

University of Pardubice

Faculty of Arts and Philosophy

Satiric Criticism of the English Government and the Enlightenment in Gulliver's
Travels by Jonathan Swift

Martin Mikulecký

Bachelor thesis

2017

ZADÁNÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

(PROJEKTU, UMĚLECKÉHO DÍLA, UMĚLECKÉHO VÝKONU)

Jméno a příjmení: **Martin Mikulecký**
Osobní číslo: **H13107**
Studijní program: **B7310 Filologie**
Studijní obor: **Anglický jazyk pro odbornou praxi**
Název tématu: **Satirická kritika anglické společnosti a osvícenství
v Gulliverových cestách od Jonathana Swifta**
Zadávající katedra: **Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky**

Z á s a d y p r o v y p r a c o v á n í :

Student se ve své bakalářské práci zaměří nejprve na obecnou kulturní a historickou charakteristiku první poloviny 18. století. Hlavní důraz bude klást na britský politický systém, konkrétně bipolární systém politických stran Toryů a Whigů. Dále se bude zabývat otázkou osvícenství a jeho vlivu na dobový světonázor, vývoj vědeckého poznání a teorií. Poté se student zaměří na charakteristiku žánru satiry především s ohledem na jeho dobovou podobu a specifické satirické prvky typické pro díla Johnatana Swifta. Jednotlivé aspekty výše zmíněné analýzy pak bude student reflektovat ve zvoleném primárním díle, tj. v Gulliverových cestách.

Rozsah grafických prací:

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:

Forma zpracování bakalářské práce: **tištěná/elektronická**

Seznam odborné literatury:

- Wroughton, John. 1980. Seventeenth century Britain. London: Macmillan.**
Brennan, T. 1972. Politics and government in Britain. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hempton, David. 1996. Religion and political culture in Britain and Ireland. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Trevelyan, G. M. 1988. History of England. Harlow: Longman.
Clark, G. N. 1972. The later Stuarts 1660-1714. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Williams, Basil. 1965. The whig supremacy 1714-1760. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Hill, Christopher. 1972. The Century of revolution, 1603-1714. London: Sphere Books.
Highet, Gilbert. 1962. The anatomy of satire. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
Bloom, Allan. 1990. Giants and dwarfs: essays. New York: Simon and Schuster.
Bentman, Raymond. Satiric Structure and Tone in the Conclusion of Gulliver's Travels. Rice University
Alexander, Michael. 2000. A history of English literature. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
Davis, Herbert. 1979. The Satire of Jonathan Swift. Greenwood Press Reprint.

Vedoucí bakalářské práce:

Mgr. Olga Roebuck, Ph.D.

Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Datum zadání bakalářské práce: **30. dubna 2016**


Termín odevzdání bakalářské práce: **31. března 2017**



prof. PhDr. Karel Rýdl, CSc.
děkan



Univerzita Pardubice
Fakulta filozofická
502 00 Pardubice, Studentská 84
L.S.



doc. Šárka Bubíková, Ph.D.
vedoucí katedry

V Pardubicích dne 30. listopadu 2016

Prohlašuji:

Tuto práci jsem vypracoval samostatně. Veškeré literární prameny a informace, které jsem v práci využil, jsou uvedeny v seznamu použité literatury.

Byl jsem seznámen s tím, že se na moji práci vztahují práva a povinnosti vyplývající ze zákona č. 121/2000 Sb., autorský zákon, zejména se skutečností, že Univerzita Pardubice má právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití této práce jako školního díla podle § 60 odst. 1 autorského zákona, a s tím, že pokud dojde k užití této práce mnou nebo bude poskytnuta licence o užití jinému subjektu, je Univerzita Pardubice oprávněna ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložila, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše.

Souhlasím s prezenčním zpřístupněním své práce v Univerzitní knihovně.

V Pardubicích dne 31. 3. 2017

Martin Mikulecký

Acknowledgement:

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Mgr. Olga Roebuck, Ph.D., M.Litt. for her time, guidance and valuable advice.

ANNOTATION

The aim of this bachelor thesis is to describe the satiric criticism of the English politics and society influenced by the Enlightenment in Gulliver's Travels by Jonathan Swift. The paper is not divided into theoretical and practical part, instead, both parts are fused into one unit. The paper is initiated by the brief introduction of satire and satiric tools used by Swift. Then, the content focuses on the English politics with emphasis on parties Whigs and Tories, the English monarchy and the prosecution of Jacobite movement. The paper proceeds with the criticism of Anglo-French rivalries, which influence domestic and foreign policy. Finally, the chapter on the Enlightenment science illustrates the misuse of Isaac Newton in political affairs, which triggered the criticism of the whole scientific branch named natural philosophy.

KEYWORDS

Gulliver's Travels, Jonathan Swift, satire, irony, Hanover, Walpole, Whig, Tory, France, Enlightenment, Newton

ANOTACE

Cílem této bakalářské práce je popsat satirickou kritiku anglické politiky a společnosti ovlivněné osvícenstvím v Gulliverových cestách od Jonathana Swifta. Práce není rozdělena na teoretickou a praktickou část, nýbrž obě části jsou spojeny v jeden celek. Práce začíná krátkým popisem satiry a satirických nástrojů využitých Swiftem. Poté se obsah práce zaměřuje na anglickou politiku s důrazem na strany Whigů a Toryů, anglickou monarchii a trestní stíhání členů Jakobínského hnutí. Nadále práce pokračuje kritikou anglo-francouzských rivalit, které ovlivňovaly domácí a zahraniční politiku. Nakonec kapitola o vědě v osvícenství nastiňuje zneužití Isaaca Newtona v politických aférách, což spustilo kritiku celého vědeckého odvětví zvaného natural philosophy.

KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA

Gulliverovy cesty, Jonathan Swift, satira, ironie, Hanover, Walpole, Whig, Tory, Francie, osvícenství, Newton

Table of contents

Introduction.....	8
1. Satire in Gulliver's Travels.....	10
2. The Criticism of English Politics.....	16
3. The Criticism of Anglo-French Rivalries	27
4. The Criticism of Science.....	33
Conclusion	39
Resumé.....	41
Bibliography	46

Introduction

The era from the Glorious Revolution of 1688 to the first half of the 18th century was undoubtedly extremely turbulent because of the struggle between political parties, religious conflicts between Catholics and Protestants, issues connected with ruling dynasties and the changes in society triggered by the Enlightenment. All those various conflicts and influences happening on the British Isles created an atmosphere perfectly suitable for the genre of satire, which thrived in an unimaginable extent. One of the best satirists of that time is Jonathan Swift, who managed to deliver his satirical criticism in his work *Gulliver's Travels*.

The aim of this bachelor thesis is to demonstrate Swift's satirical method in *Gulliver's Travels* and to identify targets of the satiric criticism. The paper is not divided into theoretical and practical part, instead, both sections are blended in order to connect the knowledge of Swift's life, and main political events of his time period, with particular points of criticism in his work. The division of paper's main body into four chapters corresponds with the areas of criticism by Swift.

The historical background of this paper consists of the Glorious Revolution of 1688, which caused the change of English monarchs. The Catholic part of the House of Stuart was replaced by the Protestant branch, which initiated several conflicts not only in terms of domestic policy and affairs, but also in the international relationship with France. Subsequent French support of the Catholic Stuarts in exile caused the number of military conflicts, for example the unsuccessful naval invasion to Scotland. In addition, the omnipresent issue of Catholic Stuarts created Jacobite movement among Tory party members. The objective of Jacobites was to restore the Catholic monarchy of James Francis Edward – son of James II, who fled to France in 1688. Jacobites triggered the dispute in domestic policy after the Hanoverian succession to the English throne, since Hanoverian king George I despised the Tory party and the prosecution began – which became one of the main targets for criticism in Swift's work.

The strategy of criticism is covered in the first chapter of this paper. To be specific, the purpose of the first chapter is to provide the reader with the brief definition of satire as a genre and to provide the list of satirical tools and techniques used by Swift in *Gulliver's Travels*. All techniques are accompanied by the specific examples from the book for clear illustration of its use. The text begins with the most known techniques of *irony* and *invective*, followed by the technique called *persona*. The focus then moves to the building of psychology of characters and the structure of the satirical tone in the work.

The theme of the second chapter is focused on English politics – namely the political parties of Whigs and Tories, as well as political interventions made by ruling dynasties – especially king George I. The struggle between Whigs and Tories is analysed from the viewpoint of Jonathan Swift and his political allegiances and convictions. The target for criticism is specified as the criticism of the ideological agenda of individual parties, which is further elaborated as the criticism of political leaders dictating the course of events. Finally, the content of the chapter connects the criticism of politics with king George I, showing the reasons and historical events causing Swift's antipathy to the Hanoverian monarchy.

The third chapter delves into the issue of Anglo-French rivalries, which is analysed from the viewpoint of ruling dynasties. The topic reveals the duality of relationship towards France, specifically the way in which English citizens' perception of France differed from the monarchs' perception. The theme of national rivalries is inseparably accompanied by the criticism of war, since military actions and expenditures contribute to the shape of domestic and foreign policy.

The last chapter closes the paper with the criticism of the Enlightenment, specifically the criticism of the scientific progress represented by the person of Isaac Newton. The content of this chapter connects science of the Enlightenment with leading politicians and the way science was misused in order to create supportive evidence in political affairs, namely Wood's Halfpence affair, in which Newton was involved. Accordingly, the satiric attack on Newton triggered the criticism of the whole scientific branch promoted by him.

As *Gulliver's Travels* is full of criticism on various issues, this paper combines the main criticized targets in order to illustrate the complexity and interconnection of the individual criticized subjects.

Satire in Gulliver's Travels

Satire became synonymous to the name Jonathan Swift since he managed to master this genre and Swift's satire is not only smartly complex, but also compelling even in the 21st century. The fact that *Gulliver's Travels* is still excessively read, despite the characteristics of satire, is a clear evidence of being an atemporal book. Satiric works are very sensitive to shifts in sensibility since specific historical events are used in metaphors and critical parts of a satiric text could have been interpreted as simple jokes. Therefore, Swift's contemporaries applying the 18th century perception of the world might have read *Gulliver's Travels* as a merry story instead of a severe criticism, like the 21st century readers do.¹ In addition, as Northrop Frye suggests: "To attack anything, writer and audience must agree on its undesirability, which means that the content of a great deal of satire founded on national hatreds, snobbery, prejudice, and personal pique goes out of date very quickly."² Bearing that in mind it becomes obvious that should the satiric work be eminent even in the distant future, a critical message must be elaborately covered with the mask of a story, which would appeal and address even the readers who are not aware of the critical background.

Furthermore, another aspect of Swift's satire might have contributed to the popularity of *Gulliver's Travels* and that is, as Michael F. Suarez mentions: "In Swift's satirical writings, there is a dual movement which is at once destructive and constructive. [...] The purpose of satire for Swift, then, is less the reformation of the target, who is typically too foregone or illdisposed for amendment, and more about the moral education of the reader."³ This diversity of intended impact enriches the simple criticism, which might be difficult to be comprehended by the reader not knowing the background, by another message which could be perceived, if ingeniously presented, separately from the critical attack. Satiric tone in *Gulliver's Travels* is achieved mainly by the usage of three simple, yet effective techniques – *irony*, *invective* and *persona*.

Irony, the most typical feature of satire, is used throughout *Gulliver's Travels* and its purpose is to communicate a message by writing the opposite of the intended meaning. The satirist writes a completely exaggerated falsehood, which is presented as a serious truth.⁴ Therefore, "the satiric text engages the reader in the quest for hidden meanings that are

¹ Raymond Bentman, "Satiric Structure and Tone in the Conclusion of Gulliver's Travels," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 11 (1971): 541

² Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of criticism: four essays* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1971), 224

³ Christopher Fox, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Jonathan Swift* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 115

⁴ Gilbert Highet, *The anatomy of satire* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1962), 55

revealed or concealed through mechanisms of irony.”¹ The degree of concealment of truth may vary from simple irony to the more complex ironical form.

The example of simple irony can be found in the very beginning of the work, particularly in the Publisher’s note:

By the advice of several worthy persons, to whom, with the author’s permission, I communicated these papers, I now venture to send them into the world, hoping they may be, at least for some time, a better entertainment to our young noblemen, than the common scribbles of politics and party.²

This passage clearly contradicts the author’s intention to share his criticism with readers. The outcome of criticism should at least leave a minimal imprint in the mind of the criticized reader and in order to achieve that goal, the book must be read by the intended reader. Therefore, the passage expressing the wish not to be read by politicians, but young noblemen as an entertainment instead, even though said as a serious demand, is not actually meant to be taken seriously and opposite is the intended meaning.

More complex irony can be found in the first chapter – particularly in the passage in which Lemuel Gulliver is tied up and is approached by the representative of Lilliputians:

He appeared to be of a middle age, and taller than any of the other three who attended him, whereof one was a page that held up his train, and seemed to be somewhat longer than my middle finger; the other two stood one on each side to support him. He acted every part of an orator, and I could observe many periods of threatenings, and others of promises, pity, and kindness. I answered in a few words, but in the most submissive manner, lifting up my left hand, and both my eyes to the sun, as calling him for a witness.³

The irony in this section is based primarily on the physical size of Lemuel Gulliver and Lilliputians. The Lilliputian representative, even though of a miniature figure, is depicted as if he was a grandiose man and a great statesman with stunning oratory skills. When a reader is introduced to those great qualities, he subconsciously imagines a man not only with a great personality, but also great physical features – which is not the case of the tiny Lilliputian, who as a result resembles a parody of the statesman. On the contrary, Lemuel Gulliver, who appears to be a giant in Lilliput, is tied up and held as a hostage, even though he could easily

¹ Melinda Alliker Rabb, *Satire and secrecy in English literature from 1650 to 1750* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 178

² Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver’s Travels* (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1952), 3

³ Swift, *Gulliver’s Travels*, 16

liberate himself and banish Lilliputians away from him. But he does not, instead, he submits to his imprisonment and deals with the tiny Lilliputian statesman with a great respect and identifies himself as a weak individual who can no longer control his life. The Lilliputian representative and Lemuel Gulliver play roles in the story which do not correspond with their real abilities.

Second satiric technique wildly used by Swift is invective, which is defined by *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* as “the harsh denunciation of some person or thing in abusive speech or writing, usually by a succession of insulting.”¹ Northrop Frye even describes it as a “technique of torrential abuse”² and Gilbert Highet further explains its usage: “The man who writes an invective would be delighted if, after delivering it, he were told that his subject had been overwhelmed by shame and obloquy and had retired to oblivion.”³ Therefore, the purpose of invective is not only to insult, but also to cause far-reaching impacts on an addressee – preferably in a seriously negative manner. Irvin Ehrenpreis specifies the use of invective in *Gulliver’s Travels*: “While name-calling as such is sufficiently effective, Swift has an extraordinary ability to fuse many invectives by means of an image or symbol, a sharp, detailed vignette which summarizes vividly a mass of insults.”⁴ In other words, Swift avoids using simple vulgar expressions in order to create a complex, and therefore more striking, image containing an insulting message.

The example of invective with ironical features can be found in the first book, specifically:

The emperor was already descended from the tower, and advancing on horseback towards me, which had like to have cost him dear; for the beast, though very well trained, yet wholly unused to such a sight, which appeared as if a mountain moved before him, reared up on its hinder feet: but that prince, who is an excellent horseman, kept his seat, till his attendants ran in, and held the bridle, while his majesty had time to dismount.⁵

Swift provided the reader with the criticism of a monarch. Instead of using any vulgar expression, which could serve as an invective, the variety of non-vulgar structures is used in order to create the image of a monarch who, even though ironically depicted as grand, is deprived of his magnificence by showing him in a situation in which he cannot even control

¹ Chris Baldick, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 128

² Frye, *Anatomy of criticism: four essays*, 236

³ Highet, *The anatomy of satire*, 155

⁴ Irvin Ehrenpreis, „Swift and Satire,“ *College English* 13 (1952): 310

⁵ Swift, *Gulliver’s Travels*, 26

and dismount his horse without the necessary help of his servants. The reader, therefore, can no longer see the monarch competent to independently rule the country.

Last but not least satiric technique used in Swift's work is called *persona*. Swift almost never published his work over his own signature in order to provide it with the mask of a specific personality, which imparted objectivity and ingenuousness to the story.¹ Moreover, as Gilbert Highet states:

He tries very hard to make the book seem authentic, by inserting intelligible and credible details which a real voyager would record (weather, ship's course, latitude, longitude, etc.) by adding maps, by transcribing at least one passage verbatim from a genuine sailor's log, and by placing his imaginary countries in little-known parts of the world, where there is, so to speak, room for them.²

Swift's objective is to create a persona for his work, which would bridge the gap between his own personality and the intended critical message. The persona for *Gulliver's Travels* is Lemuel Gulliver and according to Irvin Ehrenpreis:

[...] one of the absurdest errors in reading the book is to interpret him as Swift. No identification is less likely. The elderly dean dreaded sea voyages, had contempt for speculative science, was sophisticated and pessimistic toward mankind, lacked an immediate family, and was the last person to conform to other people's schemes. No, if Gulliver is anyone, he is the reader. Moderately successful, infused with the ordinary bourgeois ambitions, benevolent and hopeful toward man, boastful about his native land and about European civilization, he has an irresistible attraction for the reader's fantasies of identification. After going through the opening episodes, one becomes Gulliver.³

In conclusion, readers should not mistake Swift for Gulliver, since Gulliver is not the embodiment of Swift, but the satiric tool of Swift.

On top of that, the whole idea of creating personae for satiric works is possible due to the capability of satire to imitate other genres or literary models.⁴ Therefore, *Gulliver's Travels* may without any problems imitate adventure books and traveller's tales, such as the tale of Robinson Crusoe by Daniel Defoe, which was published approximately in the same time period.⁵ But what distinguishes the narrator Lemuel Gulliver from Robinson Crusoe is

¹ Ehrenpreis, „Swift and Satire,“ 311

² Highet, *The anatomy of satire*, 149

³ Ehrenpreis, „Swift and Satire,“ 312

⁴ Charles A. Knight, *The literature of satire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 32

⁵ Highet, *The anatomy of satire*, 150

that Gulliver does not seek to provide readers with the story of the shipwreck survivor who engages in thrilling adventure with a great amount of details about his everyday life like Robinson does, instead, Gulliver is only a mere silhouette of an adventurer who uses the ideas of a travel-book genre to criticize his homeland, England, and made-up countries are only satiric tools. The main focus is not directed into an unknown land, on the contrary, the attention is paid to the well-known homeland, which contradicts the purpose of travel literature to present voyages to mysterious lands and discoveries of any kind.

The use of persona technique, however, has its own pitfalls, since the persona narrator should be accompanied by appropriate identity, idiolect, opinions and knowledge. The problem arises with the fact that Jonathan Swift is the opposite of Lemuel Gulliver. Nevertheless, this gap between author's and persona's identities is suppressed by Swift's choice to include another persona in the story – the publisher. Publisher's note at the very beginning reveals several details about Lemuel Gulliver, particularly the passage:

The style is very plain and simple; and the only fault I find is, that the author, after the manner of travellers, is a little too circumstantial. There is an air of truth apparent through the whole.¹

In this sentence Jonathan Swift prepares his readers for the story and subtly manipulates them, by means of providing details and personal opinions given by seemingly trustworthy publisher, into the illusion that the whole four books were indeed written by the adventurer Lemuel Gulliver. Publisher's note proceeds with:

This volume would have been at least twice as large, if I had not made bold to strike out innumerable passages relating to the winds and tides, as well as to the variations and bearings in the several voyages, together with the minute descriptions of the management of the ship in storms, in the style of sailors; likewise the account of longitudes and latitudes.²

By this passage the credibility of the story had been provided, since publisher's note managed to explain the reason of the absence of a sailor's and adventurer's terminology and insights which readers should anticipate to be included on almost every page in the book belonging to the travel literature. This author's strategy is more than logical as Jonathan Swift is the direct opposite of Lemuel Gulliver, therefore he would not even be able to provide readers with the required travelogue information. Besides, the focus and content of the story should not be

¹ Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, 2

² Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, 3

aimed at the travelling itself, but at the satiric criticism, which is emphasized by the omission of an adventurer's notes.

Apart from building the identity of persona, special attention should also be paid to the psychology of characters and plot in a satiric narrative. Characters in non-satiric novels are supposed to be realistic – they experience conflicts, seek solutions, and more importantly, each character has his own identity.¹ On the contrary, characters in satiric works do not stand for themselves but for larger ideas which are being criticized.² Each character is usually part of the scheme in which evil and good are clearly distinguishable – as most of satiric theorists confirm.³ Gilbert Highet further explains the connection between characters without deep identities and the satiric structure of a plot:

Although the satirist pretends to be telling a continuous story and gives his fiction, a single unifying title; he is less interested in developing a plot, with preparation, suspense, and climax, than in displaying many different aspects of an idea; and, as a satirist, he does not believe that the world is orderly and rational. Therefore gaps and interruptions, even inconsistencies, in the story scarcely concern him. His characters flit from one amusing humiliation to another with scarcely any intervals of time and reflection. Seldom do they develop by degrees, as people in real novels do. They may display more of their character as the story drops them into new situations, but they do not grow.⁴

Therefore, such characters are only satiric tools and marionettes and there is no point in analysing their identities and personal motives behind their deeds. *Gulliver's Travels* is a great example of the satiric work which pays no special attention to the fate of characters and only exploits them in order to present the underlying theme behind the story. Readers should process the story and actions of characters from the viewpoint which extends beyond the perception of Lemuel Gulliver. Each character, institution, place, action and even the narrator Lemuel Gulliver himself has a prearranged purpose and it is up to readers to uncover it and perceive the underlying criticism.

¹ Knight, *The literature of satire*, 204

² Knight, *The literature of satire*, 204

³ Bentman, "Satiric Structure and Tone in the Conclusion of Gulliver's Travels," 535

⁴ Highet, *The anatomy of satire*, 206

The Criticism of English Politics

The political satire is one of the greatest themes in the work of Jonathan Swift and is concentrated on the clash between the parties of Whigs and Tories and the clash between politics and monarchs. Tom Brennan clarifies the difference between the parties Whigs and Tories: “Tories were seen as royal supporters and were called the ‘Court’ party, while Whigs were seen as the opposition and were called the ‘Country’ party. The interesting fact is, that both names – Tories and Whigs – were originally used in an abusive way.”¹ Robert Tombs gives more details about these terms – Whig comes from *whiggamore*, which means Scottish Presbyterian rebels, and Tory comes from *tóraigh*, which means Irish Catholic rebels. Both terms were used in the period of Charles II and the primary ideas of both parties were also taking shape in that time period. Whigs resisted the prospect of the future Catholic king (Son of Charles II – James, later James II) and Tories defended the legitimacy of his succession.²

Jonathan Swift identified himself as Whig, but eventually changed sides and became Tory.³ The reason for this change was the matter of the Church of Ireland, whose member Swift was, as it is further explained by David Oakleaf:

For he served not the Church of England but the Church of Ireland; that is, the Anglican church established by law in Ireland. He went to London in 1707 as an agent of the Irish church whose task was to secure, through his political connections, the remission of the First Fruits for the Church of Ireland. These were church taxes which Henry VIII had confiscated but which Queen Anne had recently restored to the Church of England, creating a fund for poor clergy that was known as Queen Anne’s Bounty. The Church of Ireland wanted the same benefit.⁴

However, Swift’s allies among Whigs did not help him, which only contributed to the increasing influence of Robert Harley, the shrewd leader of the Tory, on Swift.⁵

Swift gradually became the member of the Tory party, even though he did not identify himself as Tory – which is also explained by David Oakleaf: “Swift is an Old Whig, a supporter of principles of the Glorious Revolution. As Whig and Tory positions changed around him, he found himself neither Whig nor Tory in the terms of Queen Anne’s reign.”⁶ Therefore, even though Swift changed his party allegiance, he remained consistent, since he

¹ Tom Brennan, *Politics & Government in Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 24.

² Robert Tombs, *The English and Their History* (London: Penguin Books, 2015), 254

³ David Oakleaf, *A Political Biography of Jonathan Swift* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2008), 29

⁴ Fox, *The Cambridge Companion to Jonathan Swift*, 33

⁵ Fox, *The Cambridge Companion to Jonathan Swift*, 33

⁶ Fox, *The Cambridge Companion to Jonathan Swift*, 35

did not fully identify himself as the member of any party at that time and maintained his ideals referring to the Old Whig ideology. Moreover, in Swift's perception, modern Tories resembled the Old Whigs, as David Oakleaf further states:

He even argued that there was no difference between Tory positions under Queen Anne and Old Whig positions. Such an argument usefully presents Swift's defection from the Whigs to a Tory administration as a display of consistency, of course, but it remains a fact that Swift did not call himself a Tory.¹

The issue of ideological change of the Whig party is partially mentioned by Ian Higgins: „In *Gulliver's Travels* Swift refers to the way in which old Whig ideals have been allowed to become corrupted since the Revolution by men like Walpole.“² In other words, the Whig party became gradually corrupted as the new wave of its leaders, represented by Walpole, brought the change of the party program.

Robert Walpole was the most influential and important politician in the 1720s and 1730s. Lee Morrissey describes Walpole's office and the importance of his person:

From 1721, with his appointment as the First Lord of the Treasury, until his resignation in 1742 he would be de facto the first Prime Minister (and after 1732 the first person in such a position to occupy 10 Downing Street). Strictly speaking, the position of Prime Minister did not exist yet, nor did its name. But Walpole fulfilled its function.³

Walpole and his office became one of the elements of criticism in Swift's work. According to Paul J. DeGateno and R. Jay Stubblefield, Sir Robert Walpole is portrayed in *Gulliver's Travels* as the character Lord treasurer of Lilliput (Flimnap) and Swift points out Walpole's political balancing act in the book.⁴

Walpole's ability to balance and establish his position among political forces is criticized in Book I, chapter III, via the activity of rope-dancing:

This diversion is only practised by those persons who are candidates for great employments, and high favour at court. They are trained in this art from their youth, and are not always of noble birth, or liberal education. When a great office is vacant, either by death or disgrace (which often happens,) five or six

¹ Oakleaf, *A Political Biography of Jonathan Swift*, 4

² Ian Higgins, *Swift's politics: a study in disaffection* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 3

³ Paul Poplawski, ed., *English Literature in Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 225

⁴ Paul J. DeGateno and R. Jay Stubblefield. *Critical Companion to Jonathan Swift: A Literary Reference to His Life and Works* (New York: Facts on File, 2006), 161

of those candidates petition the emperor to entertain his majesty and the court with a dance on the rope; and whoever jumps the highest, without falling, succeeds in the office. Very often the chief ministers themselves are commanded to show their skill, and to convince the emperor that they have not lost their faculty. Flimnap, the treasurer, is allowed to cut a caper on the straight rope, at least an inch higher than any other lord in the whole empire. I have seen him do the summerset several times together, upon a trencher fixed on a rope which is no thicker than a common packthread in England.¹

The opening of this passage criticizes the fact that candidates for the highest offices should act as the king pleases and the office is not given on basis of skills, but loyalty. Moving on to the part telling the reader that the office often happens to be vacant due to death or disgrace, Swift points out the despise of George I towards Tories, who were deprived of their offices and positions during his reign. However, the criticism in this passage is mainly directed at the person of Walpole, represented by Flimnap. The resemblance is achieved not only by similar titles First Lord of the Treasury and Lord treasurer of Lilliput, but also via the depiction of balancing on the rope in order to succeed in the king's rules of his play. The political and economic situation in the 1720s was very tumultuous and the image of a politician balancing on a tight rope is more than accurate. The whole image is even more emphasized by the requirement to jump on that rope, which not only shows difficult conditions given by the king in order to please him, but also the stressful and demanding influence of the public eye. Nevertheless, the position of Flimnap, and therefore of Walpole, is made easier by the king, since Flimnap is allowed to have the rope elevated higher than for others. This little advantage criticizes the situation at the beginning of George I's reign, when Tories were disadvantaged due to the personal feelings of George I and Whigs were offered the political power over the country with almost no obstacles placed by the king.

The importance of Walpole in English politics is immense and Lee Morrissey continues on his personality and political views: "A Whig pragmatist, he was able to balance both sets of interests, while still maintain a Whig defence of the Glorious Revolution, Hanoverian succession, religious toleration and an extravagant consumerists pursuit of pleasure."² Robert Walpole was truly involved in consumerist economic issues as the beginning of his political carrier, which is known to the public, could be traced to the South Sea Bubble affair. In 1719, the South Sea Company was established and its purpose was to be the new source of revenue conducted by means of speculative financial practices, however,

¹ Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, 39

² Poplawski, *English Literature in Context*, 225

the company collapsed in 1720.¹ As Sean Moore noted, the South Sea Bubble had proven that all property and securities in England were essentially 'fictive'.² The role of Walpole in this crisis is described by Robert Tombs: "Walpole, the new Chancellor of Exchequer, played for time and protected as many politicians and bankers as he could."³ The interest in commercial matters and influential persons became the reason of dispute between Walpole and Swift, which is commented by Pat Rogers: "Walpole came to stand as a symbol for the triumph of Whiggism and commercial values, and represented a mighty opposite to the humanism of Swift." Furthermore, Walpole paid substantial emphasis on suppressing the opposition, as Ian Higgins says: "Walpole's government, provoked by the extremist and populist strain in Jacobite Tory argument, conducted a campaign of harassment, arrest and prosecution of seditious publicists."⁴ In summary, Robert Walpole was in Swift's opinion too much preoccupied with the financial issues and suppressing the opposition rather than promoting the Old Whig principles.

Moreover, the corruption of politics during the reign of George I and Whig government led by Walpole is criticized in Book II, chapter VI. Gulliver, after delivering long lectures on England and English system of government, is asked by the king of Brobdingnag about the House of commoners:

He then desired to know, 'What arts were practised in electing those whom I called commoners: whether a stranger, with a strong purse, might not influence the vulgar voters to choose him before their own landlord, or the most considerable gentleman in the neighbourhood? How it came to pass, that people were so violently bent upon getting into this assembly, which I allowed to be a great trouble and expense [...] without any salary or pension? [...]' And he desired to know, 'Whether such zealous gentlemen could have any views of refunding themselves for the charges and trouble they were at by sacrificing the public good to the designs of a weak and vicious prince, in conjunction with a corrupted ministry?'⁵

The king of Brobdingnag serves as the critical voice representing the observations of Swift. The highly realistic possibility of corrupting elections by money is highlighted in the specific example provided by the king. In this case, Swift hints at the numerous electoral affairs of which he, as a member of the political party, had to be aware and witness. Furthermore, the general idea of connection between paying no salary for being a commoner and refunding

¹ Tombs, *The English and Their History*, 316

² Harold Bloom, ed., *Jonathan Swift's Gulliver's Travels* (New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2009), 9

³ Tombs, *The English and Their History*, 317

⁴ Higgins, *Swift's politics: a study in disaffection*, 161

⁵ Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, 160

oneself by sacrificing the public good is made with the intention to raise the question whether such corruption is being supported by the monarchy and ministry. Swift could not directly express his assumption that namely George I, with the support of Walpole, is damaging the English system of government, therefore, he had to choose general expressions applicable to any government and even a country in order to cover his opinion in the mask of ambiguity. In addition, all the questions asked by the king of Brobdingnag are not aimed at Gulliver at all. The real addressee of the questions is the reader who is therefore forced to have a thought for himself and come to the, most preferably, same critical conclusion as Swift.

The king of Brobdingnag further analyses his observations about England:

I observe among you some lines of an institution, which, in its original, might have been tolerable, but these half erased, and the rest wholly blurred and blotted by corruptions.¹

Swift provides the reader, through the voice of the king, with an idea that the English system of government and the structure of its political parties has changed and do not produce public good anymore. Keeping in mind Swift's aversion towards Walpole, the possible interpretation is the indirect criticism of the Whig party, which is seriously corrupted by Walpole and other ministers chosen by George I. The original structures of an institution have been erased and replaced by the personal inclination for financial issues and maintaining the political power under the conditions given by the monarchy and other influential individuals. In summary, the original Old Whig principles, which Swift avows to be his political attitudes, were transformed and corrupted.

The Old Whig principles were based on the legislature that had the power and prerogative to institute a hereditary succession and at the same time to repeal it in cases of extreme necessity.² Furthermore, one of the typical features of Whigs was the aversion to the Jacobite movement inside the Tory party. Jacobites were loyalists to the Catholic Stuart heir and were called Jacobites from the Latin for "James".³ Ian Higgins notes on that dissent: "The Old Whigs completely endorse the Whig government in prosecuting Jacobite conspirators and, indeed, call on the government to show no mercy to Jacobite plotters."⁴ Therefore, the political struggle between Whigs and Jacobites contributed to the shape of English politics.

¹ Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, 164

² Ian Anders Gadd and Bertrand A. Goldgar, eds. *English Political Writings 1711-1714: The Conduct of the Allies and Other Works* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 7

³ Fox, *The Cambridge Companion to Jonathan Swift*, 32

⁴ Higgins, *Swift's politics: a study in disaffection*, 31

The resulting relationship between political parties became one of the themes for Swift. Looking on Lilliput from Book I, Lemuel Gulliver is an observer of a political allegory.¹ Lilliput can be interpreted either as the depiction and criticism of France under the rule of Louis XIV², but more likely as the indirect criticism of George I's reign.³ According to Ian Higgins, Swift managed to criticise the dangerous issue of the ruling dynasty. The problematic decision for any Tory member was whether to support the Hanoverian succession to the throne or exiled Stuarts, namely James Francis Edward (crowned by the French king as James III). Swift used parody and indirect irony in order to express his anti-Hanoverianism and say politically unspeakable things.⁴

The reason of Swift's antipathy to George I were Jacobites. Even though Jonathan Swift identified himself as an Old Whig and therefore should absolutely resent Jacobites, the truth is that many Jacobites were his friends.⁵ These friendships produced many suspicions of Swift being a Jacobite too and J. A. Downie describes in *Swift and Jacobitism* in great details all those occasions and Swift's statements proving he was not.⁶ Swift's life caused a lot of confusion and David P. French remarkably presents Swift as a person and a politician: "He was not, however, a simple and consistent figure; like other men of depth, he struggled to reconcile opposed virtues which attracted him, and he was by no means entirely consistent in his own mind."⁷ Therefore, even though Swift had Jacobite friends, he did not support Jacobitism. Nevertheless, Swift did not support what Ian Higgins calls "an arbitrary Hanoverian reign of terror"⁸ either and explains this phrase: "After the Jacobite rising of 1715 and the execution of the Jacobite leaders and transportation of many others, King George in speeches to his parliament in 1716 and 1717 referred to 'the numerous instances of mercy which I have shown' and his 'clemency' in the treatment of the Jacobite rebels."⁹ Many Whigs commended George I's mercy and grace, but Swift regarded his treatment of Jacobite rebels as savage and wrote satirical comments on the Hanoverian King's 'clemency'.¹⁰

The first allusion to George I's 'clemency' in punishments could be traced in Book I, chapter VII. Gulliver is the subject of debate during secret meetings about his supposed

¹ Knight, *The literature of satire*, 68

² Hight, *The anatomy of satire*, 159

³ Higgins, *Swift's politics: a study in disaffection*, 29

⁴ Fox, *The Cambridge Companion to Jonathan Swift*, 150

⁵ James Alan Downie, "Swift and Jacobitism" *ELH*, 1997, 891

⁶ James Alan Downie, "Swift and Jacobitism", 892

⁷ David P. French, "Swift, the Non-Jurors, and Jacobitism." *Modern Language Notes*, 1957, 264

⁸ Higgins, *Swift's politics: a study in disaffection*, 176

⁹ Fox, *The Cambridge Companion to Jonathan Swift*, 151

¹⁰ Higgins, *Swift's politics: a study in disaffection*, 29

betrayal and members of the council want to have him killed. Swift writes: “In the several debates upon this impeachment, it must be confessed that his majesty gave many marks of his great lenity.”¹ The word ‘lenity’ is the parody of George I’s ‘clemency’ and gives readers a hint that subsequent storyline refers to the king’s speech upon the execution of Jacobite rebels.

The relation between George I’s ‘clemency’ and the political terror of his reign is further criticized in the same chapter:

It was a custom introduced by this prince and his ministry (very different, as I have been assured, from the practice of former times,) that after the court had decreed any cruel execution, either to gratify the monarch’s resentment, or the malice of a favourite, the emperor always made a speech to his whole council, expressing his great lenity and tenderness, as qualities known and confessed by all the world. This speech was immediately published throughout the kingdom; nor did anything terrify the people so much as those encomiums on his majesty’s mercy; because it was observed, that the more these praises were enlarged and insisted on, the more inhuman was the punishment, and the sufferer more innocent.²

In this passage Swift attacks the practice of the king and his ministers to give long speeches in order to justify their cruel punishments. The ironical comment in parenthesis, that the custom of speeches was introduced recently, hints a radical change at the court and government in treating the opposition. As Swift notes towards the end of the passage, it became clear even to the public that many of the impeachments and sentences were performed only in order to diminish the influence of the opposition and to secure the political power of the court and Whig government. Moreover, allusions to George I’s ‘clemency’ are present throughout the whole chapter VII and criticize verbally expressed tenderness, which only masks the cruelty of punishments. Swift did not even have to build an irony on George I’s speeches in great details, since the king unconsciously managed to give self-ironical statements by himself.

Additionally, Swift also revealed the division in George I’s Whig Court in 1723 in the question whether one of the members of the Jacobite rebellion – Atterbury, should be executed or submitted to a different punishment.³ Swift writes in Book I, chapter VII, about the friendly Lilliputian who came to warn Gulliver about secret meetings: “The treasurer and

¹ Swift, *Gulliver’s Travels*, 80

² Swift, *Gulliver’s Travels*, 84

³ Higgins, *Swift’s politics: a study in disaffection*, 176

admiral insisted that you should be put to the most painful and ignominious death.”¹ The chapter later proceeds with:

The general came into the same opinion; so that for a long time there was a majority against you; but his majesty [...] at last brought off the chamberlain. [...] Upon this incident, Reldresal, principal secretary for private affairs, [...] was commanded by the emperor to deliver his opinion [...]. He allowed your crimes to be great, but that still there was room for mercy, the most commendable virtue in a prince, and for which his majesty was so justly celebrated. [...] That if his majesty, in consideration of your services, and pursuant to his own merciful disposition, would please to spare your life, and only give orders to put out both your eyes, he humbly conceived, that by this expedient justice might in some measure be satisfied, and all the world would applaud the lenity of the emperor, as well as the fair and generous proceedings of those who have the honour to be his counsellors.²

Disagreements among government and court members are evident from this passage. Swift names the number of influential politicians of Lilliput and depicts them in an intensive debate over the punishment. The reader (and especially Swift’s contemporaries) could notice the connection between quarrelling Lilliputians and George I, Walpole and other Whig government members. The immediate death of Gulliver is proposed by the majority of discussion participants, however, the whole cabal is not capable of delivering a united solution, just like the Whig Court in 1723 in the case of Atterbury. The final solution of putting out both Gulliver’s eyes and the horrible process of performing it, which is further depicted in details on pages 83 and 84, serves as a comparison to the punishments delivered by George I and the Whig government. In addition, the omnipresence of hints and allusions to the majesty’s lenity is in this case not only the parody of George I’s speeches and alleged clemency, but also serves as an ironical evaluation of the punishment. Lilliputian politicians declare that putting eyes out is a just punishment and it is presented as a non-cruel procedure, however, blinding a person by “discharging very sharppointed arrows into the balls of your eyes, as you lie on the ground”³ is apparently very painful. This part, therefore, suggests that behaviour of the Whig Court is extremely inhumane and treats the opposition and prisoners not as humans, but things.

The criticism of the monarchy and the court was combined with the criticism of political parties on general level, especially politicians holding offices. The situation during

¹ Swift, *Gulliver’s Travels*, 80

² Swift, *Gulliver’s Travels*, 81

³ Swift, *Gulliver’s Travels*, 84

the beginning of the reign of George I was very turbulent for domestic politics. Robert Tombs says:

George I was far from being apolitical, however: he brought about a historic reorientation of England's domestic and foreign policy. He immediately threw out the Tories in what has been called a Whig 'coup'. He was angry both with the Tory peace of Utrecht, which he saw as a betrayal of European allies, and with the contacts several had pursued with the exiled Stuarts – though probably aimed at discouraging rather than encouraging Jacobite adventures.¹

In conclusion, the reign of George I was unfavourable for Tories and those who wanted to maintain their offices and political power had to proceed cautiously or act upon the king's intentions and wishes.

The complicated relationship between politicians and the monarch is described in Book I, chapter III:

There is likewise another diversion, which is only shown before the emperor and empress, and first minister, upon particular occasions. The emperor lays on the table three fine silken threads of six inches long; one is blue, the other red, and the third green. These threads are proposed as prizes for those persons whom the emperor has a mind to distinguish by a peculiar mark of his favour. The ceremony is performed in his majesty's great chamber of state, where the candidates are to undergo a trial of dexterity very different from the former, and such as I have not observed the least resemblance of in any other country of the new or old world. The emperor holds a stick in his hands, both ends parallel to the horizon, while the candidates advancing, one by one, sometimes leap over the stick, sometimes creep under it, backward and forward, several times, according as the stick is advanced or depressed. Sometimes the emperor holds one end of the stick, and his first minister the other; sometimes the minister has it entirely to himself. Whoever performs his part with most agility, and holds out the longest in leaping and creeping, is rewarded with the bluecoloured silk; the red is given to the next, and the green to the third, which they all wear girt twice round about the middle; and you see few great persons about this court who are not adorned with one of these girdles.²

This passage involves an ironical comment when Gulliver says that the described performance is not similar to any other ceremony in the world. The opposite is clearly the true meaning and Swift criticizes the fact that politicians and influential figures are not awarded on basis of their achievements during political turmoil and contributing to the country's welfare, but on basis of the ability to fulfil the monarch's vain wishes. The procedure of performing

¹ Tombs, *The English and Their History*, 315

² Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, 40

various acrobatic jumps and creeps with the stick shows not only the unimportance and possibly even dullness of the monarch's motions, but also his strong alliance with the prime minister. The Emperor of Lilliput has handed the stick over to the first minister and tested an agility together, or the first minister even held the stick on behalf of the emperor. The relation of the Lilliputian emperor with the first minister is used as a comparison with George I and Walpole's government. George I openly despised Tories, therefore he gave the full political power to Whigs and the minister Robert Walpole, who could dictate the terms of the English politics and conditions for politicians along with the king. The last part of the passage is an open ridicule of the politicians who managed to succeed in political chaos and became king's and Walpole's puppets.

Moving on to the even more general level of politics, the political diversion between Whigs and Tories is also covered in *Gulliver's Travels*, namely in Book I, chapter IV:

[...] that for about seventy moons past there have been two struggling parties in this empire, under the names of Tramecksan and Slamecksan, from the high and low heels of their shoes, by which they distinguish themselves. It is alleged, indeed, that the high heels are most agreeable to our ancient constitution; but, however this be, his majesty has determined to make use only of low heels in the administration of the government, and all offices in the gift of the crown, as you cannot but observe; and particularly that his majesty's imperial heels are lower at least by a drurr than any of his court.¹

The parties Tramecksan and Slamecksan stand for Tories and Whigs, as the description of two struggling parties fits to the situation in England since the Restoration. Moreover, the distinguishing feature – the height of a heel – could be interpreted as a symbol showing that the difference between both parties is not that striking as Lilliputians might think. Taking into account the era of Swift, he considered himself an Old Whig and declared that the political position of modern Tories resembled the one of Old Whigs and similarly modern Whigs are corrupted and moved ideologically towards different political standpoints. Therefore, political differences are fluid and change in accordance with the politicians in charge of the party and current political situation in homeland and abroad. Implementing this knowledge into parties Tramecksan and Slamecksan, readers might observe that such thing as a heel is almost ridiculously insignificant and makes no real difference or impact on politics. Wearing different heels could therefore be regarded as a theatrical performance conducted by politicians in order to artificially maintain their battle for political power. The second part of

¹ Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, 51

the passage specifically identifies high-heel Tramecksan as Tory, since they have been deprived of their offices in government. Again, Swift describes the political situation after George I's succession and the process of cutting the influence of Tories and giving the political power to Whigs.

The Criticism of Anglo-French Rivalries

Gulliver's Travels is the novel rich in political satire and the criticism is aimed not only at political parties, but also Anglo-French rivalries and a subsequent impact on domestic and foreign policy. The overall picture of differences between England and France, which have been covered in literary works, is provided by John Richard Moores: "Where France had religious persecution and misguided superstition, England had its purportedly rational and comparatively tolerant Protestantism. France suffered under an all-powerful and rapacious monarchy, England enjoyed a political system checked by its constitution and the ideals of 1688."¹ In other words, the relationship between both countries had been shaped by the contrastive historical development in religion and politics.

The history of the Anglo-French international relationship is long and filled with wars and conflicts of various kinds, however, *Gulliver's Travels* covers mainly the period since the Glorious Revolution of 1688 to the year 1726, in which the book was published. The reason had been already revealed in the first chapter – satiric criticism and especially political satire aims at events that are recent and current for the author and his audience.

Rivalries between England and France are for example mentioned in Book I, chapter IV, when Reldresal, principal secretary for private affairs, enlightens to Gulliver domestic and foreign policy of Lilliput:

For [...] as flourishing a condition as we may appear to be in to foreigners, we labour under two mighty evils: a violent faction at home, and the danger of an invasion, by a most potent enemy, from abroad.²

Reldresal clearly alludes to political struggles between parties Tamecksan and Slamecksan when talking about 'a violent faction at home' and to rivalries between Lilliput and the neighbouring kingdom Blefuscu at the end of his speech. The clash between Tory and Whig parties is undoubtedly the true meaning of Tamecksan and Slamecksan. Moreover, the constant danger from Blefuscu represents English feelings towards France, with whom the English experienced the countless number of conflicts in the past. The degree of hostility is expressed by the choice of words 'mighty evils' and 'a most potent enemy', which illustrates animosity between the nations, a complicated history and in the case of fictional Lilliput

¹ John Richard Moores, *Representations of France in English Satirical Prints 1740-1832* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 27

² Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, 51

almost certainly the number of conflicts that had happened prior to the story of Book I – in accordance with the Anglo-French military history.

Nonetheless, an attitude towards France was dual since the Restoration. The people of England were never in favour of the French, just like the people of Lilliput are not in favour of Blefuscu. Reasons for aversion to France in the 17th century were especially Catholicism and French territorial ambitions.¹ However, the English sovereigns of the House of Stuart became closely connected with France since the Civil War. When Charles I was beheaded in 1649, the royal family fled to France and remained there in exile until 1660. The bond between Catholic Stuarts and France was demonstrated by Charles II who signed the secret alliance called the Treaty of Dover in order to attack the Dutch Republic in 1672.² His brother James II, who succeeded him in 1685, tried vigorously to fully restore Catholicism in England and used French king Louis XIV as a support.³ For example, as Christopher Hill says: “Louis XIV helped James to invade Ireland in the hope of returning thence to England.”⁴ These alliances and treaties illustrate the fact that France became a very important ally of the English monarchs belonging to the Catholic House of Stuart and the relationship between English and French courts were marvellous.

The dissension between English and French monarchies arose in 1688 when events of the Glorious Revolution happened. James II fled London for France, since his Protestant daughter Mary and her husband William of Orange were invited by the Parliament and came to Britain with the military support of the Dutch Republic.⁵ Subsequently, the Catholic monarchy was replaced by the Protestant monarchy. After the death of childless Mary and her husband William, Mary’s sister Anne, also Protestant, became the queen. In 1701, the Parliament wanted to prevent having another Catholic king, since Anne was childless as well, and therefore passed an Act of Settlement restricting the throne only to the Protestant heirs.⁶

Rivalries between England and France became frequent as the Catholic son of James II – James Francis Edward – claimed the English throne. Lee Morrissey describes the cause of the upcoming conflicts taking place after the Act of Union of 1707:

In the process, Queen Anne became the first ruler of Great Britain. There was, though, still the matter of her half-brother, the Old Pretender, James Francis

¹ Tombs, *The English and Their History*, 253

² Poplawski, *English Literature in Context*, 218

³ Tombs, *The English and Their History*, 257

⁴ Christopher Hill, *The Century of revolution 1603-1714* (London: Sphere Books, 1972), 223

⁵ Tombs, *The English and Their History*, 258

⁶ Fox, *The Cambridge Companion to Jonathan Swift*, 32

Edward. His followers in a court-in-exile in France had already declared him king upon the death in 1701 of his father, James II. France recognised him as king, thus siding with him against William, and later Anne.¹

The French support of the Catholic part of Stuart dynasty was evident and Robert Tombs adds: “As long as France supported the Stuarts, even discreetly, the cause of ‘James III’ was not lost.”² In summary, faith became one of the crucial requirements for the crown and just like the people of England were living in a constant religious conflict, the monarchy was not spared of the same dispute.

The religious cause of dispute between England and France is covered in *Gulliver’s Travels* as well. Paul J. DeGategno and R. Jay Stubblefield describe it as: “The vicious war between Blefuscu (France) and Lilliput (England) that began over a religious question of which end of an egg should a believer and patriot break (the Big Endians versus the Little Endians).”³ This idea is supported by the passage from Book I, chapter IV, in which Reldresal continues in his talk with Gulliver:

Which two mighty powers have, as I was going to tell you, been engaged in a most obstinate war for six-and-thirty moons past. It began upon the following occasion. It is allowed on all hands, that the primitive way of breaking eggs, before we eat them, was upon the larger end; but his present majesty’s grandfather, while he was a boy, going to eat an egg, and breaking it according to the ancient practice, happened to cut one of his fingers. Whereupon the emperor his father published an edict, commanding all his subjects, upon great penalties, to break the smaller end of their eggs.⁴

Paul J. DeGategno and R. Jay Stubblefield explain the initial cause in that conflict: “The current Lilliputian emperor’s grandfather who cut his finger breaking the egg the old-fashioned way represents the English king Henry VIII, who in 1534 broke with the Roman Catholic Church – the ‘Big-Endians’ – and created the Church of England – the ‘Little-Endians’.”⁵ Swift managed to incorporate the whole process of religious conflict in the chapter IV, which provided the 18th century reader with an unquestionable allusion to the situation in England.

Book I, chapter IV continues on the issue of religious dispute:

¹ Poplawski, *English Literature in Context*, 222

² Tombs, *The English and Their History*, 316

³ DeGategno and Stubblefield. *Critical Companion to Jonathan Swift: A Literary Reference to His Life and Works*, 155

⁴ Swift, *Gulliver’s Travels*, 52

⁵ DeGategno and Stubblefield. *Critical Companion to Jonathan Swift: A Literary Reference to His Life and Works*, 160

Now, the Big-endian exiles have found so much credit in the emperor of Blefuscu's court, and so much private assistance and encouragement from their party here at home, that a bloody war has been carried on between the two empires for six-and-thirty moons, with various success.¹

The Big-endian exiles refer to James II, who fled to France, and his son James Francis Edward. The Catholic branch of Stuarts found a reliable support at the French court, which caused a constant struggle between England and France. Especially the influence of Jacobites and the constant threat of rebellion disrupted the political stability of England. Swift was aware of that fact since he was a Tory member and was probably well-informed by his Jacobite friends about the extensive power of Jacobite movement. In addition, Swift might have even referred not only to Catholic Stuarts and Jacobites in Tory party, but also to the Jacobites who were forced to live in an exile due to the repressive policy and punishments performed by English kings and queens since the Glorious Revolution – especially George I and the Whig Court during Swift's life. The resulting prosecution of Jacobites and French support of Catholic Stuarts could be described as 'a bloody war', especially due to the number of military conflicts between England and France in the past, as well as in Swift's time period.

As the consequence of the French support of James Francis Edward, the naval invasion into Scotland was organised in 1708. James Francis Edward sailed north of Edinburgh with the naval support of France, but was turned back by the Royal Navy.² Christopher Hill even evaluates the defeat of French fleet as easy and claims that victory demonstrated the success of the Union of England and Scotland.³

The motif of an unsuccessful naval invasion is covered in *Gulliver's Travels* in Book I, chapter V, in which Gulliver captures the fleet of Blefuscu and prevents an invasion:

I arrived at the fleet in less than half an hour. The enemy was so frightened when they saw me, that they leaped out of their ships, and swam to shore, where there could not be fewer than thirty thousand souls. [...] Then I took up the knotted end of the cables, to which my hooks were tied, and with great ease drew fifty of the enemy's largest men of war after me.⁴

The whole three pages 55-57 describe the unsuccessful invasion of James Francis Edward in the hope of capturing Scotland. The complete absence of Blefuscan resistance to Gulliver

¹ Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, 53

² Poplawski, *English Literature in Context*, 222

³ Hill, *The Century of revolution 1603-1714*, 226

⁴ Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, 56

refers to an in advance lost attempt to succeed in revolting a Scottish rebellion. The principles of the Glorious Revolution were fully incorporated into the English law, Whig government was relatively successful in diminishing Jacobite plotters and the Hanoverian dynasty was well-established, therefore, English Protestant monarchy could not be endangered. Therefore, the giant Gulliver capturing the Blefusican fleet could be interpreted as the impressive power of England, whose security was on a great level and showed no weakness in resenting Catholic and French aggressors in armed conflicts.

In addition, one aspect of Anglo-French military conflicts is inseparably the matter of an army and financial difficulties connected to it. David Oakleaf notes: “Swift would later literalize the issue of the standing army, presenting Gulliver in Lilliput as a one-man expeditionary force whose appetite threatened to bankrupt the kingdom.”¹ The financial difficulties of maintaining a standing army are criticized in Book I, chapter II, in the form of Gulliver’s food requirements:

[...] an imperial commission was issued out, obliging all the villages, nine hundred yards round the city, to deliver in every morning six beeves, forty sheep, and other victuals for my sustenance; together with a proportionable quantity of bread, and wine, and other liquors; for the due payment of which, his majesty gave assignments upon his treasury.²

The excessive amount of food is even more highlighted in chapter VI:

A dish of their meat was a good mouthful, and a barrel of their liquor a reasonable draught. [...] I have had a sirloin so large, that I have been forced to make three bites of it; but this is rare. My servants were astonished to see me eat it, bones and all, as in our country we do the leg of a lark. Their geese and turkeys I usually ate at a mouthful, and I confess they far exceed ours. Of their smaller fowl I could take up twenty or thirty at the end of my knife.³

These passages illustrate that the amount of food sufficient for dozens of Lilliputians is only a mouthful for Gulliver. A simple question might occur on reader’s mind – whether the food requirements of Gulliver might devastate Lilliputian agriculture, economics and cause a famine or other disaster. The same question probably occurred on Swift’s mind and decided to criticize the military expenses in his work. Specifically, problems caused by sustaining a standing army threaten the whole England, just like sustaining Gulliver influences all villages near the capitol city in Lilliput. Moreover, ironical comments on the sirloin so large it had to

¹ Fox, *The Cambridge Companion to Jonathan Swift*, 41

² Swift, *Gulliver’s Travels*, 30

³ Swift, *Gulliver’s Travels*, 73

be eaten in three bites or a barrel of liquor making just a draught hint that no matter how large finances are spent on an army, it is never enough and resembles only a pinch at the end of a knife – just like Gulliver describes his dishes in Lilliput. In addition, the comment on Gulliver eating bones illustrates the massive expenditure on a standing army, which consumes literally everything exposed to it and citizens can do nothing but stare and awe, since there is no way they could ever change it – only king or Parliament can.

Furthermore, Swift provided the reader with the background knowledge of military conflicts between Lilliput and Blefuscu, which were triggered by cultural differences and the sense of superiority. These factors contributed to the willingness to engage in a military conflict, which is to be found in Book I, chapter V, when Gulliver describes languages of Lilliput and Blefuscu:

It is to be observed, that these ambassadors spoke to me, by an interpreter, the languages of both empires differing as much from each other as any two in Europe, and each nation priding itself upon the antiquity, beauty, and energy of their own tongue, with an avowed contempt for that of their neighbour.¹

Both nations, Lilliput and Blefuscu, consider themselves better and reasons for that conviction spring from a patriotic sense. Just like Lilliput and Blefuscu, even England and France built their arguments against each other on the confidence that their own nation and language is superior. Therefore, language becomes one of the most obvious and striking difference between the quarrelling nations. The contempt of Lilliputians and Blefusicians for the other language is the criticism of the overall contempt for a whole nation delivered by the symbol of a language. When Swift says that Lilliputians dislike the language of Blefuscu and vice versa, he is actually saying that England dislikes France and vice versa. Moreover, those antipathies are constantly perpetuated as both nations put more emphasis on their national pride rather than communication with each other – therefore, interpreters are needed since very few individuals are willing to learn the language of an alleged enemy.

¹ Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, 60

The Criticism of Science

Scientific progress of the Enlightenment played a major role in the period of Jonathan Swift. Simultaneously, political situation was very turbulent and science was used not only as a convenient tool for performing political decisions, but also reflected the distance of political leaders from the everyday life of citizens and inhabitants of colonies – especially of Ireland.

Concern for the Irish people is the source of Swift's satire on science. Therefore, his intention to criticize scientific progress springs not from Swift who is the dean of the Church of Ireland, but from Swift who is a humanist. The main reason for Swift's disapproval of the science of the Enlightenment is summarized by Colin Kiernan:

Swift's central argument is that while the scientists in Laputa are examining the stars and moving their island in accordance with the principles of Newtonian science, they are at the same time employing their flying island to grind the faces of the poor in Balnibarbi, which is Ireland. The question for Swift was: should money be spent examining the heavens or in ending poverty on earth?¹

In other words, scientists do not try to solve the real problems of mankind, instead, they waste their time, effort and resources on useless experiments, which are of no value for common people.

The separation of science from the surrounding world is noticed in Book III, chapter II, in which scientists are accompanied by flappers holding bladders filled with pebbles:

It seems the minds of these people are so taken up with intense speculations, that they neither can speak, nor attend to the discourses of others, without being roused by some external taction upon the organs of speech and hearing; for which reason, those persons who are able to afford it always keep a flapper [...]. And the business of this officer is, when two, three, or more persons are in company, gently to strike with his bladder the mouth of him who is to speak, and the right ear of him or them to whom the speaker addresses himself.²

Swift satirizes the inability of scientists to perceive the world around them, which results in the complete omission of citizens' needs. The counterproductivity of such condition is based on the fact that scientific progress should improve lives, which does not happen while scientists are not capable of identifying the objectives of citizens. Moreover, the inability to communicate is reciprocal, therefore not only the communication among scientists is

¹ Colin Kiernan, "Swift and Science," *The Historical Journal* 14 (1971): 712

² Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, 199

impossible, but also the communication with public is of a mediocre quality. The failure in communication is suggested to be the main source of inspiration for bizarre and useless experiments and inventions, since scientists perceive their work only from their point of view, which is heavily disrupted by constant speculative calculations and ideas.

Swift's antipathy towards scientists, who are preoccupied with unnecessary calculations, is based on the real aspect of the Enlightenment. As William E. Burns says: "A common career pattern was for a philosophe to establish a reputation in the sciences before turning to social or political questions."¹ Therefore, should a scientist want to solve current issues affecting the lives of people, he had to spend an initial proportion of his career by building his reputation. Otherwise, no matter how efficient his ideas might be, other scientists and academies would never take them into account unless he had spent a major proportion of his time and effort purposelessly.

The reason for the extensive popularity of the Enlightenment in Great Britain were its secular characteristics. People wanted to escape the turmoil of religious subjectivity experienced during the Civil War.² Therefore, the movement aiming at diminishing ignorance and spreading knowledge via science became attractive.³ The process of 'enlightening' was met with resistance in the Catholic regions, as scientific progress was often in a conflict with the Christian orthodoxy⁴, however, that was not the case of England. Robert Tombs says: "Enlightenment was not intentionally anti-religious, though it had underlying anti-religious implications. Anglican intellectuals were confident that science clearly vindicated their beliefs, and long remained so."⁵ As a result, the situation in England was very positive for the Enlightenment, which did not go unnoticed by politicians, who became aware of this condition and decided to profit from it.

One of the scientists who were used by politicians was Isaac Newton - the most influential scientists of the Age of Enlightenment. He became one of the targets of Swift's criticism due to his connection with the government, specifically for the participation in Wood's Halfpence affair. Gregory Lynall explains that the English manufacturer William Wood was granted a patent by the Crown to coin 360 tons of copper money for Ireland in 1722, since Ireland had a poor currency system that lacked small coinage and had no national mint. However, Wood obtained permission by means of corruption and connections (for

¹ William E. Burns, *Science in the Enlightenment: An Encyclopedia* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2003), 93

² Tombs, *The English and Their History*, 278

³ Philip M. Soergel, ed., *Arts and Humanities Through the Eras. The Age of the Baroque and Enlightenment 1600-1800* (Detroit: Gale, 2005), 304

⁴ Soergel, *Arts and Humanities Through the Eras. The Age of the Baroque and Enlightenment 1600-1800*, 304

⁵ Tombs, *The English and Their History*, 278

example, via Duchess of Kendal – George I’s mistress) and the patent was granted to a non-native minter and forced upon the Irish without their consent. The role of Isaac Newton, who held the position of a Master of the Mint, was to examine the quality of the coinage. Newton used specimens and discovered that the coins were all of full weight but varied widely, however, were still of about the same goodness and value like English coins.¹ Swift disapproved of Wood's Halfpence affair as an act breaching the independence of Ireland and undermining the authority of the Irish Parliament and other Irish institutions. Additionally, political background and ties to George I made it even worse.

Newton was seen by Swift as a man, who helped to deprive Ireland of part of its powers and contributed to the colonial tyranny. Gregory Lynall further describes the role of Newton with the example of Swift’s island Laputa: “Swift emphasizes the importance of Newton’s role in the halfpence affair, showing how ‘science’ has aided colonial oppression, literalized in the island’s downward force.”² The supremacy of England over colonies is for example criticized in Book III, chapter III:

If any town should engage in rebellion or mutiny, fall into violent factions, or refuse to pay the usual tribute, the king has two methods of reducing them to obedience. The first and the mildest course is, by keeping the island hovering over such a town, and the lands about it, whereby he can deprive them of the benefit of the sun and the rain, and consequently afflict the inhabitants with dearth and diseases: and if the crime deserve it, they are at the same time pelted from above with great stones [...]. But if they still continue obstinate, or offer to raise insurrections, he proceeds to the last remedy, by letting the island drop directly upon their heads, which makes a universal destruction both of houses and men.³

Laputa, through the scientific progress, was capable of elevating the city and form a flying island. The science therefore contributed to the supremacy of Laputa, which used gained power for controlling and exploiting all cities underneath. Controlled cities were held in a position of slaves and used only for harvesting resources, which would fuel the luxury of Laputians and bizarre experiments of scientists. Swift created in this example an allusion to the relationship between England and its colonies – especially Ireland. English political power was reinforced not exactly by advantages of scientific progress, but by scientists isolated from the real world, who spent their efforts in meaningless experiments and therefore, due to

¹ Gregory Lynall, *Swift and Science: The Satire, Politics, and Theology of Natural Knowledge, 1690-1730* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 94

² Lynall, *Swift and Science: The Satire, Politics, and Theology of Natural Knowledge, 1690-1730*, 114

³ Swift, *Gulliver’s Travels*, 214

indifference towards the real world, were easily manipulated to be in service of English politicians and act upon their objectives. Ireland, just like all cities in fictional Balnibarbi, was regarded by the English as just another colony suitable for exploitation, therefore, no approval or representation of Irish people was needed – as it happened in Wood's Halfpence affair with Newton's help.

The fact that science became the tool of politicians is observed by Douglas Lane Patey: "The name Laputa suggests it can be prostituted."¹ Therefore, even scientists could be used in politics, especially those appointed in high offices like Newton, who indeed became the target of Swift's satire. Just like Walpole was embodied in the character of Lord Treasurer of Lilliput in Book I, Newton was embodied in Tailor in Book III. Gregory Lynall observes: „Furthermore, that the 'Taylor' is commanded by the King of Laputa directly may imply Newton's biased role in the Wood affair."² This observation is supported by the passage in Book III, chapter II:

Those to whom the king had entrusted me, observing how ill I was clad, ordered a tailor to come next morning, and take measure for a suit of clothes. This operator did his office after a different manner from those of his trade in Europe. He first took my altitude by a quadrant, and then, with a rule and compasses, described the dimensions and outlines of my whole body, all which he entered upon paper; and in six days brought my clothes very ill made, and quite out of shape, by happening to mistake a figure in the calculation. But my comfort was, that I observed such accidents very frequent, and little regarded.³

The Laputian king's direct appointing of tailor could be interpreted as the possible George I's involvement in Wood's Halfpence affair and the act of involving Newton to deliver evidence supporting the whole suspicious affair is being emphasized. Besides, the description of tailor's peculiar process of measuring Gulliver could be interpreted in two ways. Firstly, confusing measurements could be understood as the impracticality of modern science and its calculations, which is emphasized by the statement that results of a poor quality are so frequent they do not concern public anymore. Secondly, the questionable technique of measuring could be interpreted as Swift's opinion expressing doubts about Newton's accuracy and correctness in calculating coinage in Wood's Halfpence affair.

The satiric attack on Newton served as a trigger for the satiric criticism of the whole branch of science. Isaac Newton represented 'new science', or sometimes called 'natural

¹ Douglas Lane Patey, "Swift's Satire on "Science" and the Structure of Gulliver's Travels," *ELH* 58 (1991): 827

² Lynall, *Swift and Science: The Satire, Politics, and Theology of Natural Knowledge, 1690-1730*, 104

³ Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, 202

philosophy', which was characterized by conducting experiments and deepening knowledge in order to surpass the learning of philosophers of ancient Greece and Rome.¹ Simultaneously, natural philosophers believed that empirical and mathematical methods of modern science could be applied to all spheres of thought.² As a result, the contemporary concept of 'science' emerged and the struggle between Ancient and Modern appeared – of which Swift is aware and satirizes it.³ In summary, scientific progress did not produce desirable and anticipated results – at least in Swift's opinion.

Swifts negative attitude towards inventions of natural philosophers can be traced in Book III, chapter V, in which Gulliver encounters scientists in the academy of Lagado:

The first man I saw was of a meagre aspect, with sooty hands and face, his hair and beard long, ragged, and singed in several places. His clothes, shirt, and skin, were all of the same colour. He has been eight years upon a project for extracting sunbeams out of cucumbers, which were to be put in phials hermetically sealed, and let out to warm the air in raw inclement summers. He told me, he did not doubt, that, in eight years more, he should be able to supply the governor's gardens with sunshine.⁴

Another example of scientific progress inspired by nature is in the same chapter:

There was a most ingenious architect, who had contrived a new method for building houses, by beginning at the roof, and working downward to the foundation; which he justified to me, by the like practice of those two prudent insects, the bee and the spider.⁵

This set of examples show that even though many of the mentioned experiments may bizarrely sound to be useful in theory and initial ideas spring from real-life examples, such as the comparison with bees and spiders, it completely fails when tried to be implemented into practice. The failure of inventions made by the academy of Lagado serves as a parallel supporting Swift's opinion that natural philosophers were absolutely cut from the real world and all their ideas, though meant to be productive and improving the quality of life, are only a bunch of nonsense, which has no real value for people, nor is capable of being performed in practice.

The list of grotesque inventions of Lagadan academy further continues:

¹ Burns, *Science in the Enlightenment: An Encyclopedia*, 93

² Burns, *Science in the Enlightenment: An Encyclopedia*, 93

³ Patey, "Swift's Satire on "Science" and the Structure of Gulliver's Travels," 810

⁴ Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, 224

⁵ Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, 225

The artist himself was at that time busy upon two great designs; the first, to sow land with chaff, wherein he affirmed the true seminal virtue to be contained, as he demonstrated by several experiments, which I was not skilful enough to comprehend. The other was, by a certain composition of gums, minerals, and vegetables, outwardly applied, to prevent the growth of wool upon two young lambs; and he hoped, in a reasonable time to propagate the breed of naked sheep, all over the kingdom.¹

The second set of examples show the degree to which natural philosophers were distant from the real world. All those experiments are in a direct contradiction with not only general knowledge of that time, but also with principles of common sense. What usage the sheep without wool would be and why any farmer would grow chaff, when it does not provide any food. Readers might observe some little rational intention in previous examples, however, experiments described here possess an absence of even a flash of rationality. In other words, eccentric experiments are doomed to be failures in advance and only absorb finances.

The finance-consuming aspect of natural philosophy and scientists practicing it is also covered in Book III, chapter V, when talking about the inventor extracting sunbeams from cucumbers:

[...] he complained that his stock was low, and entreated me ‘to give him something as an encouragement to ingenuity, especially since this had been a very dear season for cucumbers.’ I made him a small present, for my lord had furnished me with money on purpose, because he knew their practice of begging from all who go to see them.²

Financial expenses of Lagadan academy and the excessive wasting of money on impractical and in advance useless experiments is used as a parallel to the expenditures that could be used in a more efficient way, for example improving situation in kingdom – Ireland included.

¹ Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, 228

² Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, 224

Conclusion

The satire in *Gulliver's Travels* is rich and covers an immense list of areas. This paper further analyses the satiric tools used in the work, political struggles, which were frequently influenced by the international relationship with France and the connection between politics and scientists of the Enlightenment.

The satiric tone is achieved mainly by the usage of irony, which is omnipresent throughout the whole book, and serves to deliver Swift's critical opinions in a masked manner. Irony is further combined with the usage of invective, which serves as an insulting force. Furthermore, Swift's invective is unique, since he does not use simple vulgar expressions, instead, he uses complex and non-vulgar phrases creating an image depicting the target of criticism in an unpleasant and ridiculing situation. Subsequently, to add the credibility to the work, Swift uses the technique called persona. *Gulliver's Travels* was not published under the name Jonathan Swift, but the fictional adventurer Lemuel Gulliver, as a form of creating not only a credible author, but also protecting himself from the wrath of criticized individuals.

Satiric attacks in *Gulliver's Travels* are not direct, since the political situation was very dangerous for Tories. Swift was a member of Whig party at first, but due to the non-fulfilment of promises made by his allies and newly gained awareness of the ideological shift in Whig agenda, Swift changed for Tories. Subsequently, the target of satiric attacks was the prime minister Robert Walpole, who represented the corrupted ideological form of modern Whigs, which Swift detested. The resentment towards Whigs was multiplied by their alliance with king George I, who openly detested Tories. Whigs and George I prosecuted Jacobite movement, which became the major point of criticism, due to the fact that many Jacobites were Swift's friends.

The criticism of monarchy is connected with the criticism of Anglo-French rivalries. The relationship with France was dual – common people detested French due to historical and territorial reasons, but on the other hand kings Charles II and James II were in a tight alliance with France because of the shared Catholic faith and help for Stuarts in exile during the Civil war. However, this alliance ended with the Glorious Revolution of 1688, which brought Protestants on the English throne. Conflicts between Catholic Stuarts in exile and Protestant monarchs arose, which brought immense expenses on standing army. Military issues form a proportion of satiric criticism and serve mainly as a supporting element in criticizing domestic and foreign policy. Swift attacked domestic political struggles between Hanoverian king

George I and Whig administration led by Walpole on one side and the Tories and secret Jacobites, supporting Catholic Stuarts, on the other side.

Domestic policy was further criticized in the relation with the attitude towards colonies, namely Ireland. The paper presented one of the tools contributing to the exploitation – science of the Enlightenment. Even more specifically, the criticism of the scientific progress was aimed mainly at the person Isaac Newton, who, according to Swift, played a major role in Wood's Halfpence affair, which was seen as an act of depriving Irish of their independence. The attack on Newton triggered the attack on the whole area of science called 'new science' or 'natural philosophy'. Swift presented science of the Enlightenment as impractical and without any useful purpose for real-life needs and issues. The absence of solutions and impracticality was emphasized by Swift in his work in order to present natural philosophers like Newton as political tools misused by the Whig party and monarchy for oppression of not only Ireland, but also the political opposition.

Resumé

Tato bakalářská práce se věnuje satirické kritice v díle Gulliverovy cesty od Jonathana Swifta. Časové období, ve kterém Jonathan Swift žil a pracoval na tomto díle, bylo velmi napjaté a vyplněno nezměrným množstvím konfliktů jak mezi politickými stranami Whigů a Toryů, tak i konflikty s královskou dynastií, náboženskými spory mezi katolíky a protestanty, spory se sousední Francií a rovněž i změnami ve společnosti způsobenými osvícenstvím. Samotná kritika v díle se vztahuje především na období přibližně od roku 1700 až 1726, kdy byla kniha vydána, nicméně kvůli zasazení do historického a kulturního kontextu je v této práci zahrnuto i období po revoluci roku 1688.

Dynamické události na Britských ostrovech vytvořily příhodné podmínky a atmosféru pro rozvoj satiry, v níž se Jonathan Swift stal velmi záhy mistrem. Tato práce sleduje, jakými satirickými technikami a nástroji dosáhl kýžené a efektivní kritiky, jakož i jeho důvody pro satirické útoky na jím vybrané osoby, hnutí a instituce.

Práce není rozdělena tradičním způsobem na teoretickou a praktickou část, nýbrž obě části jsou spojeny v jeden celek, a to tím způsobem, že teoretické poznatky jsou vždy přímo podepřeny ukázkami z díla. Účelem tohoto uspořádání je jednak důraznější a přesné znázornění kritizovaného objektu v samotném díle a jednak toto uspořádání napomáhá ucelenosti pojednávané látky, díky čemuž text plyne bez větších narušení. Každá ze čtyř kapitol odpovídá jednomu tématu, jako je nastínění satiry jako žánru a satirické metody užívané Swiftem, nadále kritika anglické politiky, poté následuje kritika anglo-francouzských rivalit, které ovlivňují jak vojenské záležitosti, tak i domácí a zahraniční politiku, a nakonec kritika vědeckého pokroku v období osvícenství.

Kapitola pojednávající o satire jako žánru představuje hlavní nástroje užívané Swiftem. Prvním takovým nástrojem je ironie, která je všudypřítomná ve Swiftově díle. Pomocí ironie, která prezentuje lež jako pravdu, Swift vytvořil kritické pasáže, které tančily na hranici mezi kritikou a pochvalou, a tudíž Swift nemohl být přímo obviněn z urážky. Dalším nástrojem je invektiv, který ale není ve Swiftově případě užíván jako vulgární nadávka, nýbrž je tvořen komplexní a květnatou frází, která ve čtenářově představivosti vytváří zesměšňující obraz o kritizovaném objektu – tudíž má větší důraz než obyčejná nadávka. V neposlední řadě se mezi satirické techniky Swifta počítá i persona, čímž Swift svému dílu dodával element věrohodnosti. Gulliverovy cesty nebyly zveřejněny jako dílo Jonathana Swifta, nýbrž Lemuela Gullivera – dobrodruha a objevitele, tím pádem osobnosti, které čtenáři mohli uvěřit, že se fantaskní příhody skutečně staly. Navíc tato technika

umožnila zařazení knihy do žánru cestovatelských rukopisů. Díky nabyté věrohodnosti a zdánlivému odklonu od přímé kritiky tato technika rovněž posloužila jako ochrana Swifta před útoky politických subjektů, které mohla kritika v tomto díle nahněvat.

Kritika anglické politiky je tématem druhé kapitoly, která se zaměřuje na spory mezi stranami Whigů a Toryů a posléze se zaměřuje na ministerského předsedu Roberta Walpolea a administrativu krále Jiřího I. Co se týče kritiky politických stran, Swift kritizuje odklon Whigů od svého původního programu a cílů. Swift byl původně členem strany Whigů, nicméně po zklamání ve svých politických spojencích a nedosažení svých cílů byl přemluven a nakonec i přijat mezi řady Toryů. Swift tuto zdánlivě radikální změnu stran odůvodňoval tím, že je zastáncem principů tzv. starých Whigů. Podle jeho mínění došlo k tomu, že programy jednotlivých stran se změnily a nastala situace, kdy se Whigové posunuli do jiných oblastí politiky, kdežto program Toryů začal reflektovat právě principy starých Whigů. Důvodem pro zcela odlišný směr Whigů je podle Swifta povaha hlavních stranických osobností, které jsou reprezentovány ministerským předsedou Robertem Walpolem. Swift ve svém díle na mnoha místech útočí právě na Walpolea, kterému dává za vinu, že strana se pod jeho vedením zkazila. Walpole se ve své funkci, podle mínění Swifta, až příliš zaobíral finančními záležitostmi a krytím politiků, bankéřů a dalších vlivných osobností v různých ekonomických a politických aférách, jako např. South Sea Bubble. Principy starých Whigů – prosazování mechanismů revoluce 1688, kdy parlament má legislativní moc zasahovat do záležitostí královské dynastie a dvora, a pronásledování členů hnutí Jakobínů (Toryové, kteří se snažili dosadit na trůn katolického Stuartovce Jakuba Františka žijícího v exilu) – byly odsunuty na druhou kolej a nahrazeny obsesí financemi a navazováním styků s vlivnými osobami, které napomáhají zkorumpovanosti politiků. Tento vývoj politických stran posloužil Swiftovi jako výklad toho, proč změnil politickou příslušnost, a tudíž celá záležitost vykresluje Swifta jako konzistentní osobu, která je věrná svým vlastním hodnotám.

Nicméně Swift má při bližším zkoumání daleko ke konzistentnosti. Jedním z principů starých Whigů je již zmíněné pronásledování členů hnutí Jakobínů a Swift, jakožto vyznavač těchto principů, by měl Jakobíny opovrhovat. Jenže opak je pravdou – mnoho Jakobínů se řadilo mezi Swiftovi blízké přátele. Jak je v této bakalářské práci zmíněno, Swift je člověk, který se velmi často snažil jít svou vlastní cestou a z různých hnutí a politických a filozofických směrů si vybíral to, co ho zrovna zaujalo. Swift se tím snažil vytvořit svou vlastní originální filozofii, kterou se řídil. Jenže ve výsledku do tohoto konstruktů zapojil mnohdy protichůdné hodnoty, které jak čtenářovi, tak i jeho dobovým přátelům a rivalům způsobovaly zmatenost. Z tohoto důvodu byl Swift několikrát nucen dokazovat, že není

členem Jakobínů. Záležitosti a politické procesy spojené s Jakobínským hnutím se staly vcelku obsáhlým předmětem satirické kritiky v Gulliverových cestách. Nicméně čtenář by měl mít na paměti, že všechna obrana Jakobínů nebyla myšlena jako obrana celého hnutí, nýbrž pouze Swiftových přátel, kteří se mezi Jakobíny řadili.

Předmětem kritiky v jakobínské otázce se stal král Jiří I. z německého rodu Hanover, který otevřeně opovrhoval Toryi jak kvůli jejich jakobínským inklinacím, tak i kvůli jejich spoluúčasti na vyjednání mírové dohody z Utrechtu v roce 1713, kterou Jiří I. chápal jako anglickou zradu evropských spojenců ve válce o španělské dědictví. Jiří I. tudíž veškerou politickou moc předal administrativě Whigů vedených Walpolem a následující období bylo pro stranu Toryů velmi nebezpečné, protože mnoho z nich bylo zbaveno jakékoli politické moci nebo dokonce i trestně stíháno. Právě v tomto období bylo mnoho Toryů usvědčeno z příslušnosti k Jakobínům a následně popraveno. Tyto procesy se staly terčem kritiky ve Swiftově díle a to konkrétně zákulisní jednání mezi králem a politickými špičkami Whigů a následné královy proslovy. Co se týče tajných jednání, tak Swift vyzdvihl jednak vnitřní rozpory, kdy se jednotlivé strany tajných debat nedokázaly shodnout na adekvátní formě trestu, a jednak až samozřejmou krutost zúčastněných. Jednotliví politici a král byli vykresleni jako členové tajné rady fiktivní země Lilliput, která rozhodovala o osudu Gullivera. Návrhy trestů lilliputských protějšků, jako bylo vyhladovění, tajné otrávení, upálení zaživa a následný kompromis ve formě bolestivého zbavení zraku, sloužily jako ilustrace povahy královského dvora a administrativy Whigů, pro něž nebyla smrt či mučení žádný problém v cestě za dosažením svých politických cílů. Na tuto kritiku navázal Swift kritikou králových proslovů, kdy Jiří I. po popravě Jakobínů hovořil o své laskavosti a mírnosti, který zrovna projevil. Ačkoli už toto zní jako ironie sama o sobě, Swift tyto proslovy zakomponoval do své kritiky a obohatil je poznámkou o tom, že už i veřejnost si povšimla, že čím více král zdůrazňuje svou mírnost a trest je krutější, tím více je potrestaný nevinný. Swift tímto narážel na nehumánní a dle jeho mínění trestuhodné jednání, jakého se dostalo jeho přátelům z řad Jakobínů.

Historické pozadí pro spory s Jakobíny částečně podává třetí kapitola, která se zabývá problematikou anglo-francouzských rivalit. Mezinárodní vztahy mezi Anglií a Francií zahrnují nesčetné množství sporů a konfliktů, nicméně relevantní pro dílo Gulliverovy cesty je období po revoluci 1688 až do 1726. Je třeba poznamenat, že vztah s Francií byl v tomto období z počátku dvojitý. Na jedné straně byl prostý lid, který nikdy neměl Francouze v lásce, a na druhé straně stála královská dynastie katolických Stuartovců, kteří si k Francii vybudovali pozitivní vztah díky společné víře a také poskytnutému azylu v období občanské války. Nicméně tato situace se změnila roku 1688, kdy byl katolický král Jakub II. vyhnán z Anglie

poté, co na pozvání Parlamentu podnikla invazi Jakubova protestanská dcera Marie se svým manželem Vilémem Oranžským. Vzhledem k tomu, že tento pár byl bezdětný a stejně tak i Mariina sestra Anna, tak se na základě zákona Act of Settlement z roku 1701 stal dědicem trůnu Jiří I. Hanoverský. Ačkoli jsou události po roku 1688 z právního hlediska legitimní, katolickou větev Stuartovců to nezastavilo v tom, aby se i nadále pokoušela získat zpět anglický trůn.

Jakub František – syn Jakuba II., využíval podporu Francie v celé záležitosti. Kromě jiného byl francouzským králem jmenován anglickým králem Jakubem III. a s podporou francouzské flotily se pokusil vyvolat povstání ve Skotsku, které ovšem skončilo neúspěchem. Swift tuto událost připomněl ve svém díle, když použil motiv vojenské invaze z fiktivního království Blefuscu do sousedního Lilliputu v první knize. Kritika rivalit mezi Anglií a Francií byla nadále v této knize do detailů rozpracována, když Swift vykresloval politickou situaci v obou fiktivních královstvích. Příčinou rozporů byla otázka tlustokoncových a tenkokoncových vyznavačů v tom, na které straně se má rozbít vejce – tento příměr jasně reflektoval náboženské spory v Anglii mezi katolíky a protestanty. Nadále Swift do toho příměru zahrnul i útěk diskriminovaných náboženských a politických menšin do sousedního státu, kde se jim dostalo plné podpory – opět, Swift vykresluje perzekuci katolíků a jejich útěk společně s emigrací Toryů, kteří byli Jakobíny, do sousední Francie. Jinými slovy, francouzská podpora katolíků a katolických Stuartovců do značné míry utváří podobu domácí a zahraniční politiky Anglie, jejíž vláda a královský dvůr tím pádem podniká kroky k potlačení jakékoli rebelie a politické opozice z řad Toryů.

Vedle politických záležitostí spojených s rivalitou s Francií Swift rovněž kritizuje i to, jak tento mnohdy ozbrojený konflikt ovlivňuje ekonomickou situaci Anglie. Kvůli neustálému sporu s Francií je udržována stálá profesionální armáda, která nicméně představuje obrovskou finanční zátěž, která ohrožuje blaho země. Jako metafora pro tyto přehnané výdaje je použita osoba Gullivera v Lilliputu v knize první, jehož stravovací návyky téměř devastují zemědělskou produkci země a ta se tím pádem stálým tempem posouvá k ekonomickému kolapsu. Stejnou situaci Swift viděl i v Anglii za svého života a pokládal to za vinu politickému pletichaření.

Způsob, jakým politické strany a její členové využívají různé instituce a obory k dosažení svých cílů, je zmíněn v závěrečné kapitole. Počátek 18. století zaznamenal vzestup vlivu osvícenství a především v Anglii se do popředí dostal Isaac Newton, který byl členem tzv. „natural philosophy“, někdy též označované jako „nová věda“. Cílem vědců v osvícenství bylo překonat znalosti filozofů antického Řecka a Říma a poskytnout lidstvu nové a užitečné

vědomosti a vynálezy. Nicméně ani pole vědy nezůstalo nedotčené politikou a Isaac Newton byl zapleten do aféry Wood's Halfpence, kdy byl pověřen kontrolou nově ražených mincí pro Irsko a shledal, že ačkoli mají mince nedostatky, tak mohou jít do oběhu. Swift tuto aféru kritizoval z toho důvodu, že Irsko a jeho úřady neměly žádnou možnost, jak do celé věci zasáhnout a tím pádem jim byla odepřena nezávislost v rozhodování o interních záležitostech. Newton byl tím pádem Swiftem chápán jako člověk, který se spolupodílel na opresi Irska, a právě jeho vědecký posudek posvětil tuto aféru, která byla zastoupena zkorumpovanými politiky. Swift tudíž učinil z Newtona jeden z terčů své kritiky v knize třetí ve fiktivním městě Laputa, které bylo osídleno vědci. Předmětem kritiky se stala například nepraktičnost vědeckých experimentů a výzkumů, které odporovaly zdravému rozumu, např. extrakce slunečních paprsků z okurek nebo stavění domů od střechy po základy podle vzorů včel a pavouků. Především narážky na odůvodnění v přírodě sloužilo Swiftovi jako poukázání na obor natural philosophy a celé bádání těchto vědců vykreslil jako plýtvání penězi a úsilím na něco nepodstatného, zatímco by tyto zdroje mohly být vynaloženy na prospěšnější projekty – např. vyřešení hladomorů v Irsku. Jinými slovy, odtržení osvícenských vědců od skutečného života dovolilo politikům, aby obor vědy využily jako politický nástroj pro své vlastní účely, které se často míjely s blahem země.

Bibliography

Fox, Christopher, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Jonathan Swift*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of criticism: four essays*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1971.

Highet, Gilbert. *The anatomy of satire*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1962.

Knight, Charles A. *The literature of satire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Rabb, Melinda Alliker. *Satire and secrecy in English literature from 1650 to 1750*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Bentman, Raymond. "Satiric Structure and Tone in the Conclusion of Gulliver's Travels." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 11, no. 3 (1971): 535-48. Accessed October 13, 2016.

Ehrenpreis, Irvin. "Swift and Satire." *College English* 13, no. 6 (1952): 309-12. Accessed October 13, 2016.

Brennan, Tom. *Politics & Government in Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

Tombs, Robert. *The English and Their History*. London: Penguin Books, 2015.

Oakleaf, David. *A Political Biography of Jonathan Swift*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2008.

Higgins, Ian. *Swift's politics: a study in disaffection*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

DeGategno, Paul J., and R. Jay. Stubblefield. *Critical Companion to Jonathan Swift: A Literary Reference to His Life and Works*. New York: Facts on File, 2006.

Poplawski, Paul, ed. *English Literature in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Gadd, Ian Anders., and Bertrand A. Goldgar, eds. *English Political Writings 1711-1714: The Conduct of the Allies and Other Works*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Bloom, Harold, ed. *Jonathan Swift's Gulliver's Travels*. New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2009.

Hill, Christopher. *The Century of revolution 1603-1714*. London: Sphere Books, 1972.

Moore, John Richard. *Representations of France in English Satirical Prints 1740-1832*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Downie, James Alan. "Swift and Jacobitism." *ELH* 64, no. 4 (1997): 887-901. Accessed February 15, 2017.

French, David P. "Swift, the Non-Jurors, and Jacobitism." *Modern Language Notes* 72, no. 4 (1957): 258-64. Accessed February 15, 2017.

Kiernan, Colin. "Swift and Science." *The Historical Journal* 14, no. 04 (1971): 709-22. Accessed October 13, 2016.

Burns, William E. *Science in the Enlightenment: An Encyclopedia*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2003.

Soergel, Philip M., ed. *Arts and Humanities Through the Eras. The Age of the Baroque and Enlightenment 1600-1800*. Detroit: Gale, 2005.

Lynall, Gregory. *Swift and Science: The Satire, Politics, and Theology of Natural Knowledge, 1690-1730*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Patey, Douglas Lane. "Swift's Satire on "Science" and the Structure of Gulliver's Travels." *ELH* 58, no. 4 (1991): 809-39. Accessed October 13, 2016.

Baldick, Chris. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Swift, Jonathan. *Gulliver's Travels*. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1952.