

Corneille and Pope in Comparative Survey

Yong-Woo Jin

If we take a paragraph of Corneille's with some of Pope's and compare l'imagination mecanique of the constituent stones of the one's building with the apparent monotony, though at a glance such a comparison would be too reckless of outcome to spill the wrathful heat, of those of the other, the difference may be at first quite a simple thought overlaid with a Galimatias, rather a bewildering. In following such bewildering not in the light of choosing the paragraph from among each one's literary works, but on the point of comparing them with each other in likeness and taste or purport, what becomes clear from an examination of Pope's views and their application in the poem is that his version of grounding his poem is by no means infrequently connected with together with the strings of the giant of French classicism.

Consequently, here and elsewhere Pope touches him as much to his subject and can afford to employ its attributes as suitably as he expected to be deserving worth that employment. Such employment whose literal meaning is in a sense so ambiguous as to be mistaken readily might raise something of curiosity to think of this paper only in terms of that translation of expressing far more of what original meaning would suggest than expected to do so in its literal and figurative meaning, or in the amplification and its opposite accessible to the original version respectively. There is another way to construe the word "employment", the way into the imitation, and into the plagiarism or counterfeit. Here a good many of controversy has been raised and played directly, not quite enough for this, into the stance being unballasted in fathomless and unquiet deep of opinions. If we consider how the list set wide, it will come to question the assumptions of the methodology which since the early time the scholars have taken advantage of in advocating as well as institutionalizing what they saw and thought in that their statements, however prejudiced or preconceived, led to the speculation on the focus of similarity between the poets worthy to be compared each other, even to the extent where one's influence can wrench the stance of the other.

The diversity of opinions regarding such comparison as will be shown below may have as many cases as there were separate schools to exercise patience for looking forward to what is new and worthy of studying. In order to properly

evaluate one's position in his literariness influenced by the donor, it is likely to speak of both that comparison analysis as the main tools of the literary critic in that the former should be subordinate to the latter and of that the role of comparison is to promote more accurate literary analysis, as is affirmed by T. S. Eliot. And further on did he how great the role of the analysis as such is in illuminating the work of particular authors and the general problem of what the poet as such is doing.¹ On the other hand, this means nothing less than the assurance that to take an opposing stance to what is referred by the modern colossus of literary criticism is an immediate, rather kind of obtrusive, concern we are not too often to meet as in cases of sorts as usual.

Here for the first time in English criticism, Dryden is seen as the critic whose intellectual and literary greatness have seldom been denied. More than this, to put it in detailed terms of critical field, his famous *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* has more and more so clearly recognized as to guarantee that he was never capitulated to French influence in the face of the fact that he was well aware of what was going on in France and was prepared to argue the French point of view in the time. Such is the case in his subjective and independant way to treat the current trend that the bulk of tributes paid to his achievements of literary success has been supported by his everlasting vindication of literary criticism. Someone might be afraid that this praise of him would reach further above than deserved to be given to him, but it will be on the ground that this kind of skeptical reader will admit that he should pass to the explanation of the following quotation from Dryden, whose view point of the term "comparison" as stated above is not amiss to give the reader the whole argument to be laid open and understandable as well.

He was deeply conversant in the ancients, both Greek and Latin, and he borrowed boldly from them: there is scarce a poet or historian among the Roman authors of those times whom he has not translated in *Sejanus* and *Catiline*. But he has done his robberies so openly, that one may see he fears not to be taxed by any law. He invades authors like a monarch; and what would be theft in other poets is only victory in him. With the spoils of these writers he so represents old Rome to us, in its rites, ceremonies, and customs, that if one of their poets had written either of his tragedies, we had seen less of it than

¹ James Torrsen. "T.S. Eliot and the Austere Poetics of Valéry," *Comparative Literature*, 23 No. 1 (Winter 1971), 1.

in him.²

The substance of those “spoils of these writers” on Dryden’s argument was non the less what we call the influence, or rather imitation, or again rather plagiarism. His own word being applied more delicately than ever to its real meaning, than otherwise, above all more than this, in fact what we like it to be, “robberies”, for what was written as literariness, is not a secret act, but something so apparent and so clear as never to hide out from the ineffacable proof, the written language. In other words, this influence has the quintessence of change to go through several of its Protean metamorphosis – as is shown in the quotation, “borrowed boldly”, “translated,” “done robberies so openly,” to invade authors like a monarch,” “what would be theft in other poets,” and “with the spoils of these writers.” All of these different denominations are all in all up to and including the boundary of the term” comparison”; and so far here we can discover that the more the poet borrowed, the more victories and the higher poetical imagination he can get, along with the benefit of what we call the literary tradition as commanding in his conceits as an individual talents, leveraging up to the ears in that full-fledged stand at which he as poet writes and composes at will as well as freely.

Before going further on to the extent to which the matters more serious than the current tempo of what is now going along should be applied, it is plausible to discuss the allusion of the pronoun “he” Dryden used in his Essay on Dramatic Posey, the allusion with which Ben Jonson’s literary achievements are characterized and so are alluded to the title of critic. Such is the eloquence of what the name of Jonson is the representative of all poets who are exposed to severe trials of comparison, and one most exemplified of them is this specific case of himself we have on hand now. Though it is proper to regard him as both a symbolic and a realistic critic sharing our controversial periphery, his genuine hold clear enough from the quotation consisting of about ten lines comes to be more meaningful by taking into account another similar language from that which T.S. Eliot emphasized in *The Waste Land*.

The analogy was that of the catalyst. When the two gasses previously mentioned are mixed in the presence of a filament of platinum, they form sulphurous acid. This combination takes places only if the

² John Dryden, “An Essay of Dramatic Posey,” in *The Norton Anthology of English Literature* Vol.1 ed. M.H. Abrams and others (New York: W.W. Norton, 1979), p. 1803.

platinum is present; nevertheless they newly formed acid contains no trace of platinum, and the platinum itself is apparently unaffected; has remained inert, neutral, and unchanged. The mind of the poet is the shred of platinum. It may partly or exclusively operate upon the experience of the man himself; but, the more perfect the artist, the more completely separate in him will be the man who suffers and the mind which creates; the more perfectly will the mind digest and transmute the passions which are its material.³

This catalyst phenomenon is more rightly and more pithily compared for the literary tradition in so terse a metaphor in expressing "the experience" that it will cause a suspicion whether it is right or not, if in case of any remark about such a suitable declaration, arbitrary as it may seem at a glance among readers, as "The mind of the poet is the shred of platinum." Perhaps it may be possible to assume that the "experience of the man" is what he called "a more intelligible exposition of the relation of the poet to the past." This language might in a distinct sense insinuate that "the poet must develop or procure the consciousness of the past and that he should continue to develop this consciousness through his career." Pope's venture in embarking on procuring or plagiarizing Corneille is, therefore, so little peculiar as to take it for granted that such plagiarism is not any more queer or eccentric in the modesty of poets or rather writers not only in poetic works but also in other similar pieces, than the main current of literary tradition lingers in an age of the distinguished poets of reputation, which they must be conscious of and are so felicitously.

This assumption of Pope's plagiarising Corneille is nothing other than the pivotal point of controversy to be discussed hereafter, so that the stance of this statement is not liable to exception from skepticism to prefer an exclusive, rather, from the view point of others, partial and arbitrary thought to what would seem to be ascribed as a more reasonable theory. This is here marked as such from the commonplace principle that what we call the way of reasoning keeps not only on the rule of the Socratic dialogue but also on the reasonable inquisition of whatever renders the present subject controversial, stressed by means of practicality, means so exclusive enough to hold an identification between that main discussion in theory and its hypothetic air about the concerned matters of subject. Which becomes gradually clear from an examination both of Corneille's views and of the discourse of Pope's poetizing as well as

³ T.S. Eliot, *The Sacred Wood*, (London: Methuen), 1957, p.54.

applying them in composing of the poem, *An Essay on Criticism*. Before identifying it with If or Evans's affirmation, this modest attitude of caretaker for a crucial stance which tethers in full and influentially the direction of theorizing what would be discoursed for the main interpretation we hold hereafter.

With such considerations in mind, we find Conreille's contribution to *An Essay on Criticism* emerge from translating the philosophical tenets and at the same time practising translation by means of what seems to be word for word, not alone supporting its substantial or realistic thought, as if to make a reader wander over the territory of his literary practice by way of the disguise clothed in English language. In other words, it seems agreeable that the succession of theorizing Pope's plagiarism to be clarified hereafter should be focus of what is to be rendered with certain resolution to some extent to which it can do well for its part to terminate a coherent statement. It is only with the passages from both of these poets' achievements rather than otherwise like doing the distinguished role for their sake of literary benefits descending down on that we can examine the real shape of plagiarism by means of comparing them word for word, little of reflecting their own literary heritage or tradition to the later ages, as in usual cases of the ordinary approaching medium to handle what we call comparative literature.

Meanwhile, to disregard literary tradition completely is, it is often said, the most dangerous pursuit to come real. So remarks which are of reverse of this disregard have been voted hitherto, particularly in taking advantage of clever manipulation of it equally both in name and in reality, and sometimes in moment of emphasizing the trend of the age whose writers of exuberance carried business on the highest grade or on the finest copiousness in profession of poet, as practised in the Augustan age, so that the name of tradition must be affirmed on respect of its virtue that the writer's life is surrounded with the complete cloud of tradition.

This spirit of inquiry extended beyond science into literature and philosophy. John Dryden, a figure symbolical of his age, applied himself in prose to examine the workshop of literature in essays modelled on those of Cornelle, of which *The Essay of Dramatic Posey* is the earliest, and the *Preface to the Fables*, written in the year of his death, is the most engaging, especially in the comparison of Chaucer and Ovid. Dryden had some of the old mannerism in his prose, but, at his best, he combined "the other harmony of prose" with an easy manner of creating an informal atmosphere, and of allowing the reader

to enter into the development of an argument.⁴

It is difficult to determine precisely from this passage which of Corneille's works Dryden modelled and applied to taking on his professional office, for we can not just recognize what is the real and substantial shape of the influence infused between them until they are engaged in detailed examination. That recognition is traceable to nothing more than awareness of that trend so influential and so powerful in its proceedings at its best that it, as the things, good or wrong, trend on as usual, is enthusiastically endorsed by all of us the cognizants, in return of which the poets as agents have the generosity of personal experiences of distinct worth to gain approbation of what effects are appropriated by themselves to the cognizants. This view of how the trend of tradition and its influence do combine to make a different composition, to view it in the light of efficacy, a tour de force as with the potentiality to orientate otherwise rather than that they were, before taking place of this combination as the dynamic Vermogen of the literaty undertakings, never might be dreamed of an aftermath of this occurrence so generative and so efflorescent that it is neither of redundancy nor of vulgarity in its results.

Here the above quotation from Evans is liable to serve on unraveling the thread of continuum lurking in that combination of influential tradition which descends down from the earlier time to the present day literariness, no matter whatever genre it may be in progress of manipulating what it is closed up as issue. This is so true only in the light of the name of "literary continuum" whose perpetual attribution is more precious than any form of culture man is proud of for authentic claims to be what we believe is the reality itself of human culture over the ages. It is as much as if to say that it is not easy to assume what proper literary conclusions should be drawn from the recognition of its inheritance or tradition descended down from the forerunners to their followers, wherewith the reality between the model and its imitation, frankly speaking, the vagueness of disparity between both of them, as is so often and usual alike, is nothing other than the ambiguous and delicate problem of how confidently and satisfactorily it must be treated on terms of comparative literary executions, as are frequent from usual scenes we come to consciously or otherwise.

One may ask: is it a fact that the literary achievements of Corneille played a central role in the rite of what Alexander Pope had copiously delivered the effort in order to remark that efflorescent efflorescence of English Classicism,

⁴ Ifor Evans, *Short History of English Literature* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1955), p.304.

especially in the roll of fame, *An Essay on Man* and *An Essay on Criticism* as well. This is the question what size of role did the former hand over to the latter and what steps therein were existed between both of them and how in procession of influence-fluid from one to the the other. For the influence-fluid in the tradition investigation is highly complex and very complicated, so that this is even go so far for us to say it is within the pivot of this controversy which seems never to end, rather to continue in a sort of flurry and of fury so furiously as to divide the concerned world disputation into two, to put our cares aside from deterring whether or not to represent the substantial frame-work for the discussion of the question. But an attempt either to define the nature or substance of inheritance latent among them or to determine its "true" element seems to us in a sense unfruitful so strongly as to fear that the attempt will burn out rather otherwise from what was expected at its initiatory steps of profession of arguing about it. Thereupon it would be fruitful to grasp "the assimilation" which subsists in what is supposed to have been inherited, somewhat in rhetoric version, to have modeled down through the ages, as in many cases of arguing about the literaty traditions throughout the controversial wilderness of the so-called comparative literature. To heighten this argument as being compatible with what is reality of theorizing so far, that focus which reflects a crucial period of transition and change in this subject bridges the gap between Corneille, the proponent of Classical tendency, and his advocate who was adorned with the mantle inherited down from the former through several steps of interlude over the decades.⁵

It should be no surprise here that Pope is attributed from Dryden for depicting his literaty works on account of partly the literaty authority the predecessor enjoyed fully over the age, and partly of the contemporary tendency of literary movement by virtue of which he is capable of indulging what is descended from his senior especially. But on the other hand, Corneille is the central figure whose critical literariness could be read by his successor Dryden not only as a compliment of the search for truth, but also as a model for establishing his *An Essay on Dramtic Poesie*. This association so tightly infixed between both literary giants would draw no interest more than that which is far out of topic of this paper, and which is of stage prior to what should be discussed here. It is the relationship between Corneille and Pope, for our interest comes to the fact that the

⁵ John Dryden is treated as the one of the greatest intermediaries who served to descend the earlier tradition to the down age. This is the quotation from *The Short History of English Literature* by Ifor Evans: "The career of Alexander Pope, in many ways Dryden's successor, has been more hotly and more frequently debated than any other in English Literature." p. 53.

following quotation in French shows how they proved the external evidences that help to countenance the inherited and genuine picture of what are influenced from the earlier time down to the later one. This is the strong evidence between them to be more than showing the interrelationship laid open to the inheritor and the deliverer alike, to reveal the reality of how tightly and directly the instruction is handed down as much as to resemble what would seem to suspect the so-called catechism to each other. What happens to this statement as to what was interchanged or transmigrated from one to the other would become clear according to the succeeding excuse hereafter.

A la même époque, un auteur longtemps obstiné à ne s'en remettre qu'à sa seule "fantaisie", s'interrogeait sur les jugements qu'on avit faits de ses oeuvres: préparant l'édition de son théâtre complet, Corneill écrit ses Examaens et trois Discours du poème dramatique. Au cours de sa déjà longue carrière, il est passé d'une impatience frondeuse et volontiers insolente dans ses premiers avertissements et préfaces à une critique scrupuleuse et lucide, fondée sur sa propre expérience. En pleine quereille du Cid, il imprime en 1637, en tête de l'édition de sa comédie de La Suivante, une épître dédicatoire où son indépendance s'affirme avec éclat: "Chacun a sa méthode; je ne blâme point celle des autres et me tiens à la miene; jusques à présent je m'en trouve fort bien; j'en chercherai une meilleure quand je commencerai à m'en trouver mal."⁶

It is astonishing that such language could be overlooked. Corneille's standing-point transparently cleared out above shows that if he had not been oblized enough as to have the opportunity to saturate that effective leap-up which pricked him to have "d'une impatience frondeuse et volontiers insolente dans ses premiers avertissements et préfaces à une critique scrupuleuse et lucide, fondée sur sa propre expérience," his La Suivante would have just gleamed and faded away in nought without that glamour of reality conducting to the outburst of gorgeous and overflowing tide of Classical tradition the efflorescence of which marked its culminating top upon appearing of Pope's literariness. Why Pope and his successors or contemporary artists had ventured to be indulging the influential trend of Classicism and so in the flower of its progress at the Augustan age

⁶ Roger Fayolle, "La Critique Littéraire", Collectin U: Serie "Lettres Françaises" (Paris: Librairie Armand Colin), 1964, pp.31-2.

seemed to have been in the zenith of prosperity throughout literary affairs, as when in the earlier ages, needs to be explained before to go on further. On this context, as an appropriate answer to this question, it would be necessary to employ the most revealing excuse which might otherwise have submerge anti-intellectually beneath the thin veneer of controversial issues touching the literary arena of the time.

There is in *La Suivante* an interesting passage of what might seem to suggest the clue to that excuse which demands our patience to discern what is pivotal from there more closely and more meticulously than surveyed as that quotation already particularized above in line. Beside *La Suivante*, there are also passages of great beauty and eloquence in his three *Discours du poeme dramatique*, *Ex-amaens* and *Avertisements*, and these should not be neglected as they reveal an important, if not principal, aspect of Corneille's view of that literary trend of his age. Even so, the first one rather than the others does point to what seems to be that genuine limitation of his literary philosophy, so much so that it is clear enough for us to realize how much his influential tide furiously fluctuated down to what is assumed to be his follower's real aspect, the English colossus. This stance of influence could not but turn out with ease according to the following quotation which is more likely to grasp the pivot of what the English agent of the Classical trend sung for man's praise than any other purpose of what he tried to represent in the spirit of *An Essay on Criticism*. Getting along with Corneille whose idea is expressed in the lines below, we may easily know several ideas that go to make what is his main frame of thought there, and so the main ideas of this statement will be known to us and to those of his successor who are affected and modified by him.

Je laisse dire tout le monde et fais mon profit des bons avis, de quelque part que je les reçoive. Je traite toujours mon sujet le moins mal qu'il m'est possible; et après y avoir corrigé ce qu'on me fait connaître d'inexcusable, je l'abandonne au public. Si je ne fais bien, qu'un autre fasse mieux; je ferai des vers à sa louange au lieu de le censurer. Chacun a sa méthode; je ne blâme point celle des autres, et me tiens à la mienne; jusques à présent je m'en suis trouvé fort bien; j'en chercherai une meilleure quand je commencerai à m'en trouver mal. Ceux qui se font presser à la représentation de mes ouvrages m'obligent infiniment; ceux qui ne les approuvent pas peuvent se dispenser d'y venir gagner la migraine; ils épargneront de l'argent et me feront plaisir. Les jugments sont libres en ces matières, et les goûts

divers. J'ai vu des personnes de fort bon sens adirer des endroits sur qui j'aurais passé l'éponge, et j'en connais dont les poèmes réussissent au théâtre avec éclat, et qui, pour principaux ornements, y emplient des choses que j'évite dans les miens. Ils pensent avoir raison, et moi aussi: qui d'eux ou de moi se trompe: c'est ce qui n'est pas aisé à juger

.... ⁷

From the lines quoted above, we can discern the three major points or rather rules of being poet like Corneille himself: the first of these is to own one's own methode which is originated from what he is ready to serve for the public benefits rather than his own; the second, to concern about the judgement in its manipulation in virtue of materializing his speculative genius or insight available to admit of any strong gestation of poetic conceits; and lastly what he puts emphasis is the reason which, for the reason best known for us, can be generalized such in peculiarity as seems to be that guiding principle of the human mind in the process of things. This is the pivot of what he concentrated on responding his wonder about letters which reached that point of the original and innate principle which is the first principle of his literary vista of tradition. This trend of vista went to Pope so vividly and so practically as to be known for the examples we can confront from now on. Without exception of considering those three points headed as the controversial theme now to go on, we began by referring Corneille with Pope, and our attention was at once stricken by the following similarities as literary pioneers for the sake of establishing each nation's splendid monument of literary stance looking over its field respectively each other. What is matchable between them should be examined by means of contrasting side by side or vertically in general survey what could be well-suited in comparison. Now, *An Essay on Criticism*, some parts of which are not much verbally but more or less significantly matchable to the three heads above and so worthy to be theorized so as to come to some form of perfection which shows how correlatively these two literary masters stand vertically not horizontally, is referred to the proportion of necessity of adducing the distinction they have in their literariness. That reference should be exemplified either suitable or contrasting upon their comparative characteristics of both, applied materially to their own accomplishments of creative exertion.

In compliance with the already quoted introduction to Corneille's idea, the comparative implications Pope manipulated not only in unraveling but in materi-

⁷ Ibid., p. 32.

alizing the deeper dimension of what seemed to be his poetic centrality are little of a precious assumption only on account of such poetic sensibilities or thoughts celebrated in the following affirmative concinnities.

'Tis hard to say, if greater want of skill
 Appear in writing or judging ill;
 But, of the two, less dang'rous is th' offence
 To tire our patience, than mislead our sense:
 Some few in that, but numbers err in this,
 Ten censure wrong for one who writes amiss;
 A fool might once himself alone expose;
 Now one in verse makes many more in prose.
 'Tis with our judgements as our watches, none
 Go just alike, yet each believes his own.
 In poets as true genius is but rare,
 True taste as seldom is the critic's share;
 Both must alike from heav'n derive their light,
 These born to judge, as well as those to write.
 Let such teach others who themselves excel,
 And censure freely, who have written well.
 Authors are partial to their wit, 'tis true,
 But are not critics to their judgement too? ⁸

The speculations upon what went on in Corneille's mind, as exposed conceitedly in his view or rather concretely consolidated in that quotation, could be easily explained more realistically and effectively to examine what is given as the subject in the manner of contrasting what are correlative whether on terms of contrast with each other or not. From the above quotation, it is easy for us to detect that the positiveness of Pope's philosophic standing-point looking over all of the literary vista or the shape of what the poet should concede is that contribution form from Corneille. His preparatory arrangement for entering literary composition led Pope to assume the same figure ardened with that mantle descended from part of his possessions whose primordial interest is put emphasis on having that individual methode: *Chacun a sa methode: je ne blâme point celle des autres, et me teins à la mienne; jusques à présent je m'en suis trouvé fort*

⁸ James Harry Smith and Edd Winfield Parks ed. *The Great Critics: An Anthology of Literary Criticism* (New York: Norton, 1951), p. 386.

bien; j'en chercherai une meilleure quand je commencerai à m'en trouver mal. In accordance with this prominence of possessing individuality or personality, Pope's consciousness of what his forerunner exhibited in language is so alert and so mitiative as to develop to such an extent that the original statement is as much sound and intact as maintaining its complete purport and its external shape of what was described. This French passage from Corneille being matched with that worthy of comparison out of the above poem, the correlative prominence becomes too conspicuous and too clear to neglect that hereditary connection between both literary giants, so apparent so that in a wise to examine what are between them in such way as to go afield verbally and otherwise word for word will help us find how much they are tightly connected with each other in the face of that barrier or the lapse of distant time to rip distantly their access bent on the obstacle of about half century interval. Now when there is an onlooking at the language of Pope "Let such teach others who themselves excel./ And censure freely, who have written well./Authors are partial to their wit, 'is true./But are not critics to their judgement too?", there should be a speculation, in the light of which the lines from Corneille are desposed to be transferred, imitated, modified, exaggerated, and short-circuited, even paraphrased through literary manipulations to which Pope is liable more than any contemporary writers.

This speculation upon what went on between Corneille and Pope might seem in a sense arbitrary and entirely capricious unless the forthcoming controversy respecting another demonstration similar to what has been exemplified so far is relevant to the theory of reasoning on hand for furthering its reasonableness and validity of consanguinity inherent between both. This new kinship seems to show us more evident relationship between them than the precedent, especially from the point of prevailing impression we can get from the direct and straight, if not authoritative, objection in which the nature of this relation consists in referring and comparing the similarity assumable as the subject one another. We must keep in mind that the position of Pope has diverged from Corneille's and thus prove the following passage from *An Essay on Criticism* entirely of Corneillean in its conceits, none the less so in versification in which his composing words are stay intact or unblemished as much entirely in their significance as in taste, nuance, and in etymological sense. This is so on what it is all about, and it is more meaningful for this reason that the passage converging our attention to point is the first part of the second stanza from whose refreshing power marks a new invigorating emotion to a territory so vast and so mystic as to overflow spontaneous flood of imagination. Thus, in expressing his emotion, he blossoms

out as a poet of emphasizing

Of all the causes which conspire to blind
 Men's erring judgement, and misgude the mind,
 What the weak head with strongest bias rules,
 Is pride, the never-failing vice of fools.
 Whatever Nature has in worth deni'd,
 She gives in large recruits of needful pride;
 For as in bodies, thus in souls, we find
 What wants in blood and spirits, swell'd with wind:
 Pride, where wit fails, steps into our defence,
 And fills up all the mighty void of sense:
 If once right reason drives that cloud away,
 Truth breaks upon us with resistless day.⁹

This statement is led from Corneille's opinion that is already shown above in his quotation, the part of which, being adoptable to go afield further here, goes thus: *Les juggements sont livrés en ces matières, et les goûts divers. J'ai vu des personnes de fort bon sens admirer des endroits sur qui j'aurais passé l'éponge, et j'en connais dont les poèmes réussissent au théâtre avec éclat, et qui, pour principaux ornements, y emploient des choses que j'évite dans les miens. Ils pensent avoir raison, et moi aussi: qui d'eux ou de moi se trompe? c'est ce qui n'est pas aisé à juger ...*” From these two statements either in French or in English, the categories of both words “judgement” and “reason” are contived into as pivotal a compass as the nature of concurrence for each case of both statements can denote and even connote what they ought to mean. It is interesting to note that both giants refer to the philosophy so similar in purort to literary perspective, even through the unlike language for the sake of what they tried to delineate, as to wonder, if thus much the time lapse and the barrier of language may be remote as if to be wide asunder, how is not the keynote of their statements different each other.

Such question is so plain in contrasting the difference between both men of letters that it is more likely not to neglect taking a look into whatever vein did dispose the descendant tendencies according to the literary precocity the antiquity had turned over. This is more so, partly because of Pope's translating the Greek classic like *Iliad*, and partly because of the remark “Thus the Essay on

⁹ *Ibid.* p. 391.

Criticism, an informal discussion of literary theory, is written, like Horace's *Ars Poetica*, a similarly didactic poem, in a plain style, relatively devoid of imagery and eloquence, and in the easy language of well-bred talk. The Rape of the Lock, being "a heroi-comical poem" (that is, a comic poem that treats trivial material in an epic style), employs the lofty heroic language that Dryden had perfected in his translation of Virgil, and introduces amusing parodies of passages in *Paradise Lost*; parodies raised to truly Miltonic sublimity and completely complexity by the conclusion of the *Dunciad*.¹⁰ Here, this quotation is skeptical enough to reconsider again what it is to have expressed so far in the light of aping the older, accurately part of the preface of *La Suivante*, so skeptical as to do so rather on the ground of the antiquate influence which might be transcended to each other directly or without reference to the interconnection where the predecessor could have played as an intermediary agent to hand over to the successor. Such might be the case particularly in examining the comparative distinctiveness between the poets apart from age lapse that it seems as if to remind of such gnomic saying as one star differs from another star in glory, in other word, now two men are not of a mind.

Department of English, Kyung Hee University

¹⁰Alexander Pope in *The Norton Antology of English Literature* vol. 1. ed. M.H. Abrams and others (New York: W.W. Norton, 1979), pp. 2193-4.