose of Swift's pamphlet could not escape any but the most obtuse, but what did escape many was the high moral indignation behind the essay. Viewed as a morbid and tasteless attempt at humour in a heart-breaking situation, it helped to earn for Swift his reputation as a cruel and twisted misanthrope.

The most obvious of the traits that Defoe's *The Shortest Way With Dissenters* and Swift's *A Modest Proposal* have in common is that each attempts to achieve its ends largely by means of the shock value of an outrageous or macabre suggestion ostensibly put forward in sincerity. The resultant uproar was, in both cases, of gratifying proportions, though the pursued and pilloried Defoe no doubt felt that things had got a little out of hand. The bizarre nature of Swift's and Defoe's proposals makes comparison of their pamphlets natural, and such a comparison shows that in technique of execution, in effects sought, and in results achieved, the two works are distinctly different. Defoe's purposes were best served by a satire so subtle that in many places it hardly seems satire at all, but rather appears to be just the sort of High-Flier tract it was meant to ridicule. Swift, on the other hand,

for *his* ends used broad, bitterly indignant satire and heavy, though not ponderous, irony.

Except for some of the readily apparent general purposes for which these pamphlets were written, it is rather difficult to be sure just what each man specifically hoped to accomplish with his tract. Since the goals in each case would decide the techniques the writer used, an examination of those techniques may, by reverse process, enable us to determine what ends Swift and Defoe had in mind when writing these tracts. Looked at historically and rhetorically, Defoe's *The Shortest Way With Dissenters* and Swift's *A Modest Proposal* shed some interesting light on the uses, effectiveness, and dangers of satiric and ironic writing.

In the England of Defoe's day, the issues of religious conformity and dissent were primary ones. The Nonconformists had enjoyed a brief period of tolerance in 1672 with Charles II's Declaration of Indulgence, only to lose it in the next year when the Test Act was put through. In 1689, under William, the Act of Toleration was passed. But this act, while it allowed the Nonconformists to worship as they wished, still forbade them public office as long as they were outside the communion of the Church of England. The loophole through this restriction was the practice of Occasional Conformity—the Dissenter who was in public office had only, from time to time, to take communion formally under Church of England auspices. Defoe was among those Dissenters who attacked this compromise device as impious and hypocritical.

In 1702 the Commons passed a bill against Occasional Conformity. In the House of Lords there was much debate over the measure. The queen, meanwhile, had publicly and indiscreetly, in her first speech from the throne, expressed her disregard for those who opposed the High Church. The subjects of Nonconformity, Occasional Conformity, Dissenters, and religious freedom in general were vehemently debated. Extremists among the High Church men were advocating increasingly severe measures to suppress Nonconformists. Dr. Henry Sacheverell, in particular, was eminent among Church of England divines whose immoderate sermons aroused fear in Defoe and his co-religionists. Sacheverell had, on one occasion, urged that the "bloody flag and banner of defiance" be raised against the Nonconformists. It was into this context, in December of 1702, that Defoe stepped with *The Shortest Way With Dissenters*.

Defoe's primary purpose in writing the pamphlet seems fairly clear. "The end of satire is reformation," he says in opening the preface to *A Hymn to the Pillory*. In *The Shortest Way*, Defoe's device to bring on this reformation was to reduce the extremist High Church position, with its increasingly sinister rumblings

and threats of violence, to the ridiculous by carrying it to its logical extremity. If other High-Flyer threats were vague, those of the pseudo-Church of England man in *The Shortest Way With Dissenters* were all too explicit. Hang them, he said, and have an end to this schism weakening the nation! Had the previous argument been moderate, Defoe's suggestion would have been too far-fetched to be effective. But, only one step removed as it was from what was actually being advocated, it was close enough to home perhaps to induce a little calm reflection among Church of England men as to the direction they were travelling. Along with this end, Defoe had the subsidiary purpose of parodying the sermons and tracts of the Sacheverell type, though "pastiche" would perhaps be more accurate in this case than "parody." The original reception of the pamphlet as being genuinely what it purported to be is a tribute to the skill with which Defoe followed his models.

While we can infer Defoe's general purposes from what he wrote in the pamphlet, it is not easy to ascertain just what audience he hoped to reach and what effect he intended his tract to have. Judging from the techniques of his pamphlet, however, we can assume that his primary intended audience was the group among the Church of England advocates who were still moderate enough not to have allied themselves with the extremists, and who might yet be susceptible to reason if it came in the right way. Defoe had no reason to address himself to the actual extremists. They were men so far gone into fanaticism that, other than for purposes of vilification, there was no point in directing any argument their way. Nor surely, was Defoe writing for his fellow Dissenters. All his pamphlet could do for them would be to arouse further their already highly excited fears—which is precisely what happened when it was mistakenly believed. Had Defoe been aiming at either High-Fliers or Nonconformists, his pamphlet would have been quite different in technique—much more conciliatory in the first case, and much more obviously a burlesque in the second.

It is much more likely that the readers he hoped to affect were the reasonably moderate Churchmen, who would be aghast at seeing what could come of their fellows' fanaticism. Defoe went to great pains to achieve verisimilitude in his pamphlet, and though he surely must have realized that his authorship and intentions in the tract would eventually be disclosed, he almost certainly meant the public to make the mistake it did, and to swallow the pamphlet whole. He could anticipate the High-Fliers' endorsements of his suggestion, and he knew how ridiculous they would appear when, eventually, its real nature was revealed. Presumably he hoped that the fanatics' acceptance of it would shock the more moderate Churchmen and make them reconsider a policy which could so easily be pushed to such a bloody

stand. Such reconsideration might sober the bitter debate—something that would be well for the Dissenters, seeing that the new bill over Occasional Conformity was still pending.

Defoe begins his pamphlet with an anecdote which, to High Churchmen, must have seemed happily appropriate to the situation. A cock, roosting among horses, is so jostled that, in fear of its life, it suggests, "Pray Gentlefolks let us stand still, for fear we should tread upon one another."¹ The felicitous analogy between the cock and the Dissenters is indicated—both are weak, in the minority, and in no position to dictate. Defoe continues in the next paragraphs to speak of the "viperous Brood" that has beset the "Mother that cherished them," "the purest and most flourishing Church in the World." But now under Anne, "a Royal, *English*, True, and ever Constant Member of, and Friend to, the Church of *England*," retribution will come. "No, Gentlemen," Defoe tells the Dissenters, "the Time of Mercy is past, your *Day of Grace is over*; you should have practis'd Peace, and Moderation, and Charity, if you expected any your selves."

The Dissenters speak loudly of toleration, we are told, but where was their tolerance when they were in power? Now, the tables turned, they speak of "Christian Spirit." Despite the rather exaggerated sound of some of the phrases used, the prevailing tone of the opening of *The Shortest Way With Dissenters* is not one that would prepare the reader for the shock he is to receive at the close of the pamphlet. Throughout the work, up to the very point where the specific proposal is made, our author pictures himself as a reasonable man, but one who has been driven too far. He offers many illustrations. Example by example, Defoe demonstrates how disastrous tolerance toward the Dissenters has been in the past, and how dangerous it would be now. He is preparing us for the shock of his proposal, and he does it so well that we scarcely gasp when, almost at the very end, he finally comes out with his suggestion to hang these perverse rascals.

As a preface to his illustrations of how troublesome and treacherous these "fanatical" Dissenters have been in the past, Defoe argues reasonably that "to execute the known Laws of a Nation upon those who transgress them, after having first been voluntarily consenting to the making of those Laws, can never be call'd Persecution, but Justice." And what, after all, are these much talked of "persecutions" of which the Dissenters complain? Under James I they were allowed to colonize in New England—protected and untaxed. "This was the cruelty of the Church of *England*, fatal Lenity." In return, they rose up against the Monarch and murdered him. It is clear that severity by James I could have prevented all this.

"Charity and Love," we learn, are practised by the Church of England, but

during the Commonwealth and Restoration the Dissenters have repeatedly shown themselves to be ungrateful, ever prone to abuse power when they have it, and to seize it when they do not. If we accept the pamphleteer as a man with strong High Church opinions, his arguments are quite in line with what we would expect. The language is strong, but not so strong as to be burlesque. The argument is believable and persuasive. Defoe's instincts as a Dissenter probably told him that he could easily have selected less telling illustrations of Dissenter perfidy, but as an artist he chose the best available to his supposed High Church pamphleteer.

Ironically, in the light of what is to come, but still in keeping with the build-up, Defoe now accuses the Dissenters, specifically the Presbyterians in Scotland, of cruelty. There they "plundered and abused" and performed "innumerable" cruelties, yet they have the gall to speak now of uniting with England. Our author is highly indignant at such behaviour, and few Church of England readers would blame him.

Such, then, are the gentlemen who seek tolerance. Now, says Defoe, let us examine the reasons they give. First, they claim that as a large segment of the population, they should receive consideration. To this Defoe replies that the French king managed to clear up even more numerous Protestants in his country. Besides, the fact that they are numerous only makes them the more dangerous, and, since they *must* be rooted out, their numbers should not deter us. Another argument the Dissenters use is that it is war time, and we should be united against the enemy. But as potential subversives, the Dissenters must be eliminated so that we can reach that unity. To those who say that suppressing the Dissenters would be too great a task to undertake, Defoe mentions that the same type of argument was used against suppressing the old money, but the task was successfully done. Far from being strong, the Dissenters are now weak and "without Power." The time is ripe. "Heaven has made way for their Destruction." We are almost two-thirds through the brief pamphlet, and the note of religious fanaticism is now rising. The reader begins to wonder just what the author will propose, but, if we accept the situation as he has given it (and most Englishmen of the time probably would), we can easily accept his conclusions so far. As yet there has been no talk of hangings or banishments. They may be implied, but we need a little more priming before they are proposed.

A new series of objections to eliminating the Dissenters is dealt with. True, the queen has promised tolerance, but "Her Majesty did never promise to maintain the Tolleration, to the Destruction of the Church." The danger to the Church is real, and the time to act is now. Anticipating the charge of cruelty, Defoe asks

if it is cruel to destroy serpents, toads, and other noxious animals. The tone of fanaticism takes a sharp swing upward in these paragraphs, but the author is still unwilling to be specific about his remedy. The real cruelty, he tells us, will be to our posterity if we neglect this task. We become increasingly aware of the rising note of anger as we are told that it is vain to trifle. Moses was a merciful man, but when faced with idolaters he was ruthless. There are millions of future souls whose fate is concerned. Some three or four hundred emotional words along these lines follow, and finally, the pious High Church reader, suitably aroused, is ready for the denouement: "If one severe Law were made, and punctually executed, that who ever was found at a Conventicle, shou'd be Banished the Nation, and the Preacher be hang'd, we shou'd soon see an end of the Tale. They would all come to Church, and one Age would make us all One again."

This proposal has been a long time in coming. We are only a few hundred words from the end of the pamphlet. To have disclosed his proposal at an earlier point, before he had his reader aroused, would have defeated Defoe's purpose. Had he done so, the reader would have quickly dismissed the author as a fanatic. But the proposal, coming now from a man whose arguments the High Church reader has thus far tacitly accepted, has a doubly effective shock value, and one much more likely to induce soul-searching among the more moderate High Churchmen.

The few remaining paragraphs are anticlimactic. We hang men for trifles, says Defoe, why not for this "Offence against God and the Church"? Our duty as patriots and pious Christians is clear. The Dissenters are as bad as Papists, if not worse. A more gentle method of control would please the author, but the situation calls for extremes. So, "let us crucifie the Thieves." At the very end of his tract our author relents just sufficiently to welcome back to the fold those sinners who will return. As for the obstinate ones, he has already shown the only way, the absolutely necessary way, that we can forever rid ourselves of them.

That *The Shortest Way With Dissenters* was taken for the real thing comes as no surprise. It could easily have been written by an extremist High-Flier; indeed it is not until we are almost through the pamphlet that we even begin to realize that he is especially extreme. Defoe's pamphlet is not so much an ultra-subtle satire as it is an astute and skilful imitation. For those readers who accepted it as genuine, but who were not inclined to be revolted by the proposal it contained, the revelation later of its true authorship would come as a second shock that might induce the reaction the first reading had failed to cause. As indicated earlier, Defoe's foremost purpose seems to have been to drive the moderates away from the extremist position in distaste. In doing so, he might perhaps also shame a few of the extremists

into backing down somewhat. He may have succeeded with the moderates, but, unfortunately for Defoe, anger rather than shame is what the extremists felt; and bitter prosecution, a heavy fine, five months in Newgate, and his ordeal in the pillory were among his rewards for *The Shortest Way With Dissenters*.

Defoe was an old man of almost seventy years, furtively hiding from creditors, when in 1729 Jonathan Swift published a proposal which made the hanging of Dissenters seem relatively tame. There were many men who might happily watch a Nonconformist dangle from a rope, but there were few who cared, figuratively or literally, to stomach Swift's proposal. The palpably ironic and satiric nature of Swift's suggestion was too clear to mislead many readers into believing it to be sincere, but its grisly humour repelled many who saw it only as an unpleasant and callous joke.

The poverty which *A Modest Proposal* describes was in no way exaggerated. Ireland, like most countries in the first half of the eighteenth century, was predominantly agricultural. The majority of the desirable land, however, was in the hands of absentee British landlords. The tendency was for consolidation of small holdings into great estates, and country gentlemen and large landowners controlled the lands upon which most of the Irish peasantry lived. These landlords, often as not living off their rents in England, were seldom much concerned with the poverty which crop failure inflicted upon their tenants. Contributing further to depressed conditions in Ireland were the economic restrictions England had imposed. A long series of Navigation Acts had, by the early eighteenth century, all but brought to an end Ireland's once thriving foreign trade. Ireland's sorry plight led many to immigrate to the colonies and elsewhere. Behind them they left a population in which the impoverished lower classes were constantly increasing. Bad harvests resulted in widespread famine, as hordes of farmers were forced to beg for a living, and death from starvation became a common occurrence.

It is for this problem of the unemployed, starving poor of Ireland that *A Modest Proposal* offers an ostensible solution. Swift seems to have had several allied motives in writing his pamphlet. First, *A Modest Proposal* served to dramatize the situation—forcefully bringing to public attention the miserable circumstances of the Irish poor. Second, the pamphlet by implication condemned the English ruling classes and their policies with regard to Ireland. These two goals, along with a natural desire to express his revulsion at an intolerable situation, were augmented by a third objective, which may well have reflected Swift's primary intent—the attack, through parody, upon the mercantilist economic theories of the day as they had appeared in numerous tracts and other publications. Louis Landa has pointed out

that Swift's *Maxims Controlled in Ireland*, written about the same time as *A Modest Proposal*, reveals him openly attacking the mercantilist theory that "people are the riches of a nation" and the resultant belief that large populations, however wretched their circumstances, were always desirable.²

Swift was probably too sceptical a realist to expect that *A Modest Proposal* would result in much immediate reformation, either of the situation in Ireland or of the mercantilists, and, in point of fact, despite the pamphlet's wide circulation, the sting of its irony seems to have had no perceptible effect upon English policy or public opinion. Many an Englishman and many a mercantilist, however, must have squirmed uncomfortably as he read the caustically indignant irony of Swift's attack.

The opening paragraphs of *A Modest Proposal* describe, in a moderate but sympathetic tone, the deplorable poverty prevalent in Ireland, and the prodigious numbers of children that make things even worse. That is a grievous state, everyone will agree, ". . . and therefore, whoever could find out a fair, cheap, and easy Method of making these Children sound and useful Members of the Commonwealth, would deserve so well of the Publick, as to have his Statue set up for a Preserver of the Nation."³

This our author intends to do. He has "maturely" examined the schemes of other "projectors" and found them lacking. A child "dropt from its Dam" can survive on little else but mother's milk to the age of one year, at which age the author's as yet undesignated proposal would apply, thus happily preventing the voluntary abortions and infant murder that mothers were often driven to practise. The use of the word "Dam" is the beginning note of Swift's treatment of the destitute population in terms of animals and animal husbandry—a reflection of the mercantilist concept of people as a commodity. As yet, however, aside from the rather pompous language, the pamphlet has not fully disclosed its ironic nature.

The reader familiar with the use of statistics in economic writings should definitely begin to detect the satire in the next paragraph, wherein Swift calculates that there are one and a half million people in Ireland, two hundred thousand couples among them including wives who are "Breeders." Generously subtracting from this figure thirty thousand couples who are able to support their children (though he is sure there are not so many), and fifty thousand more whose children will die at birth or soon after, our author finds some hundred and twenty thousand children who are born into poverty each year. They are a burden to their parents, since it is not until they are six or so that they can support themselves by stealing, and only at twelve do they become a "saleable Commodity" on the labour market. As Wittkowsky has shown, Swift's cold-blooded application of statistics to human misery, as

used here and later in the pamphlet, is a scarcely exaggerated burlesque of similar passages in contemporary economic tracts.

Having stated the problem, Swift, not much more than five hundred words into his essay, comes out with his solution. Defoe waited until almost the very end of his tract before he put forth his proposal, having used most of his space for a gradual build-up. The intent of Swift's suggestion, however, is so clearly satirical that no elaborate justification is needed before it comes. The justifications, with their biting irony, are effective to Swift's purpose only *after* his audience realizes what he is proposing. Accordingly, he now boldly announces: "I have been assured by a very knowing *American* of my Acquaintance in *London*; that a young healthy Child, well nursed, is, at a Year old, a most delicious, nourishing, and wholesome Food, whether *Stewed, Roasted, Baked, or Boiled*; and, I make no doubt, that it will equally serve in a *Fricasie, or a Ragoust*." In brief, it is proposed that, aside from a few saved for breeding purposes, the bulk of Irish children should be offered in sale as food to "*Persons of Quality, and Fortune*." Reckoned at twenty-eight pounds, a year-old child, our author calculates, should make several good meals. The obvious satiric intent of the proposal is underlined, as Swift for a moment steps out of his character as "projector" and comments, "I grant this Food will be somewhat dear, and therefore very *proper for Landlords*; who, as they have already devoured most of the Parents, seem to have the best Title to the Children."

His theme stated, our author now begins his elaborations. His scheme has many advantages: Papists breed more than Protestants, consequently this plan will lessen their numbers; the mothers will profit from the sale of something that costs them very little money, and this will alleviate poverty; the skins may be used for leather goods; a shambles may be set up in Dublin, thus employing many butchers, though, says the author, "I rather recommend buying the Children alive, and dressing them hot from the Knife, as we do *roasting Pigs*."

Our projector is anxious to show us that he has thought his plan out. His reasonableness is disclosed when he tells us how a "very worthy Person, a *true Lover of his Country*" has suggested that similar use be made of twelve to fourteen year-olds as a substitute for venison. For various practical reasons, our author rejects this. Besides, some "scrupulous People" might go so far as to condemn such a practice as being cruel—something which, says the author, "hath always been with me the strongest Objection against any Project, how well soever intended." Though the impotent poor ("the Aged, Diseased, or Maimed") are not included in the proposal, they need not worry us, for every day they are "*dying and rotting, by Cold and Famine, and Filth, and Vermin*," and the country shall soon be rid of them.

Having "disposed" of all possible objections, Swift returns now to the main proposal and its advantages are further elaborated. First, as they are the "principal Breeders," it would reduce the number of Papists. Second, the poor parents will profit. Third, money will be placed in circulation. Fourth, the parents will not only profit, but will be freed of the financial drain of supporting their children. Fifth, the new food will bring new business to taverns. And sixth, it would be a great inducement to marriage, and "Men would become as *fond* of their Wives, during the Time of their Pregnancy, as they are now of their *Mares* in *Foal*. . ."

The only objection to his plan that is worthy of serious consideration, says Swift, is the fact that it would lessen population. This is true, but the plan is meant for Ireland only, and lessening the population there "was indeed one principal Design in offering it to the World." Other projects, dismissed as idle and visionary, are listed at length, and once again Swift drops his pose as a projector, and vehemently puts forth his true remedies in this list of those his ostensible author is curtly rejecting. It is unpractical, he says, to speak of taxing absentee landowners, of using home manufactures when possible, of learning "Prudence and Temperance," or "quitting our Animosities and Factions," of expecting landlords to show some mercy, and so on. All of these proposals had been advocated by Swift in earlier pamphlets and writings. His bitterness at the rejection of these, his own "projects," is apparent. He is bitter too, in the next paragraph, when he commends the baby-eating plan as one that would not disoblige England, since the flesh could not be exported—a reference to the sharp restrictions the English kept on Irish trade. The flesh is too perishable to be kept long in salt ". . . although, perhaps, I could name a Country, which would be glad to eat up our whole Nation without it."

In concluding, our author, ever reasonable, welcomes other "equally innocent, cheap, easy, and effectual" proposals, but he considers it unlikely that any scheme as practical as his will show up. He ends after proclaiming his altruism, with proof of his disinterestedness. "I have no Children, by which I can propose to get a single Penny; the youngest being nine Years old, and my Wife past Child-bearing."

A Modest Proposal was, it seems, taken by some readers in France as a sincere suggestion. We may presume that it suffered in translation. The satire in Swift's pamphlet is so pronounced, the irony so very obvious, that it would take an unbelievably insensitive reader to mistake them for anything else. Contemporary accounts of Irish poverty show that Swift was not exaggerating the misery there. He was accused, however, of enjoying cynical humor at the expense of that misery. It is doubly ironic that the irony of Swift, reflecting as it did such deep compassion, should ever be interpreted as callous joking.

The element of outrageous proposition is contained in both Defoe's *The Shortest Way With Dissenters* and Swift's *A Modest Proposal*. But in their purposes and techniques of presentation the two works show wide differences. Defoe wanted to dupe his readers—hence his care to stay in character and his genuine-sounding style. By making his suggestion a little more outlandish—by advocating, for instance, the burning of the Dissenters at the stake—his ridicule of the High Church fanatics would have been clear. But, as Defoe realized, if he could fool his enemies into first accepting his plan, the ridicule involved later, when his identity was learned, would be a good deal greater. Swift, dealing with a much more generalized object of attack, made almost no attempt at verisimilitude. His proposal was emphatically unacceptable. Had he made a somewhat less blatantly ironic suggestion—say, the selling of the children into slavery—he might have deceived some readers, but he was more interested in arousing shame than ridicule. Broad irony and satire were more suitable for Swift's condemnation and burlesque of his diffuse targets.

The particular nature of each pamphlet, then, is largely determined by its purpose, along with the influence of the personal temperament of the author. That the two works are different in manner and style is merely a reflection of their different aims, and not of the special superiority of one or the other. Whether or not what each pamphlet accomplished was satisfactory to the author, is hard to say. In Swift's case the satire and irony seemed either to be shrugged off, or misinterpreted, and in Defoe's, the misunderstanding and abuse of fellow Dissenters did not stop even after his authorship was known. But whatever the effects of the two tracts upon their times may have been, and whatever the pride or disappointment the authors experienced at those effects, *The Shortest Way With Dissenters* and *A Modest Proposal* today both occupy high positions on any list of English satiric works. They are still widely read and anthologized, and generally recognized as masterly performances. In studying them one is repeatedly impressed, in both works, by the skill with which the techniques employed are handled. It is a compliment to both Defoe and Swift that a modern reader can come away from their pamphlets feeling amused contempt and alarm over the High Church fanatics of 1702, and compassion and anger over Irish poverty in 1729.

NOTES

1. *The Novels and Selected Writings of Daniel Defoe* (Oxford, 1928), XIII, 115 ff. All quotations from *The Shortest Way With Dissenters* are taken from this edition.
2. Louis Landa, "A Modest Proposal and Populousness", *Modern Philology*, 40 (1942),

161 ff. Also see G. Wittkowsky, "Swift's *A Modest Proposal*: The Biography of an Early Georgian Pamphlet, *The Journal of the History of Ideas*, 40 (1943), 78 ff. By a number of comparisons, Wittkowsky shows that in title, technique, and content Swift's *A Modest Proposal* is a parody of a typical mercantilist "project" pamphlet.

3. *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, edited by Herbert Davis (Oxford, 1937—), XII, 109. All quotations from *A Modest Proposal* are taken from this edition.