

Charles H. Pullen

GULLIVER: STUDENT OF NATURE

THE ONE QUESTION which has not been satisfactorily answered by the critics of *Gulliver's Travels* is the most obvious one to be asked: why did Swift choose Gulliver for a task which takes that seemingly inoffensive character from innocence to despair? It should be recognized once for all that the man who reveals himself at the end of Book IV is surely in despair. The proposition, which many critics essay, that Gulliver is a symbol of man's delusive pride may be only partly true. The first sentence of the last book suggests something other than the smugness of the prideful: "I continued at home with my Wife and Children about five Months in a very happy condition, if I could have learned the Lesson of knowing when I was well". If one remembers that the entire tale is written in retrospect, this sentence is a telling judgment on the Gulliver who wanders in a no-man's land between the barn and the house. Henry W. Sams speaks of Gulliver's "felicity with his English horses";¹ but it is a muted substitute for his ideal happiness. There is no doubt that Gulliver hardly considers his enlightenment a happy situation to be in. This is not to suggest that there is not something ludicrously pompous about his conduct (Swift, for instance, may be precipitating an echo from *A Tale of a Tub* in Gulliver's feeble attempt to imitate the Houyhnhnms by talking through his nose, an action which vibrates rather unsympathetically with the memory of the nasal affectations of the zealous dissenting preachers) or that he does not take considerable pride in knowing better than other men. He is, however, less than happy in his possession of the truth, whether physical or mental, and we should not forget that he has moved into social isolation. Calhoun Winton is correct in suggesting that he returns to the world "with the marks of his conversion, a desire to impart his new-found religion to others, a disgust for those

who fail to accept his faith as gospel and, indeed, for those who savor in any respect of Yahoooness".² Yet the least energetic aspect of his conversion is his desire to spread the word: Sympson, his cousin, and others are responsible for that, if we are to believe the introductory letter: "I do in the next Place complain of my own great Want of Judgment, in being prevailed upon by the Intreaties and false Reasonings of you and some others, very much against mine own Opinion, to suffer my Travels to be published."

He wants, in short, to be left alone. He is a broken man who can no longer make the kind of mature adjustment to circumstances which has been one of his most attractive qualities throughout the tales. Given that final pathetic state of a man so completely innocent of cunning or cruelty or improper ambition, it is a bit hard to accept John B. Moore's suggestion that "the whole book (all four voyages) might not altogether inappropriately be entitled *The Sophistication of Lemuel Gulliver*".³ If there is one thing which Gulliver does not possess, either before or after his experiences, it is sophistication, however one cares to use that word. Indeed, had he one touch of sophistication about him, he would have avoided being such a fool so many times, and would, if such was his final state, have seen through the alternatives of Yahoo and Houyhnhnm without much difficulty. Moore suggests that Gulliver is "an example of a man getting knowledge or wisdom"⁴ and it is true that in one sense the journeys have taught him a great deal about the pettiness and sometime destructive nature of humanity. But if one talks of knowledge and wisdom as "understanding", his journeys have been to ignorance of the most appalling kind: the ignorance of a madman who has seen everything but understands nothing. He can hardly be seen as a man who has seen through it all with his "Nose well stopt with Rue, Lavender, or Tobacco-Leaves."

However unsystematic Swift is about his portrayal of Gulliver, he is not unsystematically *simple* in anything he does. Although we may quarrel over whether he sees the Houyhnhnms as the "ideal" or the "impossibly ideal" (I suspect that he deliberately courts the quarrel), there can be no doubt that he leaves Gulliver in a terrible mess. It is more terrible than anything Gulliver has been in before simply because he cannot, in this last chapter (and it is the last chapter), patch up a boat and take to the sea to end his troubles. He cannot go home again, hoping to adjust in time to the real world. He has done all the adjusting possible. More to the point, he does not want to return to normality, however unhappy he is. It is precisely this low-keyed unhappiness and hopelessness which makes it difficult to accept Edward W. Rosenheim's contention that Gulliver "is a comic rather than a satiric victim",⁵ a proposition

which works well for the first voyage, but becomes increasingly untenable in the following books, and simply will not hold against the miserable figure at the end of Book IV whose experience has gone beyond what Rosenheim speaks of as Gulliver's usual "exposure or embarrassment characteristic of comic 'suffering'."⁶ The later Gulliver may be a symbol of pride (I agree that he is that), but what is still disturbing is the fact that Swift has chosen a figure as attractive as Gulliver to destroy since his usual satiric practice is to pick a flawed or debased target. It seems to me that he thickens his fiction (and his satire) by choosing Gulliver, and that Gulliver, as we find him, is necessarily a man of some ability because Swift is investigating an aspect of the human condition other than pride. What he is examining I would prefer to hide for the moment, but it rests upon Swift's sometime tendency to play fair with his readers, and he often plays much fairer than is recognized. He has, as part of his literary gift, an inordinately subtle ability to prove his points by weighting the opposition against himself. In the *Travels* he does it by making Gulliver something more than a symbol, and more of a character than some critics recognize.

The quarrel over whether or not Gulliver is a "character", in the sense of having a convincing and memorable life of his own, is hampered, in part, by the attempt to label, to classify the book. It would seem not unfair to suggest that it is not a novel as we think of that form, and that we are wise to satisfy our determination to place it by accepting Frye's suggestion of Menippean satire. At this point, however, the mistake is often made. If it isn't a novel, and it is Menippean, we presume that we need no longer concern ourselves with "character". We are begging the question. Character, in fact, is not confined to the genres of novel and drama; it has an embarrassing habit of showing up in all sorts of literary forms. Chaucer achieves it almost haphazardly in the *Canterbury Tales*, often implicitly through the stories the pilgrims tell; Spenser does it in a very few admirable lines at the end of Book II of the *Faerie Queene* in his fleeting glimpse at the intransigent Grille. One of Swift's greatest characters, persona aside, is his tale teller in *A Tale of a Tub*; the fact that he does not have a name (a critical prerequisite for a "character") is in part to blame for the fact that he often goes unrecognized for what he is, a magnificently rounded, knowledge-stuffed half-wit. What Swift does with the tale teller is, in part, what he does with Gulliver; he implies, shapes and directs the character of Gulliver off and on and as much by implication as by explication.

Professor John Lawlor suggests that the emphasis in Samuel Johnson's

silly statement on the *Travels* ought to be put on "Once you have thought" of it;⁷ it might be quite as valid to say (and perhaps Professor Lawlor meant to say) that even this emphasis only becomes valid as a critical statement if the emphasis is placed on thinking about "all the rest", the consequences of putting Gulliver among big and little men, and more importantly, among the Yahoos and the Houyhnhnms. Of equal importance is the fact that it is Gulliver, not simply some everyman figure, who is so exposed to these wonderful and taxing excursions beyond the norms. There is, of course, a good deal of quarreling about Gulliver. If one chooses to ignore as far too simple the proposition that he is a symbol of everyman, there is still little real agreement on how he is to be read. Denis Donoghue seems unconvinced of any existence at all: "it is irrelevant . . . to talk of Gulliver's character; he has no character, he is a cipher."⁸ Professor Donoghue goes on to describe what he is: "He is what he does, what we see him doing, there is nothing beyond what we see. More to the point, there is nothing beneath what we see, no underground man to be sensed beneath the detail of his imprisonment."⁹ This seems clear enough. Yet even if one agrees that there is nothing hidden about Gulliver (and that remains unquestioned for the moment), is he necessarily, by that standard alone, simply a cipher? "What he does, what we see him doing" is not an unusual or ineffective way to develop or illuminate character; it is not unfair to suggest that it is, in fact, one of the common devices of the novelist. Edwin Muir, in his examination of character in the novel, finds no difficulty at all in accepting characters that we, following E. M. Forster, call "flat". Mr. Forster may regret them, but as Muir suggests they are no less "characters" for all that. "Given their flatness, what can the writer do with them? What will the function of his plot be? Obviously not to trace their development, for being flat they cannot develop, but to set them in new situations, to change their relations to one another, and in all these to make them behave typically."¹⁰ Muir may be answering the objection of Robert C. Elliott: "Swift pays little regard to psychological consistency; Gulliver's character can hardly be said to develop; it simply changes."¹¹ For Elliott, Gulliver is simply an abstraction, "manipulated in the service of satire."¹² One can hardly disagree with the fact that Gulliver is manipulated; characters often are, even in the novel, and particularly in satire. The real problem remains: why Gulliver, flat, unchanging or otherwise? Why is his change (if that is all it is) so convincing, despite his flatness (if he is to be flat)? Why are we so convinced that there is a *man* there at the end of Book IV, however many satiric symbols may be hanging around his neck?

The opposite approach may be seen in Henry W. Sams who sees that "Gulliver develops in depth and seriousness as his story progresses, that his character becomes more profound and his criticisms more searching."¹³ W. B. Carnochan says that "we follow him from a kind of birth in Lilliput through adolescence in Brobdindnag to maturity (false though it may be) among the Houyhnhnms."¹⁴ Carnochan hardly satisfies me with his idea of birth to maturity, although he qualifies that maturity, and he would not convince Donoghue who insists that "Gulliver carries nothing from one occasion to another; with every Voyage he starts again; no memories, no experience, no character."¹⁵

All of these men argue, as we would expect, with great skill and intelligence, but they do not answer the one question which would, perhaps, close the matter once for all: why Gulliver? Dyson has a partial answer: "We readily accept Gulliver as a representative Englishman fallen into the hands of an absurd crew of midgets, and realize only gradually that the midgets, in fact, are ourselves and Gulliver in this instance the outside observer."¹⁶ We are all quite willing to accept Gulliver as symbol and historian, but there is so much more to Gulliver than simply that. He can, for instance, slip so easily from observation to involvement, and it is not surprising that so many commentators see him as intellectually flawed—at the worst, stupid, and at the best, obtuse.

Yet John B. Moore insists that Gulliver is "not typical, but above average."¹⁷ There are good reasons for this. He is not, for example, so much a babe at the beginning of the *Travels* as some commentators would have us think. Swift begins to play fair here in making Gulliver an adult, university-educated, trained as a surgeon, and a responsible family man. There is no suggestion that he has any intellectual limitations; he is, as Moore suggests, a good deal more capable than the average man. And he is something more than typical in his intellectual qualifications. An acceptance of these facts, and they are facts, is of fundamental importance in understanding one of the meanings of the *Travels*. What I am suggesting is that Swift is willing to weight the scales against himself in exploring one aspect of Gulliver's experience. He is quite prepared to take on the task of watching not only a good man, but an intelligent and scientifically-trained man under the pressure of increasingly bewildering shifts of perception.

Gulliver comes out of the first test with aplomb and some considerable credit. He slips only once, in his defence of the Treasurer's lady, and it, no doubt, has comic intent. It is, however, significant since it does show that the

shift in perception has, if only slightly, weakened Gulliver's ability to make obvious distinctions. The first tale also shows his rather servile sense of the social hierarchy and his willingness to make rather sweeping allowances for people in positions of power. It is not a serious matter, but it is there. Against it must be weighed his genuine nobility in refusing to destroy the Blefuscu nation—he is big physically and he acts as a big man. What happens later is much more important.

In Brobdingnag, his conduct is much more disturbing. He is small, and he acts small. He is shabbily treated by the farmer, but given the situation, one could hardly expect the farmer to resist the temptation. Certainly Gulliver is not badly treated at Court, but he is an entertainer, a plaything. He is still capable of generosity (as in the case of the first trick played on him by the court dwarf), and of discretion (in the case of the gardener's dog, although this is, in part, vitiated by his desire not to be laughed at) when complaint would do harm to others, but he is obviously disturbed by his minuteness, his insignificance. He attempts to compensate for these limitations by performing what are for him difficult tasks (his rowing exploits), but they are never of such moment as to take him beyond the role of entertainer. And finally he does a terrible thing in offering the King the secret of gunpowder. Why does he do it? Moore has a suggestion:

He is intellectually and temperamentally disinclined to alter his outlook upon human affairs and human beings . . . his acquisition of wisdom may be supposed to have begun definitely in Brobdingnag; whereas his mature intellect and temperamental stiffness has been proof against . . . the rather obvious exposure of the falseness of human affairs and human beings in Lilliput.¹⁸

If he is so stubborn about holding on to his outlook upon human affairs, and therefore wedded to the proposition that power is to be used for national aggrandizement why did he not aid the Lilliputians in destroying Blefuscu? Certainly he had more reason for doing so: the Blefuscu nation was intent upon destroying the Lilliputians before Gulliver stole the Blefuscu navy.

Martin Price characterizes him as "a matter-of-fact man, capable of minute accuracy of detail in what he reports but equally capable of total indifference to the 'value-tone' of experience", but if he is an example of "the incorrigible tendency of the mind to oversimplify experience",¹⁹ he is more so in Book II than in Book I. Why make such an unsolicited offer of destruction to a King who patently does not need it and does not want it? John Lawlor is quite right in underlining the fact that Gulliver sees the King of Brobding-

nag as a victim of confined education, a fantastic idealist;²⁰ the question is why does Gulliver shift from a comparable idealism in Book I to the role which echoes that of the Lilliputian King? It does not seem to me that we have an adequate answer in Price's suggestion that Gulliver's pride in the European man brings this about.²¹ It may be that, in part, but there is something more: Gulliver's slip concerning the lady's honour in Book I had indicated a weakness in psychological terms: the shift of environment sometimes affects his ability to think reasonably, in proportion. In Lilliput the slip is harmless, and it is, at least, an honourable explanation and Gulliver is nothing if he is not consistently honourable in Lilliput, and in his relations to the Lilliputians. If he had wished, he could have destroyed the kingdom: he certainly has the advantage of knowing in the end what they have planned for him. Nor does he go over to the side of Blefuscu, as he might well have done. He is simply bigger than his enemies; he has power which he uses or refuses to use, and used or not, his choice is always honourable. But in Brobdingnag he is not a man of power; he is a toy, and he makes it perfectly clear that he does not like it. Price has an answer to the problem: "Having learned there [in Lilliput] the nature of kings and courts, he seeks to win this king's favor by appealing to his desire for power."²² This will not do; there is nothing in the text to suggest that the Brobdingnagian King wants anything of the sort. Indeed, Gulliver has had every indication to the contrary, but he persists. I suspect that he insists because he wants, because he needs power so desperately that he has lost control not only over the understanding of Brobdingnagian politics, but also over his own nature: the shift to insignificance has betrayed him. If he learns anything out of the second voyage, it is this: that the next time he is at a disadvantage, he will bow to the ideal of the land in which he is stranded, accept the inevitable, as he does with the tragic consequences for himself in Book IV.

Granted the satiric intent on Swift's part in giving the King of Brobdingnag a chance at attacking European politics, it is not without significance that Gulliver is the one who provides the King with the information needed to make such judgments, and gives it with a sense of pride. The power of the European political, social and military systems reflect some power upon Gulliver, magnifies his existence, proves what a powerful devil a man of his size can be. Certainly it is obtuse and prideful, and it is something which we would never have expected of Gulliver in the first book. He has, I would suggest, (and despite Donoghue) a memory of what happened in Lilliput, but he cannot see it in context. He only remembers that he was a figure of

importance and power, and he wants the dignity of importance and power back at any cost. It is not, for instance, simply comic that he has some difficulty in adjusting at the end of the second voyage. He has nothing of which to be proud of at its conclusion, and his yelling and stooping indicate a need for power above the ordinary.

The Third Book seems to have the least influence on him, but again there are indications of weakness under pressure. If Swift puts Gulliver out of his depth physically in the first two books, he puts heavy pressure on his intellect in Book III. The very abundance of alternatives presented to him in this book is enough to force him into occasional errors of judgment, but he is much more cautious about making judgments on this journey. Kathleen Williams points out that "here he merges completely into his surroundings, and serves merely to describe what he sees, so that we cannot take him seriously as an interpreter."²³ But he does manifest two weaknesses which appear in Book IV. One of these is his inability under pressure of environment to make distinctions. He is pulled off balance on only one occasion, but it is an important error. Gulliver has been swamped by scheme after scheme of the hare-brained Projectors. He makes little or no comment until he is introduced to the School of political Projectors:

These unhappy People were proposing Schemes for persuading Monarchs to chuse Favourites upon the Score of their Wisdom, Capacity and Virtue; of teaching Ministers to consult the publick Good; of rewarding Merit, great Abilities, and eminent Services, of instructing Princes to know their true Interest, by placing it on the same Foundation with that of their People: Of chusing for Employments Persons qualified to exercise them; with many other wild impossible Chimaeras, that never entered before into the Heart of Man to conceive, and confirmed in me the old Observation, that there is nothing so extravagant and irrational which some Philosophers have not maintained for Truth.

Obviously this is one of Swift's ironic intrusions, using Gulliver as a mouth-piece. But why use Gulliver at all, and why make it so clearly a value judgment on Gulliver's part? At this point, Donoghue is quite correct. Gulliver does not have a memory that is operating at the moment because what he says is simply not true. Not only has such an ideal entered in the Heart, but into the Mind, and into practice: in Lilliput in the past and in Brobdingnag at the time of Gulliver's visit. Gulliver has been reacting so long and so often in one way to the sheer idiocy of Book III that he can no longer think straight, can no longer pick out the good from the bad.

The other aspect of his character which is tested once again is his respect for greatness, shown in small in Lilliput, rebuffed in Brobdingnag. In the Laputian journey his need to identify with his environment and learn from it is again unsatisfied. He learns very little of importance from the spirits of the great men of the past, and his encounter with the Struldbrugs simply horrifies him. What began in Book I as curiosity and becomes a failed search for power in Book II is abortive once again. The Gulliver who exults in his anticipated meeting with the Struldbrugs is not the cool and balanced traveller of Book I. The journeys are wearing him down. However decently he acted in Book I, he was betrayed; however hard he tried to give the King power in Book II, he was reviled; and now the wisdom of the ancients and the promise of everlasting life have failed him. Miniaturization of his environment was the least difficult problem for him to understand because he was above it, he could see it whole, he had the power to choose. Magnification caused him enormous difficulty because he could not grasp it fully, it unmanned him. Intellectualization has forced him to lose confidence in the integrity of the human mind, so much so that the one admirable experiment is the only one which he sees and comments upon as the absolute height of folly. Donoghue is partly correct in pointing out that "When Gulliver is obtuse, the reason is that he is bogged down in errors of perspective."²⁴ And one can only agree completely with his proposition that "the degree to which moral and political judgments depend upon primary acts of perception"²⁵ is an abiding interest for Swift. Where one must fall away from Donoghue is in his suggestion that there is no cumulative effect of these errors on Gulliver; flat or not as a character, he becomes a less accurate judge of right and wrong from book to book. Before Book IV, he tends to choose wrongly, but those errors seem to me to be part of a consistent pattern leading Gulliver to a psychological response of "overkill" in choosing what he thinks is "right" in Book IV.

If, indeed, the last book had not been written, it might be possible to guess at what it would contain. Given the fact that the reasonable, educated and experienced man has withstood the blandishments of power in Book I (despite betrayal by those whom he served honourably), given the exposure to extreme weakness further undermined by severe criticism of such power that he is willing to offer in Book II, bombarded by intellectual improvisations of mad men and discovering the futility of past knowledge and everlasting life in Book III, one might guess that Swift would turn the tables and try him with the simplest of obvious alternatives in the final test. The choice is so obvious that Gulliver cannot possibly miss it, but it is a choice offered to him only after

his mind and his senses have been so often betrayed that he no longer has the desire or intellectual strength to choose for himself. If one agrees with John F. Ross that "his mind is a single-track one, it never compasses the complex and the contradictory; it cleaves to the best line it knows, but to that line alone",²⁶ it can be seen that Swift has obviously been attempting to undermine Gulliver's confidence in even that quality of stubborn apprehension; the man who comes into the land of the Houyhnhnms has failed so often, in so many ways, that he is, more than ever, likely to misuse in one last desperate throw one of his formerly attractive strengths; his ability to adapt. And adapt he surely does to the point of no return.

In Book IV, as in no other book, Swift makes it too easy rather than too hard. The choice is so obvious. Gulliver can patronize the Lilliputians for their puniness, the Brobdingnagians for their grossness, the Laputians for their madness, but he has no such defence in Book IV. The alternatives are so far apart that he hardly makes any decision at all. His adaptability becomes a mock-conformity with the only one of the alternatives which makes any sense at all. Swift plays perfectly fair: the "ideal" is represented not by a human, but by a horse, and the Yahoos are not really human beings as Gulliver knows them even at their worst. If he cannot understand the alternatives, surely he can see them. John Lawlor calls him the "experienced observer" by Book IV.²⁷ He is certainly experienced, but he is less an observer than he ever was. He is, in fact, no longer an observer at all, but the central character and he has no sense of perspective at all. Perspective has failed him before, but he has always managed to retrieve himself; he no longer can. His weariness, his horror and fear of the Yahoos, his long search for the ideal makes him an easy target for the extreme. Lawlor suggests that the Houyhnhnm ideal works so well on him because it is put into practice while the King of Brobdingnag only made pronouncements about it.²⁸ Yet it is perfectly obvious that the King practices what he preaches quite as much as the Houyhnhnms do, and more importantly he practices it among men, however large they may be. The real ideal is not in the Houyhnhnms, but in Brobdingnagian politics, but at the time it is presented to Gulliver he is so obsessed with his own problems of insignificance that he cannot recognize it.

Swift has played again on the two extremes of the surface-depth paradox of *A Tale of A Tub*. The Yahoos stand for the surface of life, the horror of humanity at its worst, the Houyhnhnms for the enthusiast's obsession with the ideal. The answer is in neither, but in the *via media* as exemplified in the actions of the Portuguese captain on the social level and the King of Brobdingnag

on the political level. It is unfortunately too late for Gulliver, and if we see him as mad at the end of Book IV it is not because he rejects the cupidity, ambition and cruelty of European politics and society, but because he cannot live with his wife and family who show no evidence of any of these extravagant gestures of humanity at its worst.

However "flat" Gulliver may be on occasion, he is a character of real substance by the end of Book IV. When one looks back from the concluding passages of the fourth book, it seems obvious that the complete work is beyond simple classification as either Menippean satire or Romance simply because the implications of the experience imposed upon Gulliver, however satiric or symbolic, are also personal. It is not simply a tale of adventure used as a framework for Menippean satire or for the pure pleasure of adventure (although it is both of these things in part), and the best test for rejecting such limitations lies in the fact that however interesting or intellectually telling the adventures are in their own right, they could not possibly be arranged in any other sequence than the one given to them by Swift.

Gulliver carries a formidable load of political, social and religious implications by the end of the book, but it should not be forgotten that whatever he stands for as a symbol he is obliged to live with as a man. If he has a tendency to forget things on his journeys, he lives in his memory finally, and his former flexibility and powers of recuperation have given way to stubborn despair. A good man has been brought to his knees by one test too many. Swift is saying, among so many things, that even the best of us are fragile vessels and that man (to paraphrase a later artist) can stand only so much reality.

However suspicious Swift was of John Locke, he seemed to agree with him on the one point of man's limitations. Donoghue quotes the pertinent passage from Locke:

Nay, if this most instructive of our Senses, Seeing, were in any Man one thousand or one hundred thousand times more acute . . . things several Millions of times less . . . would then be visible to his naked Eyes. . . . But then he would be in a quite different World from other People: Nothing would appear the same to him, and others; the visible Ideas of every thing would be different.²⁹

That is the point, one of the many which Swift is making in the *Travels*, and why he needed a man of the intellectual and moral strength of Lemuel Gulliver: even the most sensible of men holds on to sanity by a thin thread. Michael Levey, the art critic, makes an illuminating comment on this problem:

A rational mental structure could be constructed by the eighteenth century as beautifully as its buildings were; yet this structure was known to be raised on potentially dangerous foundations. The situation was perfectly expressed by Pope who asked a question to which nobody knew the answer:

With terrors round, can reason hold her throne,
Despite the known, nor tremble at the unknown?
Survey both worlds, intrepid and entire,
In spite of witches, devils, dreams and fire?³⁰

Price says something about the *Tub* which can be applied to the *Travels*: "Man loses freedom when he surrenders the powers of rational choice, and his visions have a way of turning out to be irrational compulsions."³¹ Gulliver the traveler becomes Gulliver the truth-searcher, and once he finds something so obviously true as the ideal life of the Houyhnhnms, he surely surrenders the power of choice and becomes, as Price points out and as Bacon originally said, a victim: "let every student of nature take this as a rule—that whatever his mind seizes and dwells upon with peculiar satisfaction is to be held in suspicion."³² Gulliver has become Bacon's spider caught in his own web of ideality. The bee selects and flies free, but Gulliver can no longer do so.

Price has talked about Gulliver's failure admirably. What he does not recognize is Gulliver's basic innocence or, indeed, the tragic implications of his final position. For Price, he is a man suffering from inverted pride, "the hero of a comedy of incomprehension."³³ Gulliver seems to me to be too good and too intelligent for pride alone to cause his fall, and too unhappy in the end to be spoken of as a comic hero. Swift has, in fact, piled on more agony than comedy can sustain. He has simply, among so many other things, illustrated a point upon which he and Locke and Pope and so many others agreed: that man has a tenuous hold on reality. He has, in twentieth-century jargon, "brainwashed" a good man.

NOTES

1. Henry W. Sams, "Swift's Satire of the Second Person" in *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Gulliver's Travels*, ed. Frank Brady (Englewood Cliffs, [1968]), p. 39.
2. Calhoun Winton, "Conversion on the Road to Houyhnhnmland" in *A Casebook of Gulliver among the Houyhnhnms*, ed. Milton P. Foster (New York, n.d.), p. 278.
3. John B. Moore, "The Role of Gulliver" in *Foster Casebook*, p. 98.
4. Moore, p. 96.
5. Edward W. Rosenheim, *Swift and the Satirist's Art*, (Chicago, 1963), p. 93.

6. Rosenheim, p. 101. Rosenheim recognizes that the final book transcends the comic, and would also claim that it goes beyond satire. P. 101: "It is, instead, a mythical statement of a profound and terrible belief about the human condition."
7. John Lawlor, "The Evolution of Gulliver's Character" in *Gulliver's Travels An Annotated Text With Critical Essays*, ed. Robert A. Greenberg (New York, n.d.), p. 231.
8. Denis Donoghue, *Jonathan Swift: A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge, 1969), p. 162.
9. Donoghue, p. 162.
10. Edwin Muir, "Novels of Action and Character" in *Approaches To The Novel*, ed. Robert Scholes (San Francisco [1961]), p. 182.
11. Robert C. Elliott, "The Satirist Satirized" in *Twentieth Century Interpretations*, pp. 44-45.
12. Elliott, p. 48.
13. Sams, p. 37.
14. W. B. Carnochan, *Lemuel Gulliver's Mirror for Man* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1968), p. 133.
15. Donoghue, p. 163.
16. A. E. Dyson, *The Crazy Fabric Essays in Irony* (London, 1965), p. 4.
17. Moore, p. 102.
18. Moore, p. 99.
19. Martin Price, *Swift's Rhetorical Art: A Study in Structure and Meaning* (London, 1963), p. 89.
20. Lawlor, p. 321.
21. Price, p. 96.
22. Price, p. 97.
23. Kathleen Williams, "Gulliver in Laputa" in *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Gulliver's Travels*, ed. Frank Brady (Englewood Cliffs, [1968]), p. 68.
24. Donoghue, p. 68.
25. Donoghue, p. 67.
26. John F. Ross, "The Final Comedy of Lemuel Gulliver" in *Swift: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Ernest Tuveson (Englewood Cliffs, [1965]), p. 79.
27. Lawlor, p. 322.
28. Lawlor, p. 322.
29. John Locke, *Works* (London, 1727), vol. 1, p. 129 (II.xxiii.12).
30. Michael Levey, *Rococo to Revolution* (London, [1966]), p. 10.
31. Price, p. 81.
32. Price, p. 3.
33. Price, p. 89.