





The University of Chicago

PARTY POLITICS AND ENGLISH
JOURNALISM 1702-1742

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF ARTS AND LITERATURE IN CANDIDACY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
(DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH)

BY

DAVID HARRISON STEVENS

A Private Edition

Distributed by

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES

1916

447

670

PARTY POLITICS AND ENGLISH JOURNALISM

The University of Chicago

PARTY POLITICS AND ENGLISH
JOURNALISM 1702-1742

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF ARTS AND LITERATURE IN CANDIDACY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
(DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH)

BY
DAVID HARRISON STEVENS

A Private Edition
Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
1916

11488
.58

711
The Divisive
111 2 1916

TO
MY MOTHER

PREFACE

A study of eighteenth century periodicals lies on the borderland between literary and political history. Most of the papers printed from 1700 to 1750 were inspired by political events; consequently they are in many ways valuable for students of party government. The materials of such periodicals as well as the causes behind their production are of interest to the political historian. An investigator of the literary taste of the period will likewise turn to the periodicals for facts regarding the vogue of such essays as first appeared in the *Review*, the *Tatler*, and the *Spectator*. He will find also in the popularity of the news journals ground for broader conclusions as to the economic conditions of all literary production during the eighteenth century, and will inevitably realize that a constant demand for partisan and factional newspapers led many writers into channels quite unnatural for men of literary tastes. The student of politics is the one most interested in the partisan periodicals that these men produced, but the student of literature shares his regard for the economic phases of journal production in an age of literary dependence as well as of party development.

In the course of the present study reference is made to many facts of eighteenth century social practice. Literature and politics were both subjected then to the pressure of new forces, chief of which was the tendency to exalt the common good of society at the expense of special privilege. In 1700 "divine right" was a failing principle. Men were taking the place of a lifeless theory. Yet the transformation was not made without cost. The bloodless Revolution of 1688 marked the turn from a full trust in kings to the doctrines supporting modern modes of government, but that was only the preliminary to a grievous civil struggle.

To win the prize of political domination offered to men of remarkable individuality, Whigs and Tories fell upon one another with the greatest fury. Greed for power possessed individuals. Leaders were ruled by their ambitions, for the new constitutional provisions seemed to afford unlimited opportunity for self-advancement. Such intimate friends as Oxford and Bolingbroke worked together for a time in order to win political power, only to fall soon into suspicion, then into open hostility, and at last into a struggle that brought one to political ruin and the other to loss of everything excepting his intrepid resolution. The situation of Oxford and Bolingbroke in 1714 represents the worst state possible for individuals to reach under an unregulated system of constitutional

government: that of Robert Walpole ten years later displays the possibilities of such conditions for a politician strong enough to dominate the minor actors in the play of statecraft. The three embody much of the eighteenth century theory and practice in political matters, and their acts show what a spirit of opportunism possessed the age.

The men striving for a livelihood through a use of their pens were naturally affected by such conditions. In some cases reasons are found for a complete change in their interests. Such data, which may be counted proof of the spirit of opportunism pervading English society in the eighteenth century, must likewise be considered important for literary history. The partisan acts of various writers were merely the consequences of economic laws. The economic conditions of literary production determined what should be their field of activity. Consequently, literary periodicals gave place to party journals, private patronage languished because of new publishing conditions, and personal opinions were sold out to the leader or group willing to pay. The changing status of professional writers has long been counted one of the most distinctive facts of eighteenth century literary history, but very little has been done to show how completely the literary craftsman was a creature of his age. Addison brought philosophy out of closets to become an active force in English life, but he and the lesser essayists brought forth their individual talents for use in party service for no such altruistic purpose.

This assumption the following pages should establish. The present work has as its chief end to present proof of political influence in the literary world of Queen Anne and the first two Georges. This proof is offered, both as new fact in itself, and as a partial explanation of current literary standards. It should show why men of letters then wrote with reason rather than emotion, and why their demonstrations of feeling were restricted largely to acrid satire and personal abuse. In short, it is hoped that to disclose the ends sought by politician and writer will be to enforce the obvious truth that in determining literary vogues current demands must be considered of quite as much importance as any critical rules.

I am under obligations to many for assistance during the course of my work. Attendants in the British Museum and the Public Record Office showed me every courtesy. George A. Aitken, Esq., whose life of Steele has been more useful to me than any other single work, also made highly profitable my stay in England by suggesting sources of material and by giving me the benefit of his broad knowledge of eighteenth century literature and politics. Professor C. N. Greenough of Harvard University

and Professor Conyers Read of the history department of the University of Chicago advised me on specific points. I wish to express my thanks to the attendants in our own University library and to Mr. A. W. Shaw of Chicago for helping me to secure copies of scarce books needed from time to time. My greatest obligation, however, is to members of the English department of the University of Chicago. Professor Myra C. Reynolds, Professor W. D. MacClintock, and Dr. G. W. Sherburn have made many valuable suggestions. Professors Robert Morss Lovett and John Matthews Manly have been of similar service, and have also read the manuscript repeatedly during its preparation. To Professor Manly I am particularly grateful for the training gained in his classroom and for the encouragement given in private conference.

Chicago.

D. H. S.



CONTENTS

CHAPTER I THE CONDITIONS OF LITERARY PRODUCTION FROM 1702 TO 1710	The new interest in politics—growth of the book trade after 1695—the 1709 copyright law—popularity of subscription editions—number of journals in 1709—Defoe's <i>Review</i> and Steele's <i>Tatler</i> —effect of politics upon Steele, Defoe, and minor writers—government prosecutions.....	1
CHAPTER II THE POLITICAL IMPORTANCE OF ADDISON AFTER 1712	Addison's earlier political work—the significant events of 1712—minor writers under his control—his relations with Pope—the dependence of Steele—party measures of Addison and Walpole.....	15
CHAPTER III SWIFT'S RELATIONS WITH THE TORY MINISTRY	The new measures of Oxford and Bolingbroke—foundation of Bolingbroke's <i>Examiner</i> —prosecution of the opposition—the Tory political club—Swift as director of party journalism—the patronage offered to competent writers—rewards to Swift for his services.....	30
CHAPTER IV DEFOE AND THE EARL OF OXFORD	Oxford's interest in party journalism—the <i>Review</i> and Defoe's news organization—secret service journeys—the <i>Mercator</i> —intrigues against Steele and the Whig journals—Defoe's rewards— <i>An Appeal to Honour and Justice</i>	47
CHAPTER V PARTY JOURNALS AND JOURNALISTS FROM 1710 TO 1714	General condition of English journalism before 1710—the <i>London Gazette</i> —journals founded under the Tory ministry—Defoe's <i>Review</i> and the <i>Examiner</i> —minor Tory journalists—Matthew Prior—opposition offered by the Whigs—the <i>Whig Examiner</i> and <i>Medley</i> —the <i>Flying Post</i> —Steele's <i>Guardian</i> and <i>Englishman</i> —minor Whig journals—the Stamp Act of 1712—effect of party influence upon journals and writers.....	61
CHAPTER VI WHIG REWARDS UNDER GEORGE I	Expectation of rewards to writers—Steele's employments—in high favor with the King—his <i>Hanover Post</i> and second <i>Englishman</i> —his theatrical difficulties—Steele and Addison on the <i>Peerage Bill</i> —Steele's relations with Walpole—Addison and Lord Halifax—Addison's petitions and state grants—his influence as literary advisor—Budgell and Tickell rewarded—Nicholas Rowe—Congreve—Ambrose Philips—Cibber, Hughes, Odell, Ridpath—disappointed petitioners.....	81
CHAPTER VII DEFOE AND WALPOLE IN THE SERVICE OF GEORGE I	Prosecutions before 1721—Defoe's stratagems on the side of the ministry—his supervision of the press—administration journals in circulation between 1715 and 1721—the <i>London Journal</i> —Walpole's subsidy plan—the <i>Briton</i> —The Negus investigation of 1723.....	104

CHAPTER VIII POLITICAL AND LITERARY IMPORTANCE OF THE *Craftsman*
GROUP

New political methods—the secret investigation of 1742—Walpole's papers and editors—Swift and Gay turned to the opposition—Savage and Young—foundation of Bolingbroke's *Craftsman*—Pope's interest—Prince Frederick's group of disaffected politicians—minor opposition journals—Nicholas Amhurst—gains in freedom for the press—Thomson and other dependent writers—general consequences of literary patronage..... 118

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 135

INDEX..... 147

CHAPTER I

THE CONDITIONS OF LITERARY PRODUCTION FROM 1702 TO 1710

THE NEW INTEREST IN POLITICS—GROWTH OF THE BOOK TRADE AFTER 1695—THE 1709 COPYRIGHT LAW—POPULARITY OF SUBSCRIPTION EDITIONS—NUMBER OF JOURNALS IN 1709—DEFOE'S *Review* AND STEELE'S *Tatler*—EFFECT OF POLITICS UPON STEELE, DEFOE, AND MINOR WRITERS—GOVERNMENT PROSECUTIONS.

When Anne became queen of England in April 1702, party lines were definitely drawn on many points, and men were finding in political controversy matter for violent disagreement. Popular concern over state affairs had grown gradually after the conclusion of the Revolution in 1688, an event that had given men new reason for studying the conduct of government. Thereafter the reign of William III had been a period conducive to free speech and individual thinking, and as a result well-organized parties began to displace in power the small groups of autocratic nobles. This was not accomplished by 1702, but the effect of changing conditions had appeared in all social and literary activity. The London clubs and coffee-houses, more and more numerous after 1700, became centers for political discussion, and all social groups dealt freely in political gossip. As a result, men of letters adapted their work to suit current demands, so that the interest in popular government may be said broadly to have permeated all the cultivated groups of the city.

With these facts in mind one cannot examine the literary products of the reign of Anne without watching for political allusion. It is often necessary to do so if one is to get a fair understanding of implied meanings. Yet the existence of partisan material proves nothing directly regarding the economic causes behind this production. Unless one can see what inducements led writers of the eighteenth century to burden their works with political materials, he cannot properly estimate the economic condition of literary production during that period. After 1700 the intrusion of political matter into all kinds of writing was steadily increasing in a way not attributable to unfostered partisan zeal. Very obviously a writer of the time may have been on the Whig side; but why should his works show these partisan marks when devotion to literary pursuits normally excludes such utilitarian matter as political argument? As a rule, the Queen Anne writer chose political topics because to do so was profitable, and the matter of profit must consequently be considered a powerful determinant of literary vogues.

To be sure, politics afforded but one means to a livelihood; other fields of endeavor were opening up after 1700. New conditions in the book and newspaper trades seemed to foreshadow better days for the professional writer, wherein he would attain true independence. In opposition to these favoring circumstances there still existed the deadening force of private patronage, as well as the rapidly developing subservience to party leaders that was to bring about a new but similar bondage. It is, therefore, with the clash of these opposing tendencies that a student of literary conditions before 1710 must concern himself: he will usually find that political interests seem to have overcome all others in the minds of the men of letters.

Though in 1702 the book trade was not flourishing, recent occurrences had led publishers to expect greater prosperity. In February, 1695, parliament had allowed the Licensing Act to lapse, so that henceforth English printers were freed from the close surveillance that for years had restricted their freedom. The immediate consequence was a greater number of newspapers, and an equally important result was a marked stimulation of the book trade. With the relaxation of state checks upon production, new publishing houses were organized, and a few strong firms began projects requiring heavy investments. When the demand for translations led such firms as Tonson's and Lintot's to make plans involving large expenditures for the sake of long-deferred profits, the new freedom from state restrictions as well as the safeguards of the subscription mode of printing gave them a sense of security.

A sign of the progressive methods in use soon after 1700 is to be found in the projection of a work by several London publishing houses because it seemed too expensive for a single firm. In 1705 thirteen booksellers banded together in order to bring out *A Compleat History of England*. Proposals bearing the names of all the "undertakers" were sent throughout the country, and booksellers in the provincial districts were urged to obtain subscriptions from their customers.¹ The London dealers in this way spread the responsibility over an entire group of houses, and then utilized their country connections as a further means to success. Possibility of failure was reduced to a minimum and the cause of letters was greatly aided. Until particular firms were strong enough to specialize upon one sort of work the London publishers found it best to pool their interests in this way whenever a large project was to be carried to

¹ Professor Arber has reprinted the proposals in his *Term Catalogues, etc.*, III, 459. In the Preface to the same volume (p. ix) he refers to the new manner of publication then coming into vogue.

completion. This arrangement entered into in 1705 was, therefore, only one of many such plans to be used throughout the century.

By such means the London firms made the city market fairly stable and also enlisted country dealers everywhere as their advertising agents. These two changes in procedure put the book trade into better condition than it had enjoyed during former years. It was still necessary, however, to prevent by some means the constant pirating of expensive London editions by printers in Dublin and elsewhere throughout the kingdom. To this end in 1709 the leading houses appealed to parliament for better laws governing book publication, an appeal that gained weight through the vigorous efforts put forth in its behalf by all the interested publishers. The Stationer's Company fathered the new proposals, and every influential firm in London lent some assistance.

The results of their campaign demonstrated how powerful the book publishers had become. The copyright law passed by parliament in 1709 was distinctly advantageous to the London houses and enabled them to act with still greater assurance. It was provided by the terms of this act that after April 10, 1710, a book might be copyrighted for fourteen years. In case the author should be living at the expiration of that period, a renewal might be obtained for fourteen years more. Such publications as had been issued before the date mentioned, were to be protected for twenty-one years. The act further provided that titles should be registered with the Stationer's Company, and that infraction of this rule subjected the offender to a fine. With this definite, though not always effective, check upon piracy the book publishers attained a measure of security utterly impossible under the Licensing Act or during the unregulated years from 1695 until 1709.²

A subsidiary effect of the growth of the book publishing industry appeared in the new popular attitude towards all subscription editions. Since this change affected the possibilities of return to the writer, chiefly as to private patronage, its evolution formed an element in the economic development of the writing craft. Before 1700 the subscription method of publication had given both writer and publisher needed assurance for their more ambitious undertakings. With a long list of sponsors for a new work, and with a part of the selling price paid in before a volume was published, every one concerned felt sure of his returns. Books were thus brought out that never would have appeared under the ordinary

² Birrell's *History of Copyright* gives in historical sequence an account of the important acts regarding literary property. See also Nichols' *Illustrations of Literature*, VIII, 460, and Timperley's *History of Printing*, *passim*.

conditions of popular sale. As for the subscribers, they were drawn into such projects by a readiness to enroll their names as being patrons of culture, often undoubtedly when their actual interest in particular editions was very slight. The subscription list of a well-advertised work was a sort of social register wherein every English nobleman wished to see his name entered. Consequently, among the upper classes of society this method of publication was well received merely for its social value, but it gratified the nobility far more for another reason; the subscription edition afforded a cheap method of meeting their class obligation of giving private patronage to needy authors. Many men instead of one thereafter patronized the English man of letters, to the general satisfaction of those who had before borne the burden.

So far had the subscription edition developed before the opening of the eighteenth century. Private patronage was then clearly declining, and instances of such support became fewer during every decade after 1700⁸ as better forms of support became available. The active promotion of the subscription method through the syndicate system brought on the end of even the cheaper forms of private patronage possible through such editions; for when the London syndicates advertised everywhere for subscribers, the class privilege immediately disappeared. In former days the author himself or an indulgent lord had asked the aristocracy for signatures: now every small book dealer in England was an agent of the publishing syndicate, and his appeals were directed to wealthy tradesmen and nobles alike. It was in such fashion that the Englishman of little social importance became a subscriber for the sort of books sold before 1700 chiefly to the aristocracy, and many a man thus increased his self-esteem by subscribing for important works.

By 1725 the names of men of common birth on subscription lists are very nearly equal in number to those from the nobility—at least this is true in many instances. For example, John Dart's well-known work, published in 1730,⁹ shows this balance between titled and untitled sub-

⁸ The distressing case of Chatterton in the third quarter of the eighteenth century gives an illustration of the stupid injustice possible under the worn-out methods of private patronage. A pleasing contrast to Walpole's neglect of Chatterton appears in the generosity of Burke to Crabbe several years later. These furnish the best illustrations of how private patronage had fallen off as a class obligation before 1800.

⁹ Comparison with specific publications dated earlier than 1700 would be useless without the most complete information regarding conditions of publication. Rather than attempt to establish thus conclusions that seem fully warranted by my personal observation, I have stated only the facts regarding Dart's book. From this account it is clear that in 1730 tradesmen were well represented on subscription lists.

scribers. The *Westmonasterium*, or *The History of the Abbey Church of St. Peter's, Westminster*, etc., was brought out for four hundred and forty-six subscribers. Two hundred and seven of these ranked as members of the noble orders, and two hundred and thirty-nine were of no station whatever. Of the forty-eight tradesmen on the list, such names and designations as the following were printed out in full: Mr. John Watts, Operator of Teeth; Mr. Samuel Tusnell, Mason; Mr. John Tusnell, Joiner; Mr. Robert More, Writing Master; and Mr. John Holland, Herald Painter. Quite evidently in 1730 lack of rank was no bar to enrollment with the aristocracy on a subscription list; on the contrary prosperous tradesmen were then considered fit game for the aggressive publisher. The same conclusion is reached upon examining other subscription lists of the same decade; one, for example, bore the names of thirty-three gentlemen above the rank of esquire, of one hundred seventeen esquires, and of sixty-three men without rank.⁵ From such evidence one can derive an explanation for the decline of private patronage⁶ and for the rapid growth of strong publishing houses under the improved conditions following the lapse of the Licensing Act.

The activity in the book trade was paralleled in other branches of the printing industry. News journals became increasingly plentiful and some, founded after the press had been freed in 1695, persisted throughout Queen Anne's reign. Such was the case with George Ridpath's *Flying Post*; yet it, like many others of partisan tone, drew upon artificial means of support. All such periodicals probably had secret subsidies from political leaders, and so their prosperity was due to something else than popular demand.⁷

Apparently the number of periodicals in circulation attracted general attention in 1709. Political journals had multiplied since the foundation of Defoe's *Review*, while the immediate contemporary success of Steele's *Tatler* was encouraging imitators of its style and matter. Addison made some amusing comments on the current journals in the *Tatler*

⁵ *Proposals for Publishing by Subscription A Curious Impression of Heads*, etc. This list, dated 1732-33, is in the possession of Mr. A. W. Shaw of Chicago.

⁶ An interesting instance of the decline of private patronage even before 1710 appears in the case of Elkanah Settle. Before the accession of Queen Anne, and shortly after, he continually solicited favor by means of dedications. How small was his income from this source has been shown by Dr. F. C. Brown, *Elkanah Settle* (Chicago, 1910), pp. 20-44.

⁷ Without seeking at present to analyze individual cases, one finds several general accounts that prove the newspaper industry to have grown remarkably between 1700 and 1710. The several causes for this growth will be presented later.

for May 21, and a more significant account appeared in the *General Postscript* for October 21 of that year. In what purported to be an accurate list of the London newspapers, the *Postscript* presented the following data for the use of the government. The papers then appearing regularly were said to be these: daily, the *Daily Courant*; Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, the *General Remark*, the *Female Tatler*, the *General Postscript*, and the *Supplement*; Monday and Friday, the *British Apollo*; Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday, the *London Gazette*, the *Postman*, the *Postboy*, the *Flying Post*, the *Review*, the *Tatler*, the *Rehearsal Revived*, the *Evening Post*, the *Whisperer*, the *Postboy Junior*, the *City Intelligencer*; Wednesday and Saturday, the *Observer*. These totalled fifty-five issues each week, and in addition there were said to be many "postscripts and other scandalous and seditious papers hawked in the streets."⁸ The investigator made no estimate of total circulation, but it was probably not far from the weekly output in December 1710, when another government investigator put the total at 44,000 copies.⁹

Although after 1702 party organizations constantly fostered their journals, the number of papers issued in 1709 was made possible only through the added encouragement of a popular demand for news. Even the *London Gazette*,¹⁰ a government organ open to subsidy, in 1710 was supported wholly by advertising charges and public sales. Surely at the same time others were also winning independent support by satisfying genuine public needs. Thus quite clearly the English people read intelligently and eagerly before Addison and Steele improved public taste with their *Tatlers* and *Spectators*. The theory that to these two belongs all credit for bringing England to her books, has been used simply because it is conveniently explanatory of a recognized change in literary forms. But it is idle to credit the new periodical essay with so abrupt a creation of public taste,¹¹ when natural courses of development very obviously were being followed before 1709.

⁸ Quoted by Nichols, . . . *Anecdotes . . . of James Bowyer*, etc., p. 493.

⁹ *Cal. of Treas. Papers*, 1708-14; entry for December 2, [1710]. There is possibility that this undated paper was written a year earlier.

¹⁰ For full data regarding the profits from the *London Gazette*, see my article in the *Nation*, C I, No. 2610 (1915), 69-70.

¹¹ Of many such comments that might be quoted, one from Henry Morley's 1891 edition of the *Spectator* will suffice. Page xx of the preface reads: "It was through these [the Tatlers], and the daily Spectators which succeeded them, that the people of England really learnt to read. The few leaves of sound reason and fancy were but a light tax on uncultivated powers of attention."

It is far more logical to look for natural causes behind the instant success of the *Tatler*—for such evidence as that given above regarding the sales of periodicals before the *Spectator* appeared. Then the contemporary comments upon the popularity of Mr. Bickerstaff become more interesting,¹² and Gildon's assertion that the *Tatler* "ravished the Town, and almost reconciled Parties in its Praise, that were opposed in everything else,"¹³ intensifies belief in the existence of true literary taste before 1709.

In general, an examination of conditions outside the sphere of politics proves that before 1710 the book and journal trades were encouraging men to independent literary endeavor. The improvement in the public market and the consequent decline in private patronage would eventually have brought freedom of action and proper income for professional writers had not new forces changed the natural course of events. In 1709 non-partisan journalism was in a healthy state, and the popularity of the *Tatler* was increasing the possibilities for similar projects. As in the book trade, release from government surveillance had led writers and publishers to make new ventures. But party demands were soon to offset all such advantageous conditions, until at the end of Queen Anne's reign English journalism was to be virtually in the hands of party politicians to use as they saw fit. Long before Addison finally gave up his new series of *Spectators* with the issue of December 20, 1714, almost every other competent writer in London had preceded him in entering completely the service of a political party.

*

The hindrances to a normal development of the book and newspaper trades arose, as stated above, from political sources. At the outset Queen Anne's reign assumed its settled division into hostile camps with eager partisans constantly trying to outwit their opponents. It is not strange that they turned to newspapers and pamphlets as party instruments, or that in consequence the trend of literary activity was determined by the increasing ardor of the contests. The traces are to be found in the life stories of writers then living.

The first and most important act of the administration in this newspaper war was to make plans for Defoe's *Review*. Its editor had demon-

¹² One interesting proof appears in Lady Marow's letter to her daughter, Lady Kaye. On January 5, 1709-10, she wrote: "All the town are full of the *Tatler*, which I hope you have to prepare you for discourse, for no visit is made that I hear of but Mr. Bickerstaff is mentioned, and I am told he has done so much good, that the sharpers cannot increase their stocks as they did formerly. . . ." *Dartmouth MSS*, III, 148.

¹³ *Art of Poetry*, p. 117.

strated during King William's reign his power in political satire, particularly through his 1700 pamphlets and his *True-Born Englishman* (1701). It was, therefore, natural that Harley in 1702 chose Defoe as the writer best suited to the needs of the government. Records do not show when the negotiations between them began, but it clearly was soon after the crowning of Anne. This much is proved by Godolphin's letter of September 26, 1703, in which he put Defoe's case wholly into Harley's hands.¹⁴ After securing Defoe's release from Newgate, Harley, who "was shrewd enough to see the use that might be made of his peculiar talents,"¹⁵ at once provided for the foundation of the *Review*. This journal was at first intended as a moderate guide to public opinion, but quite naturally its tone became more and more openly favorable to all administration measures.

The circumstances attending this newspaper venture have two significant relations to the literary activities of the time. First, the establishment of the *Review* marked the beginning of the serious political journalism for which Queen Anne's reign was distinguished. Harley's message to Godolphin, that it would be "of great service to have some discreet writer of the government side,"¹⁶ was prophetic. Thereafter Whig and Tory constantly advanced their causes through the aid of party journals. In the second place, upon beginning the *Review* Defoe abandoned all other interests that he might more effectively perform his duties as secret service agent and editor. To be sure, his experience previous to 1704 had given admirable training for party writing, and it is probable that he took up his new work willingly. Yet the literary qualities of his later writings show how much Defoe might have accomplished through purely literary endeavors. From 1702 to 1715 he conformed so completely to the demands of the age as to draw his themes almost exclusively from current events. No one except Swift adapted himself more completely to contemporary demands. In doing so they both gave up individual freedom for the sake of uncertain political spoils.

Swift's life from 1701 to 1709 may be characterized as a time of inactive expectation. He had first ventured into political service in 1701 with his *Discourse of the Contests and Dissensions between the Nobles*

¹⁴ For quotations from the Oxford correspondence see the detailed account of Defoe's work, pp. 47-61.

¹⁵ Sir George F. Warner, "An Unpublished Political Paper of Daniel Defoe," *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXII (1907), p. 131.

¹⁶ *Add. MSS* 28,055: quoted by E. S. Roscoe, *Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford*, p. 72.

and the *Commons in Athens and Rome*. Thus recommended he came to London looking for employment. But the publication in 1704 of his *Tale of a Tub* injured his chances for preferment in the church, and temporarily there was slight need for his party writing. Until 1708 the Whigs and Tories alternately had the upper hand, so that had his Whig friends been fully disposed to advance Swift they would have had only fair opportunity. In that year, however, his friends rose to a place of security that gave him reason to expect recognition. In January, Somers made a sincere effort to get Swift the vacant bishopric of Waterford, and with his party in control the Whig leader should have found the way. Swift's hopes were vain: on going back to Ireland in Midsummer 1709, he tried without avail to urge his case upon Halifax by letter, and then finally gave up in disgust. Having lost all hope of patronage from the Whigs, he remained at Laracor in sullen silence waiting and hoping for a turn of affairs. His desired chance came in November, when stirring events in London precipitated the downfall of the Whigs and of the leaders who had broken their promises.

On the fifth of that month Dr. Henry Sacheverell preached his famous sermon before the Lord Mayor and alderman of the city, a sermon that was to affect all English politics and indirectly the fortunes of Swift.¹⁷ When the Whig prosecution failed through an inability to prove Sacheverell guilty of treasonable utterances, Tory prospects brightened immediately, and amid the turmoil of parties Swift saw new possibilities for personal advantage. Having returned to London, he was ready in 1710 to accept service with either party, but he still remembered his ill-treatment at the hands of the Whigs.

For eight years he had vainly looked for profitable party employment, devoting his best energies to the main quest. Writing but little, unlike Defoe, he was not preparing himself then for distinguished service in party journalism, and he was also ignoring any opportunities for purely literary production in a way that determined completely his later desires. Like Defoe, Swift finally made every literary or social interest subsidiary to party matters, and wrote only to satisfy a current demand. Both in this represent the blighting effect of political patronage upon men possessing the genius for creative writing, and their acts display what causes brought in aggressive party journals in place of literary periodicals modelled after the *Tatler* and *Spectator*.

¹⁷ The sermon was an attack upon politicians who favored religious toleration on grounds of party expediency. Godolphin was personally abused under the name of "Volpone."

In similar fashion political events determined the careers of Prior and Addison, neither of whom attained the development in literary craftsmanship that would have been his under favorable conditions of production. Prior, though earlier a Whig, swung to the Tory side shortly before Queen Anne came to the throne, while Addison followed the line of action determined by his acceptance of a Whig pension from Halifax, his election to membership in the Kit-Kat Club, and his further association with Whig leaders after composing the *Campaign* in 1704. Neither writer was aggressively partisan before 1710; both on the contrary seemed content to remain inactive, with faint interest in creative composition and with hope of state appointments whenever their respective parties should become all powerful.¹⁸

Less significant instances of perverted literary ability appear in the cases of John Dennis, John Howe, and John Tutchin. Howe and Tutchin attacked the government so assiduously through their *Observer* that attempts were made to silence them as early as 1704, when they stood trial before the House of Commons. Tutchin had been in political service before Queen Anne came to the throne. In 1703 he served the Earl of Nottingham as a secret informer, a fact now made certain through the discovery of their correspondence among the *Domestic Papers*,¹⁹ but his chief service was rendered the Whigs through the columns of the *Observer*. Until his death in September 1707, as a result of a brutal beating at the hands of government hirelings,²⁰ he coöperated with Howe in making the *Observer* one of the most effective party organs of the period.

From the beginning of the century John Dennis, remembered chiefly for his quarrels with Pope, was busily turning out poems with hopes of political patronage. In 1702 he vainly flattered William III through his poem called *The Monument*, but was more successful two years later with one celebrating Marlborough and the victory at Blenheim. One

¹⁸ The appointments granted Addison during the years 1702-1710 are listed on p. 90. Prior's means of support from 1707 to 1711 was an annual pension of four hundred pounds from the Duke of Marlborough, his reward for praising the great general. The year 1711, when he went to Paris, marks the beginning of his official career under a Tory administration.

¹⁹ *Dom. Anne* 1703: Bundle 2, fol. 40, a letter from Tutchin to the Earl of Nottingham, February 9, 1702-03, giving information against a clerk, John Gellibrand; *ibid.*, Bundle 3, fol. 42, a letter of October 23, 1703, giving information against one Bierly.

²⁰ A. Andrews, *The History of British Journalism*, I, 98.

authority²¹ records that the Duke gave Dennis a hundred guineas for the personal praises in this poem, called *Britannia Triumphans*. Perhaps, too, in recognition of its bold dedication to the Queen and because of its Whig lines, his tragedy *Liberty Asserted* (1704) brought results; in June 1705, at any rate, he became a royal waiter in the London Custom-House.²²

Again, in 1707, Dennis took advantage of the English victory at Ramillies to compose a patriotic poem, entitled *A Poem on the Battle of Ramillies in Five Books*. His latest biographer, H. G. Paul,²³ believes that he also wrote many political pamphlets at this time and as late as 1715. It seems clear that he got no government post except the place as waiter, though constant dedications to Halifax, Somers, Pembroke, and Lansdowne probably brought him small gifts from time to time.

Such mediocre writers rank with Swift, Defoe, and Addison as exemplars of the perverting power of politics. Each showed capability in party service that would have brought moderate success in creative work. But the same restrictions that affected the lives of great men determined completely the opportunities for employment open to less competent writers. Many others with small pretension to literary merit put whatever talents they possessed at the service of party leaders only because the conditions of the time made such procedure almost imperative. Most of these are to be found among the hack journalists, men whose performances scarcely assure one of their possibilities for greater things. But still others, more competent men, were turning to politics for materials before 1710, and by so doing were limiting the field of their later activities. Dr. Arbuthnot was writing political pamphlets during the preliminaries to the union with Scotland. William King was also hinting the course of his later service by writing on the side of the high church party in the Sacheverell controversies, and John Philips with his *Blenheim* was pitting against Addison's *Campaign* a party poem that shows the weak efforts possible in party service for one who had written the *Splendid Shilling*. All three were capable of more enduring work. This may not have been true of Thomas Yalden, known as a stout Tory; of

²¹ Cibber, *Lives of the Poets*, IV, 217.

²² The post was worth fifty-two pounds annually.

²³ Mr. Paul has found that Dennis held his post as waiter until 1715, when he sold it for £600. His last years were spent in want, in spite of the benefit performances and subscription editions of his works that were promoted by such friends as Atterbury, the Earl of Pembroke, Pope, and Robert Walpole. It is interesting to learn that Walpole gave him twenty pounds a year for several years. For all the facts about John Dennis I am indebted to Mr. Paul's *John Dennis: His Life and Criticism*, (1911).

Edmund Smith and other mediocre writers already under Addison's personal influence; or of such men as Thomas Parnell, who later fell under the persuasion of more forceful writers acting as party agents. At any rate, the inclination of all these minors was to follow the trend of the times, and their acts reveal the same prompting from political patronage as appear more obviously in the lives of Swift, Addison, or Defoe.

*

Finally, the new dominance of party patronage appears in the restrictions gradually laid upon the press after 1702. These were but results of the rapid growth in number and influence of the opposition journals, and prove how unceasingly party leaders were subsidizing such mediums of publicity.

In 1702 definite steps were taken to place restrictions upon all writers attacking the government. On March 26 of that year two proclamations appeared in London: one, the less important, had to do with the punishment to be inflicted for vice, immorality, and profanity; the other was directed at every form of writing that could be classed as treasonable or seditious. The act regarding printing specified that after that date the government proposed "to restrain the spreading of false news, printing or publishing irreligious or seditious papers and libels, reflecting on her majestie or the government, or upon any of her publick ministers, officers &c., and that the offenders should be proceeded against with the utmost severity of the law."²⁴ Thereafter government prosecutions of authors, printers, and publishers increased steadily in number and severity until in 1710, under Harley and St. John, the methods of repression were improved through far more stringent regulations.

Instances of such treatment as Defoe experienced in 1703 for his *Shortest Way with Dissenters* demonstrate how competently the state informers and prosecutors applied the terms of this new proclamation. Queen Anne in 1702 had called attention to the need for such restriction and within the following years arrests became increasingly frequent. Narcissus Luttrell recorded on May 30, 1704, that £100 reward had been proclaimed for proofs implicating anyone in the publication of *Legion's Humble Address to the Lords*;²⁵ that on October 18, 1705, Doctor Drake, Mr. Leslie, and Mr. Dyer were all bound over for trial on account of seditious articles in their respective journals;²⁶ and that on February 2, 1705-06, Dr. Brown was imprisoned for writing the *Country Parson's*

²⁴ Narcissus Luttrell, *Brief Historical Account*, etc., V, 157.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, V, 429.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, V, 602.

*Advice to the Lord Keeper.*²⁷ During the year 1705 Edward Ward paid the penalty for his satires upon the Whigs and the Low-Church party by standing in the public pillory,²⁸ a form of punishment used in such cases with increasing frequency. Again on November 14, 1706, as the result of writing *Hudibras Redivivus* Ward suffered two exposures in the pillory, paid a fine of forty marks, and agreed to keep on good behavior for a year: Dr. Drake had paid a like penalty a week earlier for writing *A Letter to the Right Honourable Mr. Secretary Harley*, etc. By this time arrest and prosecution had become common, so that the recurring arrests of editors opposing the government were taken as matters of course.

One comment upon the secondary motives behind these cases is worth noting. It reads: "Some were of Opinion that these, and other Prosecutions of the like Nature, were chiefly promoted by Mr. Secretary *Harley*, not only that he might thereby appear to be entirely devoted to the General [Marlborough] and the Treasurer, but with a deeper design of rendering them obnoxious by these unpopular Indications of Severity."²⁹ The same writer, Abel Boyer, commented as follows upon the condition of party journalism in 1706: "Several Persons, either prompted by their own Ill Humour, or which is more probable, acted upon and countenanc'd by some Great Men out of Place, having of late, in their publick writings, stretch'd too far the Liberty of *Englishmen*, and presumed too much on the Mildness of her Majesty's Government; the Ministry thought fit to put a seasonable check to their licentious Pens."³⁰ Both explanations for the rigorous prosecutions of the opposition writers and printers are entirely plausible, and by their great diversity prove that the motives for punishing free criticism of the administration were not simple. As a private matter and for the good of the party every leader in official position was anxious to suppress any journal hostile to the state; consequently prosecutions increased in number and became more and more severe in proportion to the growing heat of the contest between Whigs and Tories. By the year 1707 political news items were

²⁷ *Ibid.*, VI, 12.

²⁸ Little more is known of Ward's political activity. As he lived until 1731, he may have been the Ward pilloried in 1727. A news-letter of that year reads: "Yesterday Mr. Ward of Hackney stood for one hour in the pillory and the Duchess of Buckingham saw him stand, after which he paid his fine of £500." *Hist. MSS Comm. Ninth Report, App. II*, p. 401.

²⁹ Boyer, *History of the Reign of Queen Anne*, etc. (1735), p. 287.

³⁰ Boyer, *History of the Reign of Queen Anne*, etc. (1735), p. 286. Throughout the succeeding pages Boyer noted the punishments meted out to various offending writers and printers.

scattered everywhere throughout England,³¹ and such prosecutions as had become common during the controversies over the Scottish Union were multiplied during the following years.

Such attack and counter-attack could have arisen only after financial encouragement had influenced the writers. The opposition and ministerial presses were being subsidized constantly that public opinion might be led to desired beliefs; incidentally the writers themselves were being persuaded to adopt or profess the political opinions tending to increase their opportunities for employment. By 1710 political patronage had a strong economic influence upon literary production, with the result that capable writers were being rapidly drawn into party service. Other forms of literary support could not meet the competition offered by political organizations. Consequently private patronage lessened, the book industry could not develop along lines that shortly before seemed promising, and literary periodicals speedily gave place to aggressive party journals.

³¹ In that year the editor of the *Muses Mercury* announced the appearance of his journal with the following statement regarding contributed articles: "We Except against all *Political* or *Personal* Scandal, what is Injurious to good Sense or good Manners, Immoral or Profane; All *Party* Libels and Lampoons; and those who cannot speak well of Publick or Private Persons, must make use of some other Means to Introduce their Spleen into the World."

CHAPTER II

THE POLITICAL IMPORTANCE OF ADDISON AFTER 1712

ADDISON'S EARLIER POLITICAL WORK—THE SIGNIFICANT EVENTS OF 1712—
MINOR WRITERS UNDER HIS CONTROL—HIS RELATIONS WITH POPE—
THE DEPENDENCE OF STEELE—PARTY MEASURES OF ADDISON AND
WALPOLE.

The importance of Steele and Addison in the life of Queen Anne's reign justifies the attention paid them by all students of eighteenth century conditions. Both were concerned with the most characteristic literary product of their day—the periodical essay, and both became deeply involved in politics. As they were thus typical of their age and influential in its affairs, they have been discussed familiarly by literary and political historians from their own time to the present. The life story of Steele in particular has had due presentation in a critical biographical study¹ which clearly reveals the variety and importance of his political employments. But in the case of Addison less has been done; biographers and less responsible critics have passed over his political influence upon his contemporaries, his standing with the Whig politicians of his day, and the general results of his interest in politics. It is in these respects that Addison's life had a significance beyond Steele's. His personal influence was far greater and the consequences of his party work more important for himself and for others.

In order to discover the value of Addison's party activity it is not necessary to review all the familiar events of his life story; more can be learned by considering a few of the best-known facts in connection with contemporary political events. Addison has usually been looked upon as an unwilling and incompetent office-holder, whose appointments came through literary reputation rather than through demonstrated ability in statecraft. It would be more proper to assert that he submitted to the needs of party politics all his personal and literary powers. He was always a competent, though not brilliant, official and gave a variety of service not recorded in written history. His unusual political services were made possible by his literary reputation, but it is equally true that public employments effectually destroyed his natural devotion to pure literature.

¹ Little of importance has been added to Mr. George A. Aitken's *Life of Richard Steele*, 2 vols., 1889.

It is very evident that his aggressive party work during Oxford's ministry was an outgrowth from earlier causes. Before 1710 he was not active politically, but contented himself with passive allegiance to the Whig party. From the time of his first congratulatory verses to King William in 1695 he was recognized as of that political group, and he never broke from his allegiance.

Considered as a whole, Addison's life from 1695 to 1710 seems to have been a time of waiting upon the wishes of Whig leaders; while doing literary work, he was in readiness to serve the party. This he demonstrated by constantly working to keep in favor. His *Poem to His Majesty* (1695) opened with verses to Lord Somers, the lord chancellor. Two years later, following the peace of Ryswick, he addressed a similar Latin poem to the King, and this he presented to Montagu, then first commissioner of the Treasury. The discreet dedications were recognized in 1699 by the grant of a three hundred pound pension, and from then on he had the continual good will of the two Whig leaders. Though the pension money was paid irregularly and the grant revoked at the accession of Anne, the affair proved Addison's standing. In 1702, having been elected to membership in the Kit-Kat Club, he became thoroughly a Whig. Two years later he celebrated Marlborough's victory at Blenheim in his *Campaign*, and was made a Commissioner of Appeal in Excise. Very shortly after the publication of this poem, in at least one production he made good return for the patronage of leading Whigs; his pamphlet, *The Present State of the War, and the Necessity of an Augmentation*, which appeared anonymously in November, 1707, revealed more intense party interest than any of his other work preceding the first issues of the *Whig Examiner*.

After such active partisanship Addison was the logical choice as editor of the new journal founded in 1710 to oppose the Tory *Examiner*. He proved himself a sound Whig by championing every cause of his party. Perhaps his most distinctively partisan article during his brief term as editor was in defence of verses by Dr. Garth. That loyal Whig had written a poem remarkable chiefly for unrestrained praise of Godolphin, and upon its publication the *Examiner* had commented caustically upon its "strong unlabour'd impotence of thought."² Addison's prompt rejoinder in the *Whig Examiner* for September 14, 1710 was a partisan piece on a level with the Tory review that inspired it, and both represent the manner in which a great deal of so-called "literary criticism" was written during succeeding years. While men of letters continued to be

² Issue for September 7, 1710. See *Biog. Brit.* (1750), III, 2,133.

active partisans, literary criticism languished, for their minds were too frequently perverted by party prejudice for the formation of impartial opinions. Addison in this limitation suffered with the other men of his day.

Though he made such open display of party zeal while editor of the *Whig Examiner*, Addison was not a real factor in Whig affairs until after 1712. In that year he became a politician instead of a man of letters, a change that he made known to all through two important acts—by dropping the *Spectator* and by aiding Daniel Button to establish a Whig coffee-house. The chief consequence of these evident political steps was an open break with his old associates and literary acquaintances, so that thereafter party allegiance became his new test for friendship and support. As a secondary result a similar demonstration of political devotion became necessary for the average writers wishing during the next years to win favors from any leading literary man or politician in London. With the need for a choice of party, English men of letters encountered a corresponding need for accurate information on political topics, so that their interests and ambitions both underwent a gradual change. As for Addison personally, upon the opening of Button's Coffee House he became a practical man of affairs instead of an amusing, instructive essayist, and thereafter constantly subordinated lighter interests to public requirements. His chances for state office had disappeared at the fall of the party in 1709; consequently, in 1712, being dependent upon men out of power, he willingly entered into their plans to reestablish Whig control.

It is important to recognize the consequences of Addison's acts in order to see their relation to his later work. Like Swift among Tory writers, he stood in 1712 as advisor to the minor writers of his party, and consequently became a mediary between them and the party leaders. In this service he undoubtedly assisted many friends without regard simply to practical ends; but with both men it appears that personal friendship was one of the best mediums for getting others into party service. In addition to the power of friendship, Addison utilized the patronage obtainable from the Whig nobility and the prospect of state employment for the faithful when the Whigs should regain control of the government.

Specific instances of his activity are numerous enough to prove these assertions. In 1709 his cousin, Eustace Budgell, went with him to Ireland and later on lived with him in London. Both experiences were effectual bonds, as was their relationship, so that Budgell contentedly

waited for the Whig patronage to be distributed at the accession of George I. His work on the *Spectator* ranks with that of other occasional contributors like Colonel Brett, Henry Carey, and Thomas Tickell; all lent aid during their years of inaction as members of Addison's "little senate." The relations of Tickell and the essayist illustrate well the effect of political attachment upon literary production. Having praised Addison's opera *Rosamond* in his poem of *Oxford* (1707), Tickell won favor that made his addition to the Whig group a certainty. In 1712, however, he wrote his *Poem to his Excellency the Lord Privy Seal on the Prospect of Peace*, a direct contradiction of his patron's political creed. Addison discreetly ignored the Tory materials in the poem and praised it in the *Spectator* as a "noble performance."³ Having thus kept Tickell in the Whig group, he was able later to make use of him in his quarrel with Pope and finally to get him into state employment under a Whig administration.

Ambrose Philips, best known of the minor writers for the *Spectator*, had been under Addison's influence before the paper was founded. As early as April 25, 1710, his patron had tried to obtain for him a diplomatic post,⁴ and thus had brought the pastoral poet into intimate relations with prominent Whigs. As a result he held Philips against Swift's proffered patronage, a success that led the literary advisor for the government to exclaim angrily that he "would have helped him [Philips] had he not run party mad."⁵ The acts of Addison and Swift's comment attest the pressure put upon Philips by both political groups. Another writer to recognize the need for courting favor from the Whig literary advisor was the poet Young, who looked to Addison for recommendation. Both of these writers saw what were the channels to patronage. Tickell chose the Whig side in spite of Tory persuasions; Young secretly played for Tory favor, but openly professed fidelity to the party of Addison and his friend Tickell.

While thus influencing men of definite literary ability and reputation, Addison also approached men of lesser merit on purely practical grounds. For instance, he proposed to Edmund Smith, a mediocre writer, that he should write a Whig history of the Revolution. It was common enough during the reign of Anne to bring out "party histories" under the guise of unbiased accounts, and this work was to have been one for the glory of the Whig party. The inducement offered was three hundred

³ No. 523.

⁴ Letter of Addison to Philips: in Aikin's *Life*, II, 14.

⁵ *Journal to Stella*, December 27, 1713.

pounds—a large sum for the work, except for the fact that it was to have an immediate political value. As it happened, the book was never written, but only because Smith's indolence was too great. Yet the record of the negotiations is enough to prove what was Addison's disposition in the affair, and to show how he was used by his party. He could not have made such a proposal unless wealthy Whigs had given him, as their agent, the necessary funds.

A more significant instance of his purposeful work for the party is to be found in his dealings with Pope between 1712 and 1714. At the time when Addison instituted a Whig club at Button's in opposition to the Tory group at Will's, Pope tried to remain neutral. He had close friends on both sides and hoped to keep them. Mr. Courthope has summarized the facts regarding Pope's situation in the perplexing days thereafter with the statement, "His religion prevented him from hoping for any state employment; he had suffered from the bigotry of religious party spirit in consequence of his *Essay on Criticism*; his taste was repugnant to politics, and his moralizing temper made him inclined to take up a temporizing position."⁶ To be sure, these considerations checked Pope from entering party controversies, but more concrete inducements also had their effect. It was in connection with one of these practical appeals that Addison proved himself an important factor in the Whig plans for publicity.

The case can be understood properly with some knowledge of Pope's situation in 1712. He was not identified completely with a political party, as were almost all of his old associates; he still held an anomalous position politically, and undoubtedly quite intentionally. During the preceding years events had occurred that opened his eyes to the cleavage that London literary groups were undergoing through the force of politics, and he was disposed to maintain an attitude of neutrality in order to keep alive his literary friendships. The success of his work depended on it. One proof of this friendly disposition appeared in his plans to help Steele with the *Guardian*. The paper did not begin until the next spring, but Pope was planning his contributions as early as November 1712.⁷ Then he had no fears over party matters. Soon, however, he showed in his letters to Caryll that Tory likings were drawing him towards partisanship, and that because of natural inclinations he might easily be led to take an active part. It is not sufficient explanation for this inclination of Pope's to count his Tory interest due to the party attach-

⁶ Pope, *Works*, V, 80.

⁷ Letter to Caryll, November 19, 1712. *Works*, VI, 167.

ment of his correspondent, for everything in his life hitherto turned him towards that side. At heart a Tory, Pope was in 1712 still on good terms with the writers for the opposition.

Only when *Windsor Forest* was published in March 1713 can he be said to have taken an open stand for either political group. Then, under his own name, Pope made public a poem that had seventy lines in praise of the Tory negotiations with France. These had been added through the suggestion of Lord Lansdowne to a poem that originally was not planned with any party intention. Immediately its author was looked upon as another active writer on the Tory side; the one whose silence on party matters had seemed certain, had spoken out definitely for the administration.

Whatever may have been Pope's surprise at the consequences, his old friends were quick to show their appreciation of the act. Swift expressed his joy in his *Journal* for March 9, 1713, and at once made haste to fraternize with the new Tory poet. He introduced Pope to all the leading politicians on the government side and sought to make him a sharer in their plans. Though the only permanent result was an enduring personal friendship between the two, under other circumstances Swift might easily have had his desire. As it happened, he himself three months after these events left for Ireland, Oxford and Bolingbroke fell to loggerheads over private jealousies, and so Pope was left free from outside pressure to choose his own course of action. His gain privately was to come from the friendship of Swift, Gay, Arbuthnot, and Bolingbroke.⁸ As for the Tory leaders, they were distracted to matters more pressing than the encouragement of a poet. They none the less realized his value.

⁸ When Swift returned to England in September 1713, he began a correspondence with Pope. We know from Pope's reply to a letter from his friend, that Swift had urged him to change his religion. The reply, dated December 8, 1713, (*Works*, VII, 3) was bantering in tone but unquestionably of serious purpose. For instance, the following lines show Pope's true position: "I am afraid there is no being at once a good poet and a good Christian, and I am very much straitened between the two, while the Whigs seem willing to contribute as much to continue me the one, as you would to make me the other. But, if you can move every man in the government who has above ten thousand pounds a year, to subscribe as much as yourself, I shall become a convert, as most men do, when the Lord turns it to my interest." This letter comes from Lord Orrery's *Remarks on Swift*, not from Pope's edition of his own correspondence. With no doubt as to its authenticity, one is disposed to admit that Swift was trying to remove a religious disability preparatory to recommending Pope to the ministry.

Though the proofs of Addison's concern in the matter are less obvious, it is very clear that he had political reasons for his attitude towards Pope. He knew, to be sure, the influence drawing the poet towards the Tories, among them being the fact that a recognized Catholic could scarcely find tolerance and favor from a party sworn to secure a Protestant succession. In addition he saw how deftly Swift was drawing Pope into the companionship of the Tory lords. With such reflections as these Addison assumed *Windsor Forest* to be only a token of what could be expected presently in the way of outspoken Tory writings.

It would not, therefore, have been odd had Addison considered the matter settled: instead he interfered. At least it might be possible, he thought, to deprive the Tories of such assistance as Pope could render, even though it could never be obtained for the Whigs. His need, therefore, was to find an alternative course more attractive than that offered by the Tory politicians, and from past experiences he had learned what arguments would best serve his purpose.

The chief desires in Pope's heart were to be recognized as England's greatest living poet and to live independent of the degrading patronage granted by the nobility to writers of the preceding reign. Though serving the Tory party would not necessarily prevent a realization of these worthy ambitions, Addison knew that Pope might fear such a result. In a letter dated November 2, 1713, he wrote in commendation of the projected translation of Homer, and added significantly: "You gave me leave once to take the liberty of a friend, in advising you not to content yourself with one half of the nation for your admirers, when you might command them all. If I might take the liberty to repeat it, I would on this occasion. I think you are very happy that you are out of this fray [i. e., political controversy] and I hope all your undertakings will turn to the better account for it."⁹ Addison may have had in mind the time, noted by Spence, when he wrote to Pope saying, "You who will deserve the praise of the whole nation, should never content yourself with half of it."¹⁰ Whatever may have been the date of the original suggestion, evidently it gave weight to the later plea, made when Addison was most solicitous that Pope should refuse to aid the Tories.

If one is opposed to assuming so much when the evidence has been taken from Pope's edited correspondence, he may turn elsewhere for proof. Joseph Warton wrote as follows regarding the attitude of Addison towards Pope after the publication of *Windsor Forest*: "A person of

⁹ Pope, *Works*, VI, 402.

¹⁰ Singer's (1820) edition of the *Anecdotes*, p. 9.

no small rank has informed me, that Mr. Addison was inexpressibly chagrined at this noble conclusion of *Windsor-Forest*, both as a politician and as a poet. As a politician, because it so highly celebrated that treaty of peace which he deemed so pernicious to the liberties of Europe; and as a poet, because he was deeply conscious that his own *Campaign*, that gazette in rhyme, contained no strokes of such genuine and sublime poetry."¹¹ All the circumstances make Warton's anecdote seem reasonable. First, in 1713 Addison was so deeply engrossed in politics that he quite naturally would have disliked Pope's opposition. Freed from the restraint upon him while writing *Spectators*, he was then too much alive to the political situation to ignore Pope's appearance on the side of the ministry. Moreover, the method taken to divert Pope from political interests is in itself quite convincing against Addison. Very obviously here is an instance of a writer stopped in his party writing through the use of clever diplomacy. Under the guise of friendship, Addison accomplished his purpose.¹² For many years after, Pope care-

¹¹ "Essay on the Genius of Pope," (1806 ed.) I, 29.

¹² Mr. Courthope (V, 84) does not believe Warton's anecdote to be authentic. Because Addison had shown a non-partisan attitude in praising Tickell's *Peace*, another Tory poem on the Peace of Utrecht, he considers Addison to have been non-partisan in his literary judgments. He also offers the opinion that Addison, if angered by *Windsor Forest*, would not have let stand Pope's Prologue to *Cato*, which was acted two months after the publication of the Tory poem.

In the first place, Mr. Courthope cannot assume that the anecdote "rests on no foundation" simply because it seems contradictory to Addison's open praise of a similar political poem; for Addison's relations with Tickell are not comparable to his relations with Pope. Tickell had been a favorite of his ever since writing the complimentary verses on *Rosamond*, and had been under Addison's protection during all his years in London. Later he was to get state appointments through the help of his patron and finally to edit his works. A question in point—though not one easy of solution—would be, why Tickell, a Whig partisan, wrote his Tory poem on *The Prospect of Peace*. It is not extraordinary that Addison should have had the tact to praise his friend's poem, and a conclusion of some plausibility might be that his praise held Tickell among the Whigs at a time when Tory policies seemed most successful. As to Pope's part in the production of *Cato*, Addison may simply have used Pope's *Prologue* as a recommendation to favor from the most prominent poet of the day. The literary relationship of the two men may be held to justify such a conclusion. As a political expedient, however, the use of the *Prologue* can be explained in the same way as Addison's letter of Nov. 2, 1713; Addison used the best means available to restrain Pope from Tory allegiance—in one case by reading his *Prologue* into a Whig play, and later, by advising him to keep free from party. It seems entirely probable that both of Addison's acts were purposeful, and no other interpretation suits the spirit of his letter to Pope. Warton's anecdote confirms this conclusion.

fully avoided party attachments and soon prided himself on his independence.¹³

The most complete statement of his new position in regard to party is to be found in a letter written to Caryll on May 1, 1714, which indicates how definitely he had then determined his line of conduct. It reads: "I have . . . encountered much malignity on the score of religion, some calling me a papist and a tory, the latter because the heads of the party have been distinguishingly favourable to me: but why the former I cannot imagine, but that Mr. Caryll and Mr. E. Blount have laboured to serve me. Others have stiled me a whig, because I have been honoured with Mr. Addison's good word and Mr. Jervas' good deed, and of late with my Lord Halifax's patronage. How much more natural a conclusion would it be to any good-natured man to think a person who has been favoured by all sides has been inoffensive to all. This miserable age is so sunk between animosities of party and those of religion, that I begin to fear most men have politics enough to make the best scheme of government a bad one, through their extremity of violence, and faith enough to hinder their salvation. I hope, for my own part, never to have more of either than is consistent with justice and charity. . . . I am ambitious of nothing but the good opinion of all good men on both sides."¹⁴ Sincerity seems more evident in this letter than is usual in Pope's correspondence. Again, on August 16, 1714, following the death of Queen Anne, he wrote to Caryll: "I thank God that, as for myself, I am below all the accidents of state changes by my circumstances, and above them by my philosophy."¹⁵

After this statement of contempt for party he became involved as deeply in his Homer as even Addison could have wished. Not until he freed himself finally in 1725 from the long task on the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* was he ready to reassert his political opinions. In the instances when Pope actually aided either Whigs or Tories, he apparently expected no rewards for his services, and undoubtedly he kept to his resolution to live wholly upon public support.

As for Addison's other forms of assistance to the Whig cause, proof of his active partisanship appears in a pamphlet issued during the time of his chicanery with Pope. In the summer of 1713 he brought out anonymously *The late Tryal and Conviction of Count Tariff*, in which he made a strong attack upon Defoe, who was then defending the Tory

¹³ See his comment upon Steele's expulsion from the House, *Works*, VI, 196.

¹⁴ *Works*, VI, 208.

¹⁵ *Works*, VI, 217.

trade policy in his journal *Mercator*, and who in the same year had defended the Tory trade policy in his *Memoirs of Count Tariff*. In his invective against the personified foe of free trade, Addison warmly assailed the *Mercator* and the *Examiner* for defending Count Tariff, as follows:

. . . "When the Count had finished his speech, he desired leave to call in his witnesses, which was granted: when immediately there came to the bar a man with a hat drawn over his eyes in such a manner that it was impossible to see his face. He spoke in the spirit, nay in the very language of the Count, repeated his arguments, and confirmed his assertions. Being asked his name; he said the world called him *Mercator*: but as for his true name, his age, his lineage, his place of abode, they were particulars, which for certain reasons he was obliged to conceal. . . . There appeared another witness in favour of the Count, who spoke with so much violence and warmth, that the Court began to listen to him very attentively; till upon hearing his name they found he was a notorious Knight of the post, being kept in pay to give his testimony on all occasions where it was wanted. This was the *Examiner*: a person who had abused almost every man in England, that deserved well of his country. . . the witness overheard the word *Pillory* repeated twice or thrice, slunk away privately, and hid himself among the people.

. . .¹⁶

This excerpt from an unfamiliar essay shows a controversial spirit not usually associated with Addison's name. Its open hostility to the Tory journalists proves that he personally entered the party controversies of the day with hopes of confuting Defoe and the retainers of Swift. His party activities between 1710 and 1714, consequently, comprised direct attack upon Tory writers as well as non-committal encouragement of his literary associates towards the same end. Great importance should also be attached to the trickery used repeatedly in his dealings with Pope. Moreover, his readiness in 1713 to write a controversial party pamphlet bears out the conviction that he was thinking of political conditions when staging *Cato* during the same year. Whether or not he had begun the play years before while residing in France is insignificant; the fact is that his only play was used as a political document in the spring of 1713 when party rage was at its height.¹⁷ He had unquestionably a clear intention in portraying Cato's last stand

¹⁶ *Works* (1721 ed.), IV, 326-7.

¹⁷ The first production was at Drury Lane Theater on April 14, 1713, not on April 13, as Mr. Courthope implies in his *Addison*, p. 119. Mr. Gosse makes the same error in his history of the period.

against the usurpation of state liberties by Caesar, for contemporary events seemed to justify a Whig in viewing Oxford's acts as those of a similar tyrant. It is not significant of anything relative to Addison's purpose, that the Tories tried to turn a Whig play to their own uses; that Bolingbroke openly gave Booth, the actor, a purse of fifty pounds as a reward for his services to the government; or that Tory praises diminished remarkably the effect desired by the author. In 1713 Addison's contemporaries knew how resolutely he was attached to Whig principles, and his *Cato* was accepted as a Whig play in spite of Tory efforts to subvert his intention.¹⁸

Being so fully a sharer in Whig plans, Addison thus showed it occasionally in his writings before the death of Queen Anne. Though his least productive period for political composition, the years 1710-1714 were marked by these few noteworthy examples of such work. His more important activities were in restraining others from entering Tory service through the means of Button's Coffee House and its associations, or through such unobtrusive acts as those brought out concerning his dealings with Pope.

*

Two interesting problems arise in the study of Addison's political activity between 1710 and 1714; one, the question of what influence he had over Steele, and the other as to his relations with the Whig leaders.

On the first point the opinion has prevailed that Addison repressed Steele's political enthusiasms while the *Spectator* was in existence. The satisfaction and profit derived from a Tory office also kept him in check, but to Addison has been accorded credit for keeping the *Spectator* free from violently partisan essays. Correspondence for these years clearly reveals Steele's submission to Addison in important matters. For example, on October 6, 1713, John Hughes wrote begging Addison to check his friend's plan to enter more deeply into politics with his new paper, the *Englishman*.¹⁹ The obvious conclusion is that Steele's subservience to Addison was well known to their close friends, and that it

¹⁸ In commenting upon Bolingbroke's gift to Booth, one writer observed: "Undoubtedly he would have rewarded it much nobler in the person of Mr. Addison had it not been universally known that the Gentleman had made a Present of that Copy to the Players, and that his Principles would not suffer him to accept of any place under that Ministry." *Authentic Memoirs of the Conduct and Adventures of Henry St. John*, etc. [n. d.], p. 29.

¹⁹ Addison, *Works* (1768 ed.), V, 411.

was noticed to a certain degree by others. Since Addison, in his letter of October 12, assured Hughes that any advice he might then give Steele would have no weight,²⁰ it seems that he realized the waning of his old influence. By that time more powerful Whigs were directing Steele's acts, and party work was fast becoming his chief concern. Though personally very effective as a journalist and as a parliamentary speaker, Steele could never dominate other writers in the fashion of his friend.

In all his service he was rather a ready worker under guidance. He permitted his friends to make intelligent use of his talents. The circumstances of his election to parliament for Stockbridge show their deliberate plan to raise Steele to a place of usefulness to the party. No one doubts that his advisors used funds improperly during the election; indeed, on March 3, 1714, James, Earl of Barrymore, and Sir Richard Vernon entered a petition for his expulsion on that ground. Had not the charges for seditious libel seemed more plausible ground for prosecution in an age of general bribery, this plea would have been pushed to a conclusion. Whig and Tory leaders alike recognized what ends their opponents were seeking, and meanwhile Steele was only a pawn in the hands of greater men.

Some contemporary comments prove this to have been the situation. One writer boldly asserted that what "seduced" Steele more than any interest in Whig measures was getting "a Pension from the Party, double the Income of the *Stamp Office* at Present, and in Hand, for Speaking in the House."²¹ The *Examiner* also commented characteristically: "Whether the Author of the *Crisis* and *Englishman*, by laying down the *Pen*, and trusting altogether to the Use of his *Mouth*, will be best able to do his *Party Service*, may justly be made a Question, till he can give other Proofs of his Abilities, than have yet been communicated to the Publick. I readily believe that the Number of his *Prompters* is pretty near equal to that of his Correspondents, but there is a sensible difference in their Weight."²² These opinions regarding Steele's motives in entering parliament hint openly that he was under the guidance of Whig leaders, not at all a free agent.

The completeness of his dependence upon others and also Addison's relations with the Whig politicians were shown by the events of Steele's trial and expulsion from the House of Commons. Defoe had instigated

²⁰ *Works* (1768 ed.), V, 412.

²¹ *The Character of Sir Richard Steele*, etc. (1713), p. 5.

²² *Examiner* V, No. 32: March 8-12, 1713.

the proceedings against him,²³ and at Oxford's move to push matters to a conclusion Steele's Whig friends rallied to his support. In this critical situation his most powerful protector was Robert Walpole. This influential Whig, once considered by Oxford as worth half his party, was in 1714 the most significant factor in English politics. He was the acknowledged leader of the opposition, and the Tories greatly feared him. When the contest over Steele's seat arose, therefore, it was but natural for Walpole to assume the responsibility of defending the party spokesman.

His speech in Steele's behalf was a powerful plea for an enlarged freedom of the press and for unrestrained freedom of speech. Long tenure of public office had shown him the efficacy of such government journals as Defoe's *Review* and the *Examiner*; now that the Whigs, completely out of power, sorely needed the aid of Steele as a speaker and pamphleteer, Walpole exerted every effort in his behalf. General Stanhope was also aggressive; Lord Hinchinbroke and Lord Finch both spoke for him, and Addison was posted in readiness to advise his old friend. But of them all, Walpole was by far the most vigorous in his pleading, and even went so far as to prepare much of the three-hour speech delivered by Steele in person.²⁴

Although the Whig lords failed to break down the Tory prosecution, the trial brought to light definite facts of importance concerning party writing on the government side: it also proved Walpole a sedulous investigator into the practices of the administration. In his speech for Steele he revealed some startling facts. He charged the Tory leader with having prepared the way for a return of the Pretender by conducting a propaganda through all sorts of publications. A corrupt post-office system, it was asserted, furnished the means of distribution for documents presenting false information concerning conditions, all to the end that Tory rule might be continued after Queen Anne's death. Walpole's specific charge was based upon the publication of a party history, called *The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England asserted*. This work,

²³ On February 19, 1713-14 Defoe wrote to Oxford: ". . . The new champion of the party, Mr. Steele, is now to try a experiment upon the Ministry, and shall set up to make speeches in the House and print them, that the malice of the party may be gratified and the Ministry be bullied in as public a manner as possible. If, my lord, the virulent writings of this man may not be voted seditious none ever may, and if thereupon he may be expelled it would discourage the party and break all their new measures." *Portland MSS*, V, 384.

²⁴ Coxe, *Walpole*, etc. (1798), I, 45.

he charged, had been written after Oxford had employed a competent student to search the state files for documents unfavorable to the Hanoverian succession. Thus, Walpole said, while ostensibly supporting Queen Anne, Oxford was actually dispersing statements intended to prevent a Protestant succession. In support of this charge the Whig leader offered to bring evidence that a Treasury order for twelve or fourteen pounds had been issued to the investigator for finding arguments for his case in the will of Henry VIII. The Tory leaders, however, were loathe to discuss the matter and let Walpole's charge pass uncontested.

This proved instance of government subsidy for a party history strengthens belief in the truth of such statements as the following, written by the editor of the *Examiner*: "By *Party Histories* I do not understand the Accounts of any one *Party* or *Faction*; for those may be very True and Useful; But I mean such *Histories* as are written for the Sake of a Party, and to promote its declining Interests: Wherein there is a manifest Byass upon the Author, who must keep close, not to the Truth, but Design; and so Correct, Model, Conceal, Alter, and temporize his Facts and Reflections, that they may effectually serve his Friends, instead of instructing his *Readers*. All Works of this kind are reserv'd for a *Crisis*, and come abroad in some favourable Juncture. . ."²⁵ Clearly both parties at the end of Queen Anne's reign were freely resorting to such means of presenting false reports of historic events. Walpole's charge against Oxford and Addison's offer to "Rag" Smith are definite proofs that both parties used that method. Furthermore, on good authority it may be asserted that the government made improper use of its power by compelling army men to distribute broadcast the copies of these party histories, and that Secretary Bromley supplied the funds for advertising the works in the *London Gazette*.²⁶

Knowing what the government leaders were doing regarding the succession, Walpole naturally took vigorous steps to keep Steele in the House. It was undoubtedly he who led Steele to try new ways of helping the Whigs against the Tories, and in coöperation with Addison he devised checks upon the work of Swift, Bolingbroke, Oxford, and Defoe. We know from outside information that Walpole was not at work simply through liking for Steele; he was working for the party and for his own political career. The proof is to be found in an unpublished letter among the *Domestic Papers*, written on January 30, 1723, by Stephen Whately. In addressing Walpole, the writer asked for assistance in a case then

²⁵ V, No. 1: November 27-30, 1713.

²⁶ Boyer, *Reign of Anne*, etc., p. 676.

pending against him in court. As ground for the request, he had this to say of his previous relations with the Whig leader during the reign of Anne: "In the Close of the Late Reign, your Memorialist had the Happiness of being Indulged with Access to your Honour, and was employ'd in the private Printing and Dispersing of several Papers wrote by the Best Pens against the Enemies of the Protestant Succession, particularly the Letter to the West Country Clothier, The Short History of the Parliament, and others with which I will not now take up your Time; only I would beg Leave to acquaint your Hon^r

That when the Author of the Flying Post George Ridpath was forced to go beyond Sea for Animadverting on the then Administration, your Memorialist being desired to stand in the Gap, carry'd on the said Paper with the same Spirit to ye Demise of the Queen, in spite of all Difficulties and Dangers, and has ever since continued it with the same Zeal, by combating all Libellers that have hitherto taken the Field against the present Government; from the *Examiner* down to *Mist's Journal* and the *Free Briton*. . .²⁷

The significance of Whately's letter lies in its positive proof of Walpole's active interest in party journalism before 1714 as well as later. Above all others he has hitherto been considered hostile to every sort of literary production and to the whole writing profession, simply because some explanation was needed to justify the unhappy state of English letters during the reign of George I. As a result of this need, the foreign king and his chief advisor have been condemned for supposedly ignoring men who were trying to support themselves by writing. Now it is certain that Walpole was working in complete agreement with Addison during the last years of Queen Anne's reign. The events of Steele's trial and Whately's letter show that they were mutually interested in promoting the Whig propaganda. In view of their common interest in party journalism, in party histories, and in the patronage of minor Whig writers, it is proper to assume them working together after 1712. All the available evidence supports such a conclusion.

²⁷ *S. P. Dom. Geo. I.* Vol. 44, fol. 229.

CHAPTER III

SWIFT'S RELATIONS WITH THE TORY MINISTRY

THE NEW MEASURES OF OXFORD AND BOLINGBROKE—FOUNDATION OF BOLINGBROKE'S *Examiner*—PROSECUTION OF THE OPPOSITION—THE TORY POLITICAL CLUB—SWIFT AS DIRECTOR OF PARTY JOURNALISM—THE PATRONAGE OFFERED TO COMPETENT WRITERS—REWARDS TO SWIFT FOR HIS SERVICES.

When England, in 1710, came under the control of Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford,¹ her political affairs were in chaos. Tory and Whig alike distrusted the new favorite of Queen Anne. No one felt sure of a place in the new government, for the noncommittal manner of Oxford whenever party lines were under discussion did not please office seekers. The Whigs quite naturally suspected some deceit to lie behind this mask. As for the Tories, the mere suggestion of a bi-partisan government was enough to cause great uneasiness in their ranks, for division of the expected spoils was their worst fear. Consequently, the newly appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer² realized that he had many potential enemies about him and very few loyal supporters. It was with a dubious future that he began forming plans for a new administration.

It would be useless to examine in detail all the conditions under which Oxford took up his task. At present, it is important only to remember that the new leader had behind him no unified organization; he had deprived himself of that means to political strength by trying to ignore party lines. Though the elections of 1710 had brought into parliament a strong Tory majority, Oxford did not presume this to be due to his personal popularity. The common people merely used this means of discrediting the persecutors of Sacheverell. Their Tory votes were but the aftermath of that strange political accident that had led Queen Anne to break the Whig rule on June 3, 1710, by dismissing Sunderland from his place as Secretary of State. That act had opened the way for the Tories as an alternative, but it had not made them or their leader desired by the common voters of England.

¹ Robert Harley was created Baron of Wigmore, Earl of Oxford, and Earl Mortimer on May 23, 1711. For convenience all further reference to him will be by his title as Earl of Oxford.

² Oxford was virtually in control before receiving this appointment, which was made on August 10, 1710.

It was clear to Oxford that he had more prospect of favor with the people than with the professional politicians. His experience in 1707, during the preliminaries to the union of Scotland and England, had taught him the uses of popular appeals through the press. He therefore set out to increase the efficiency of his publicity agencies.

Perhaps a survey of the work accomplished by Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke,³ will best reveal Oxford's devices. This active politician had previously shown an interest in party journalism, and was eager to act as news director of the administration. He made his desire known as soon as a reconstruction of the government appeared certain; thus in the fall of 1710 he assumed the responsibility of promoting a new Tory journal. Having gained at once the good will of the journalists, he sought boldly through their help to get an important post in the Oxford ministry. Largely because of the pressure thus brought to bear, on September 21, 1710, Oxford made him Secretary of State for the Northern Department.

The manner in which Bolingbroke demonstrated his zeal before gaining the place of secretary is of importance. As a bolster to the unstable Tory cause, on August 3, 1710 he brought out the first issue of a new journal, the *Examiner*. At once the paper became the official organ of the unformed party. Popular opinion turned to the side of Oxford as soon as the *Examiner* began its expositions of party policy, and as a result its promoter rose to a position of influence among the grateful Tories. He was recognized as the codifier for public use of their political opinions. His was a place of tremendous possibilities at a time when political meetings were unknown and reports of parliamentary procedure were strictly forbidden. Operating under government protection, Bolingbroke established himself firmly in popular esteem and also in the councils of his party. Through fortunate circumstances he ingratiated himself with everyone, greatly increased his own political importance, and soon compelled Oxford to give him more and more power. At last he was able to defy his former master.

The new Secretary was quick to make capital out of his opportunities. Having full control still of the *Examiner*, he was able to make his private opinions appear to be established Tory doctrines. He became, in short, a public figure demanding consideration. On one occasion he wrote to Marlborough that he had "given the proper hint"⁴ to the

³ St. John became Viscount Bolingbroke on July 7, 1712. As with Oxford, further reference to him will be by the familiar title.

⁴ March 20, 1710-11. *Works* (1798 ed.) I, 115.

Examiner regarding a particular matter, with the implication that he was in full control of that means to popular attention. Apparently men of his own party recognized his command of the situation. Such suggestion lies in the comment of a contemporary, who called him a "Writer and Director of other Writers for the Ministry"⁵—clear evidence that he was esteemed to be in full control of Tory journalism.

This power came to him through his dealings with such writers as depended upon their work for a livelihood, for the bulk of the Tory news matter was produced by hired subordinates. With Swift's help Bolingbroke brought to terms every capable journalist who was not beyond solicitation. Though no account books prove to-day what sums he distributed, the unrefuted charges of his contemporaries demonstrate that Bolingbroke used money freely in promoting his Tory propaganda. One Whig journal, the *Medley*, not only charged him with having bought up writers for his journals: it also laid to his account every misfortune befalling those venturing to write against the ministry.⁶ Another contemporary work contains slurring reference to Bolingbroke and his methods in the statement, "Mr. *Mainwaring* [a Whig editor] never doubted, but what *Mr. St. J[ohn]* was the main Promoter of that Paper [the *Examiner*], and if *Mr. H[arle]*y paid for it out of the Publick Purse, he [Bolingbroke] not only contributed to it out of his private One, but also by his assistance in Writing and Correcting."⁷ Such statements add weight to the natural supposition that the Tory party fostered political journalism; they also point to a general understanding of Bolingbroke's function in the administration. With the appearance of the *Examiner* and subsequent Tory sheets began a vigorous defence of the ruling party quite different from the temperate procedure of the *London Gazette*. Swift and Bolingbroke thus demonstrated the worth of Oxford's plan.

During these last four years of Queen Anne's reign the usual methods of checking opposition journals were continued. Writers, printers, and publishers suffered fine or imprisonment as punishment for seditious publication, but at first such hindrances to free speech put but little restraint upon production. Whig journals, particularly the *Medley*, continued during 1710 and 1711 to publish frank comments upon the party in power, while Bolingbroke was gradually developing the intensity of his attacks upon their liberties. His prosecutions became more fre-

⁵ *The Grand Accuser the Greatest of Criminals*, etc., p. 10.

⁶ *The Medley*, XXXI, April 30, 1711; XXXIX, June 25, 1711.

⁷ John Oldmixon, *The Life . . . of Arthur Mainwaring, Esq.*, p. 158.

quent, rewards were advertised as in waiting for informers against Whig journalists, and measures were adopted that promised only evil fortune for all working against the Oxford administration.⁸

Hindrances to the Whig journals were of varied sorts. The best known measure of Bolingbroke's repressive campaign was the Stamp Act of 1712, imposing a tax upon all English sheets and pamphlets. This tax upon printed matter was not made chiefly for revenue purposes, but with the hope that the charges might prove prohibitive for the Whig journals. Swift for one expected great results from the measure and exulted over the prospect of seeing his foes undone;⁹ but he eventually admitted regretfully that the Whigs had defeated Bolingbroke's plan by subsidizing their journals more liberally.¹⁰ Other forms of persecution were the institution of more vigorous proceedings against printers and publishers on the Whig side, and the immediate arrest of all dealers or hawkers caught selling seditious pamphlets. Frequently the papers were burned publicly by the common hangman while the writer or printer stood out his sentence in the pillory at Charing Cross or near the Exchange. When not in the stocks, such prisoners lay in jail without hope of bail. Government spies gathered the information needed for these prosecutions, and often were able to intercept seditious articles on their way to the press.¹¹ Contemporary references to such practices are so frequent as to prove them common¹² during the years 1712-1714.

One should not assume from these statements that Bolingbroke confined his activities to the founding of one journal and an occasional prosecution of his opponents. Two months after beginning the *Examiner* the Secretary was also busy with plans to control the foreign press, that he might win good will for the new ministry among England's allies. His hope was to extend the power of the Tory party abroad as an aid to

⁸ The earliest date found for a signed offer of reward is May 19, 1713. On that day Bolingbroke printed over his own name an advertisement in the *London Gazette* promising £100 reward for the arrest of George Ridpath, editor of the *Flying Post*. By that time he evidently had discarded all pretensions of concealment and openly admitted his interest in prosecutions. For contemporary comment see Boyer's *Political State of Great Britain*, etc., V, 378.

⁹ *Journal to Stella*, July 19 and August 7, 1712.

¹⁰ For a full discussion of this act and its effect see pp. 76-78.

¹¹ Reports from such spies are scattered throughout the State Papers. In the same connection see Swift's letter to Archbishop King, May 10, 1711. *Works*, XV, 421.

¹² A good idea of the modes of persecuting Whig writers can be got from an examination of Luttrell's *Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs*, Boyer's *Political State of Great Britain*, and similar works of the time.

its safety at home. In one letter written for this end he assured his correspondent in Holland that nothing detrimental to Dutch interests should appear unchallenged in the papers of England, provided that similar restrictions were placed upon the Dutch press. Continuing, Bolingbroke revealed that another end sought in his request was to get from Holland information of use in prosecuting Whig journalists at home. Apparently the opposition was unusually active abroad, and Bolingbroke wished to destroy their means of communication. He wrote: "I thought it might be more easy to discover in Holland than here, through what channel those party-lies are conveyed to your news-writers; I fancy Buckley, the writer of the Daily Courant, may have some share in this correspondence."¹³ This letter was written in 1710 at a time prior to Bolingbroke's open prosecutions of the Whig journalists. Its existence, therefore, proves that if more secretive than later, he was nevertheless equally vindictive during the first part of Oxford's ministry. Apparently from the outset he subjected the opposition press to relentless harrying.

Finally, in addition to patronizing Tory journalists and prosecuting their Whig opponents, as a further help to the government Bolingbroke set out in 1711 to form a political club. It was to be patterned after existing organizations, whose chief end was to afford places for social conferences between writers and political leaders. London possessed many such clubs during the latter part of Queen Anne's reign. Their individuality was preserved by the identification of the groups with the respective coffee-houses where the members always met, and under the evident social reason for such gatherings always existed more serious purpose. It was with the usual coffee-house club of the day in mind that Bolingbroke on June 12, 1711, set down in a letter to the Earl of Orrery the plans for a new Tory organization. His statement was made so specific in every detail that it furnishes absolute proof of the political intention prompting the action. Perhaps no equally lucid description of the purposes of an eighteenth century club can be found, and for this reason Bolingbroke's letter may well be quoted at length. In outlining the plan, he wrote: ". . . I must, before I send this letter, give your Lordship an account of a club which I am forming; and which, as light as the design may seem to be, I believe will prove of real service. We shall begin to meet in a small number, and that will be composed of some who have wit and learning to recommend them; of others who, from their own situations, or from their relations, have power and influence,

¹³ Bolingbroke to Mr. Drummond, October 13, 1710, *Works* (1798 ed.) I, 6.

and of others who, from accidental reasons, may properly be taken in. The first regulation proposed, and that which must be inviolably kept, is decency. None of the extravagance of the kit-cat, none of the drunkenness of the beef-steak is to be endured. The improvement of friendship, and the encouragement of letters, are to be the two great ends of our society. A number of valuable people will be kept in the same mind, and others will be made converts to their opinions.

"Mr. Fenton, and those who, like him, have genius, will have a corporation of patrons to protect and advance them in the world. The folly of our party will be ridiculed and checked; the opposition of another will be better resisted; a multitude of other good uses will follow, which I am sure do not escape you; and I hope in the winter to ballot for the honor of your company amongst us.

I am ever, my dear Lord. &c."¹⁴

In this union of party leaders and writers¹⁵ Bolingbroke possessed the organization needed then by any religious or political group that depended for success upon popular good-will.

In reviewing Bolingbroke's position among these Tory politicians and writers, one discerns what an important part his journalistic interests played in the development of his power. By reason of his popularity among men of the writing profession he was first chosen to organize a staff of writers for the new Tory organ: then, by their insistence in his behalf, he became Oxford's Secretary of State for the Northern Department. Thereafter his gains in political influence came largely through a use of the *Examiner*. Having created the journal, from the first he dominated it. Its policies were often his own rather than those of the entire Tory party, but reiteration soon made identical in the minds of men these personal opinions and the broad plans of the ministry. Thus Bolingbroke formulated the creed of the Tories and in so doing became their spokesman. Recognized as such by men of all political beliefs, he rose to a place of leadership that made him as important publicly as Oxford himself. Finally, the Secretary added to such widespread influence the help of a political club, in which he individually held the reins. As in the councils of the *Examiner* staff, there Bolingbroke also held first place. Several wealthy Tory

¹⁴ *Works* (1798 ed.), I, 246.

¹⁵ The editor of Bolingbroke's works (1798 ed.) gives (I, 247 n.) the following list of members: ". . . Earl of Arran, Lord Harley, Duke of Ormond, Swift, Sir Robert Raymond, Arbuthnot, Duke of Shrewsbury, Lord Duplin, Sir William Wyndham, George Granville, Masham, Earl of Jersey, Bathurst, Orrery, Colonel Hill, Colonel Desney, Bolingbroke, Duke of Beaufort, Prior, Dr. Freind, etc. Their meetings were first at their several houses, but afterwards they hired a room near St. James."

noblemen and a few writers of the first rank were his advisors and supporters in this new organization, so that he lacked neither funds nor active assistants. He stood in a position of peculiar importance among his fellows. Journalist and statesman alike found in him the means of advancing themselves, and they consequently lent him every assistance. From such circumstances he reaped a personal advantage proportionately great. All of these elements in Bolingbroke's rise to prominence can reasonably be considered due to a personal control of the great Tory journal, the *Examiner*, and to a careful development of his duties as news director of the party.

Among the Secretary's active advisors the foremost was Jonathan Swift, whose greatest fame as a politician rests upon his party writings for Bolingbroke and the Earl of Oxford. Among the Tory journalists he was leader and next in importance to Bolingbroke himself as director of the Tory propaganda. The relations of Swift and Bolingbroke with one another were very similar to those of Addison and Walpole in the Whig party; in each case a great writer depended upon a prominent politician for the financial backing needed to attract other writers to the party standard. Both Swift and Addison were unofficial agents of their respective political organizations. They also wrote freely in support of Whig and Tory measures, and hoped through the indulgence of others to get suitable rewards.

The chief facts concerning Swift's career are of common knowledge. In September 1710 he reappeared in England after a term in Ireland, ready to serve the party offering the best inducements. Past events had embittered him towards the Whigs, but he was unwilling to enter immediately the service of their opponents; on the contrary, he refused to aid either side, played off one against the other without displaying any personal feeling whatever, and then finally threw in his lot with Tories. No one who has read his *Journal to Stella* doubts that in making this decision Swift looked for personal advantage. His letters reveal a self-seeking spirit intermingled with a secret satisfaction over the attentions paid him by both parties. On one occasion he boasted that Oxford flattered him at every turn, while the Whigs in their extremity would have laid hold on him as one might have seized a twig when drowning.¹⁶ A month after writing in this fashion regarding his situation, Swift again referred to the attentions paid him, saying, "Oxford knew my Christian name . . . he charged me to come to him often."¹⁷

¹⁶ *Journal to Stella*, September 9, 1710.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, October 7, 1710; October 8, 1710.

Such comments could be paralleled many times from the *Journal*, and all would make evident his determination in 1710 to seek his own best interests. Of all the writers then in England, he was most keenly alive to the possibilities of his age, and probably no one was more ready to ignore private political beliefs for the sake of immediate advantage.

Other sources of information besides the *Journal to Stella* prove that his desire for personal advantage was known to men outside his own social group. Arthur Mainwaring, a writer on the Whig side, judged him ready in 1710 to write for either party,¹⁸ and during the time of Swift's vacillation his motives must have been entirely evident to all. He himself made no attempt to conceal his intentions under a cloak of pretended Toryism, but was frank in his requests for favor. No hint of excuse appears in his note of January 5, 1712-13, in which he wrote to Oxford: "I most humbly take leave to inform your Lordship that the Dean of Wells died this morning at one o'clock. I entirely submit my fortunes to your Lordship."¹⁹ Here is an unparalleled example of open appeal for patronage.²⁰

During the years preceding this direct demand Swift had steadily increased the obligation that made the Tory leaders liable to such a request. During 1710 he had worked continually to improve the *Examiner*, and in doing so had put St. John deeply in his debt. Oxford shared in the resultant advantages to the party, and also enjoyed the private advices of his aid in all matters bearing on the attitude of the public towards the administration. It was while living at Chelsea in 1711 that Swift formulated the rules of that literary-political group from which the Scriblerus Club developed. The original organization, which was active in promoting Tory policies, was composed of twelve members,

¹⁸ John Oldmixon, *Life . . . of Arthur Mainwaring, Esq.*, p. 158.

¹⁹ *Bath MSS*, I, 228.

²⁰ A recent book on English journalism contains an unwarranted paragraph on Swift's motives. It reads: "Before Swift no political writer had shown such indifference to patronage or employment by political chiefs. His superiority to such considerations first raised him above the level of party hacks, and then proved instrumental in lifting Swift's branch of the writing profession to a higher plane." (T. H. S. Escott, *Leaders of English Journalism*, p. 91). The error in such a declaration seems entirely obvious, for Swift's whole career shows his desire for place.

A proper mode of examining Swift's record is to determine first how much he deserved. Having freely sold himself to the highest bidder, what did he do to merit reward? Both his writings and the clamor of party leaders for his help prove that according to contemporary estimate of his deserts he was treated badly in the final settlement.

all of them intensely Tory in their sympathies and in some fashion able to help on the party propaganda.

Up to the middle of July 1711 his services on the *Examiner* and in defending Oxford's personal integrity had been considerable,²¹ but in November of that year he surpassed all previous efforts in his *Conduct of the Allies*. The significance of this pamphlet has often been commented upon, and no one questions the usual belief that it saved Oxford's ministry from overthrow upon the return of the victorious Marlborough. In January 1711-12, Swift prevented internal dissension by silencing the radical Tories with another pamphlet, called *Some Advice humbly offered to the Members of the October Club, in a letter from a Person of Honour*, so that all in all by the end of 1712 he rightfully expected fit reward.

Thereafter he continued to aid Bolingbroke in matters of news dissemination and regulation, and he likewise persisted in writing Tory pamphlets of high merit. Following his justifiable quarrel with Steele in 1713, he entered into a controversy with his Whig opponent which marks fairly well the height of political pamphleteering during the Queen Anne period. Two pamphlets²² preceded Steele's *Crisis* (January 19, 1714) and Swift's *Public Spirit of the Whigs* (March 1714), but they were little more than prefaces to these great documents. The current suspicion that the Tories were planning secretly to bring back the Pretender, was serious enough to threaten the life of the Tory party, and it was at this critical juncture that Swift's pamphlet again turned the balance in favor of the ministry. Parliament showed great interest in the work of the two pamphleteers; Swift was attacked in the House of Lords, and Steele in the House of Commons. The circumstances made the two journalists the most prominent figures in public life and led to general recognition of their importance. The favorable turn of events in this crisis ought surely to have impressed the ministry with a sense of obligation to Swift, who unaided had frustrated a determined attempt to drive them from power.

Apart from his services as a journalist, Swift held, as has been noted, the important post of intermediary between the Tory leaders and petitioners for favor. Bishop Kennett's diary affords the most striking contemporary description of him in court circles performing such duties. The account reads as follows: "When I came to the antechamber to wait

²¹ His personal defence of Oxford was made in "Some Remarks upon a Pamphlet entitled *A Letter to the Seven Lords of the Committee appointed to examine Gregg*." (1711)

²² *The Importance of Dunkirk Considered* (September), by Steele, and *The Importance of the Guardian Considered* (December, 1713), by Swift.

before prayers, Dr. Swift was the principal man of talk and business, and acted as a master of requests. He was soliciting the Earl of Arran to speak to his brother the Duke of Ormond, to get a chaplain's place established in the garrison of Hull for Mr. Fiddes, a clergyman in that neighborhood, who had lately been in gaol, and published sermons to pay his fees. He was promising Mr. Thorold to undertake with my Lord Treasurer, that, according to his petition, he would obtain a salary of £200 per annum, as Minister of the English Church at Rotterdam. Then he stopt F. Gwynne, Esq., going in with his red badge to the Queen, and told him aloud he had somewhat to say to him from my Lord Treasurer . . . Lord Treasurer, after leaving the Queen, came through the room, beckoning Dr. Swift to follow him: both went off just before prayers."²³ As this account was written by one who heartily disliked him, it can be considered an accurate exposition of Swift's importance at court.

Yet it was not there that Swift was of greatest service. He had far more influence in literary circles, where he was so far above the others in individual influence that he could be for Oxford and Bolingbroke a very efficient agent. Almost as soon as he entered Tory service Swift began to use his personal influence to bring other writers into closer relations with the administration, and in 1711 he became genuinely active. In June he wrote: ". . . This evening I have had a letter from Mr. Philips, the pastoral poet, to get him a certain employment from Lord Treasurer. I have now had almost all the Whig poets my solicitors; and I have been useful to Congreve, Steele, and Harrison: but I will do nothing for Philips; I find he is more a puppy than ever, so don't solicit for him. Besides, I will not trouble Lord Treasurer, unless upon some very extraordinary occasion."²⁴ Long afterwards, on December 27, 1712, he wrote again to Stella concerning his earlier solicitations for Whig writers and of how time had affected his friendships: "I met Mr. Addison and Pastoral Philips on the Mall today, and took a turn with them; but they both looked terribly dry and cold. A curse on party! And do you know I have taken more pains to recommend the Whig wits to the favour and mercy of the Ministers than any other people. Steele I have kept in his place, Congreve I have got used kindly, and secured. Rowe I have recommended and got a promise of a place. Philips I could certainly have provided for, if he had not run party mad, and made me withdraw my recommendation; and I set Addison so right

²³ Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, etc., I, 399 n.

²⁴ *Journal to Stella*, June 30, 1711.

at first that he might have been employed, and have partly secured him the place he has; yet I am worse used by that faction than any man."

Turning from these general statements of Swift's regarding his concern for the welfare of the Whig writers, one quickly comes upon other facts regarding his understanding of the new conditions. His reference to an early attempt in Addison's behalf indicates that in the first months of Tory rule, and even as late as June 30, 1711, Addison was not considered an active Whig partisan. This fact will be commented on further in a separate account of that writer's full service to the Whigs; it is important here merely as showing that Swift was slow to realize the growth of a literary movement in behalf of Whig measures. He did not at first discern how completely some writers were soon to identify themselves with the other political party, and consequently he was disgusted at the unwillingness of his literary acquaintances to accept offers of government posts. Having discovered, presently, the determination of such firm Whigs as Addison and Steele to remain true to their party, he "promised Lord Treasurer never to speak for either again."²⁵ Within a month of Swift's determination never again to solicit for Addison, the latter wrote to a friend that fidelity to the Whigs had cost him places worth £2,000 a year.²⁶ The conclusion to be drawn from these letters is, that Swift's hints had become more and more pointed during 1710 and the early part of 1711, until Addison saw that his complete refusal of Tory patronage would be credited only when he became actively a Whig. As a result of his coldness Swift broke off negotiations completely, and soon after Addison publicly showed his intention to work aggressively for his own party.

As will appear later, Steele was more willing to entertain offers of Tory patronage.²⁷ Swift kept him in the post of stamp commissioner long after the Whig party had fallen, and thus prevented a bold profession of Whig partisanship. Though known then through his writings as a Whig, Steele found it profitable as late as the fall of 1712 to assure Oxford of his good will towards the Tory administration. Shortly afterwards, like Addison, he entered a new phase of his career, broke openly with Swift, and turned upon the Oxford ministry with the greatest energy. Meanwhile, Swift had won a tactical victory for his party in keeping

²⁵ *Journal to Stella*, June 29, 1711.

²⁶ Addison to Edward Wortley Montagu, Esq., July 21, 1711; quoted by N. Drake, *Essays . . . Illustrative of the Tatler*, etc. (1805 ed), I, 350.

²⁷ See p. 74.

this most capable journalist out of Whig service until Oxford's administration had passed through two full years.²⁸

In his dealings with Abel Boyer, Swift showed still more definitely how influential he was with the ministry and how generally he was held responsible for the rewards dealt out by the Tories. After showing constant Whig partisanship for years by writing for the *Postboy*, Boyer in 1709 discreetly changed to the side of the Tories. He was led to do so through personal reasons, but was very willing to write, for profit, against his former friends. Oxford and Swift, however, mistrusted such an unusual convert to the cause and gave him nothing.²⁹ Blocked in his plans to obtain a state appointment under the Tories, Boyer went back to the Whigs and turned his wrath against the one who had evidently done him the injustice. As Swift was obviously the one responsible for the selection of writers for the government, he became the object of Boyer's abusive articles.³⁰

Not only Steele, Addison, Philips, and Boyer, but other writers of less importance came under Swift's scrutiny. Some of them are mentioned in his *Journal to Stella*, among others a young fellow named William Harrison. Swift undoubtedly had been attracted by Harrison's personality during the period when the literary groups of London were still undivided by political opinion. At all events, Swift seems to have been particularly fond of him and to have sought in various ways some method of getting him into employment. First, he put the young, inexperienced writer at work upon a new *Taller*—Steele's journal having been discontinued—, but by the opening of 1711 it was clear that Harrison lacked the wit necessary for such writing. Upon seeing the project languish,³¹ Swift next sought a political appointment for his protégé and soon persuaded Bolingbroke to make Harrison secretary to Lord Raby, Ambassador at the Hague. In his *Journal* for March 15, 1711, he re-

²⁸ Addison during this time had some share in controlling Steele's acts, chiefly in preventing the injection of partisan matter into the *Spectator* essays.

²⁹ From 1705 to 1709 Boyer wrote regularly against the Tories. He then followed up a quarrel with his fellow workers by starting a Tory journal, the *True Postboy*. It was after this that he asked patronage of Oxford. See p. 71, n. 34

³⁰ He first attacked Swift in his *Political State* for 1711 (p. 646), and then in a pamphlet entitled *An Account of the State and Progress of the Present Negotiations for Peace*. In revenge for the second attack Swift had Boyer arrested, only to see him released. (*Journal to Stella*, Oct. 16, 1711.)

³¹ *Journal to Stella*, January 13, 1710-11.

ferred to the place as "the prettiest employment in all Europe," and later stated that the post was worth twelve hundred pounds a year.³²

There are other instances of Swift's generosity and friendly interest. Through Bolingbroke he helped William Diaper, an insignificant poetaster, to a living.³³ He also wrote for a Mr. Pilkington several essays which were then sold to Bowyer, the printer, for a good sum.³⁴ Later he aided the same writer to the place of chaplain to Alderman Barber, a post that brought him a hundred thirty pounds a year.³⁵ Another chaplainship he secured from the Earl of Oxford for Richard Fiddes.

Some such cases as the preceding can be credited to Swift's friendly interest in less fortunate men, but in not many others does his charity seem without obviously practical motives. Among his purposeful transactions was that with Nicholas Rowe. In a letter of December 27, 1712 Swift wrote to Stella that he then had promise of a place for Rowe, but it soon appeared that the poet was not to be won over in such fashion. He remained true to his party and later became poet-laureate through this fidelity. Another poet, Thomas Parnell, was more tractable. As early as 1710 he submitted to persuasion and joined the Tories. As a means to special favor Parnell followed Swift's suggestion to insert verses complimentary to Bolingbroke in a poem then ready for presentation at court. The device was successful, and commenting upon the incident his advisor boasted, "I value myself on making the Ministry desire to be acquainted with Parnell, and not Parnell with the Ministry."³⁶ As reward for joining the Tories the poet in 1713 gained the prebend of Dunlavin. Three years later he was granted the vicarage of Finglas, worth four hundred pounds annually, even though the Tories were then out of power.

³² Harrison held this place until his death in February 1713, at the age of twenty-seven. Probably because of slack methods in the Treasury Swift had to record that "though he teased their heart out" the officials never paid Harrison a groat. *Journal to Stella*, February 12, 1713.

³³ *Ibid.*, December 23, 1712.

³⁴ John Nichols, *Anecdotes of Bowyer*, etc., 79 n.

³⁵ Letter from Alderman Barber, November 17, 1733. *Works*, XVIII, 165.

³⁶ *Journal to Stella*, January 31, 1712-13.

Swift also boasted of other services to the party during Oxford's ministry. He got the office of Gazetteer³⁷ for Charles Ford, a post worth about two hundred fifty pounds a year.³⁸ He also asserted that Mrs. Manley, the editor of the *Examiner* during part of 1711, profited through his assistance. Her claims to patronage dated back to the publication in 1709 of her *New Atalantis*, which had stirred London with its bitterly satirical sketches of the Whig leaders and its contrasting laudation of Harley, Lord Oxford. Attracted then by her ability in satirical portraiture, Swift remembered her in the days when forming the *Examiner* staff and later saw to her appointment as editor following his withdrawal from that place. He also seconded her appeal to Lord Peterborough for private patronage,³⁹ and in less important instances gave her his full support. It is not material to the present study that his aid may have been prompted by real friendship for Mrs. Manley, for the political consequences of his acts would have been in any case the same. It is, however, significant of something that Swift's friendship or esteem seemed the needful preliminary to appointment in the Tory news organization.

The favors granted to John Gay may be classed among those given with small prospect of return in service. During the last four years of Queen Anne's reign Gay was not interested in politics. He professed no political opinions, and his appeals for favor were made without regard for party distinctions, with no end except that of personal advantage. Gay felt that his graceful verses entitled him to government patronage, but his many friends among the nobility vainly tried to win

³⁷ The following letter gives an account of this office:

December 15, 1798.

Edmund Malone to Wm. Windham.

"The office of the writer of the *Gazette* I believe it will be found, has always been in the gift of the Secretary of State for the Home Department. That Secretary is the Keeper of the Signet: and the writer of the *Gazette* has often been one of the clerks of the Signet. . . . The *Gazette* itself is supposed to be the immediate production of the Secretary of State for the Home Department or emanates from that office; in consequence of which, alterations are made frequently in the proof of the *Gazette*, while passing through the press, by orders from that office. Hence all the volumes of the *Gazettes*, from the beginning in the time of Charles the Second, are preserved in the office of the Secretary of the Home Department. Do not all these circumstances shew, that the appointment of the writer of the *Gazette* belongs to him?" *The Windham Papers*, (1913 ed.), I, 89-90: quoted from *Add. MS 37,854*, fol. 152.

³⁸ This is Swift's own estimate. See his letter to Archbishop King, January 8, 1712. *Works*, XV, 487.

³⁹ *Journal to Stella*, July 3, 1711.

for him any favors at court. Swift, however, was successful. In the summer of 1714 he secured for Gay the place of secretary to Lord Clarendon, envoy-extraordinary to Hanover; and Gay, after complaining at a lack of funds for traveling expenses,⁴⁰ set out to enjoy his first state appointment. His good fortune, though it ended abruptly at the death of Queen Anne, must be reckoned as due wholly to the good offices of his friend.

If we may trust his own statements, Swift also assisted Congreve by keeping him in his government position after those interested in his case had lost all political power and influence. Policy alone might have led Oxford to pension such a prominent Whig in order to win good will for his administration; yet Swift repeatedly wrote that he feared Congreve was about to lose his place as commissioner of wine licenses, and considered it a personal victory when Oxford allowed the Whig poet to continue in office.⁴¹ It appears, however, that Lord Halifax was also influential with the Lord Treasurer in this matter. On May 13, 1714, the former wrote in behalf of the poet: "Poor Congreve is again alarmed by reports that he has had that their commission [of wine licenses] is renewing. He does not doubt the continuance of your Lordship's favour to him, depending on the assurances you have given him, as well as me, of your care and protection of him. But I beg you will enable me to ease him entirely of his fears."⁴² By its backward reference this letter proves that Halifax had long been interested in Congreve, so that probably Swift was not, in this case, peculiarly influential with the ministry.

The fact that Oxford spared Congreve all this time may be interpreted variously. He may have retained the poet in office through fear of personal unpopularity following⁴ his dismissal, or he may have felt that such a man would remain unaggressive only so long as he held a government post. The third possibility—the most probable—is that Oxford, from first to last, wished to recognize his literary merit without thought of payment in service, but that temporarily outside pressure forced him to look upon Congreve's dismissal as a necessity. He had been known as a patron of letters in preceding years, and now his political power enabled him to patronize liberally at state expense. The repeated attempts to remove the dramatist from his Tory post prove that party feeling was intense, for under the conditions prevailing during previous

⁴⁰ Gay to the [Earl of Oxford], June 10, 1714. *Portland MSS*, V, 457.

⁴¹ *Journal to Stella*, June 22, June 30, July 2, 1711; December 27, 1712.

⁴² Lord Halifax to the [Earl of Oxford]. *Portland MSS*, V, 438.

decades there would have been no need to plead for the retention in government service of such a famous writer.

These accounts do not sum up all the reasons for Swift's expectation of substantial recognition. Not only through an exercise of personal influence among men of letters had he worked for the strengthening of Oxford's administration; from the day of his admission to the inner councils of the party he had been a valued advisor of the Tory leaders. He had brought into the party such of the Whig nobility as were not completely loyal to that cause, and at least in the case of Lord Peterborough had drawn a very valuable worker into the Tory circle. Little need be said of the efficacy of his writings that opportunely appeared to meet the attacks upon Oxford's ministry. The full sum of his service through these various means was rounded out in 1713 at the completion of peace negotiations with France. This event brought the Tory administration into a position of security, and consequently to a time for accounting with its loyal adherents who had so far failed to get their due rewards. Swift, among them, waited dubiously for the settling of his account.

His own *Journal* contains a graphic picture of his situation during the days when Oxford, the Duke of Ormond, and the Queen were bickering over the distribution of vacant deaneries.⁴³ The Queen stubbornly opposed all pleas in Swift's behalf. Her prejudice had been inspired by the Archbishop of York and the Duchess of Somerset, against whose influence Oxford and Erasmus Lewis vainly strove. At length, on April 23, 1713, the opposition compromised, and Swift was entered in a signed warrant as the new dean of St. Patrick's. His personal feelings had by then been grievously wounded through the temporizing tactics pursued, and in the final decision he saw only utter banishment from English politics. To settle outside of England meant complete detachment from court intrigue for all time to come. Even Oxford's tardy promise of a Treasury order for a thousand pounds was futile as solace, for the new administration prevented the payment. It is not, therefore, a pleasing picture that one forms of Swift as he left for Dublin on the first day of June 1713. His days of political power were gone forever, and as a future prospect he saw only a secluded life amid surroundings utterly distasteful.

In order to appreciate the measure of his final disappointment, one must realize precisely what ambitions dominated Swift's mind during these years with the Tories. Actually, during his three years in public

⁴³ See especially Swift's entries for the second and third weeks of April, 1713

life, he had the reward that he most desired. His great longing was for a place of influence, a desire that was gratified while everyone at court was paying him deference. Though never a government official, he was for three years more influential than any other man of his station then in public service, and his opportunities for dispensing favors to others gave him an authority among the Tory journalists that was matched only by Addison's power in similar respects on the Whig side. Swift was then realizing the greatest ambition of his life—to stand in high esteem with his fellow craftsmen and with those of noble rank. Had he obtained, in 1713, a high church office on English soil, he would have felt grateful to the Tories regardless of the income accruing from the appointment. For one whose purpose in life had always been to win power, not wealth or social position, unfriendly minds could have devised no greater sorrow than the prospect of life in an obscure Irish deanery.

Yet in spite of the depressing circumstances of his withdrawal, Swift might have derived much satisfaction from a recollection of his work with Bolingbroke. He had demonstrated that through sheer merit a man of letters could win a place in the highest councils of the nation. His recommendations had brought into being a thoroughly efficient news organization, and his pamphlets had been able to determine the course of national events. Compared with Defoe, he lacked industry and resourcefulness; Addison outstripped them both in honors. But in mass of argument and lucidity of style no one was Swift's equal. This was the judgment of his contemporaries, and it has been confirmed by succeeding generations.

CHAPTER IV

DEFOE AND THE EARL OF OXFORD

OXFORD'S INTEREST IN PARTY JOURNALISM—THE *Review* AND DEFOE'S NEWS ORGANIZATION—SECRET SERVICE JOURNEYS—THE *Mercator*—INTRIGUES AGAINST STEELE AND THE WHIG JOURNALS—DEFOE'S REWARDS—*An Appeal to Honour and Justice*.

Daniel Defoe so far surpassed the other journalists of his day that he deserves individual consideration, even though he had no personal influence with minor writers. He was never publicly powerful in the manner of Addison or Swift, and yet in amount and variety of political service he stood above them. The devious methods necessary to the success of his secret missions removed him completely from public affairs, while regard for his personal safety made him still more secretive concerning all his movements. Consequently, on account of the uncertainty still existing as to his life story, particularly in regard to his real political importance, it is needful to summarize the known facts regarding his work for the Tory ministry in order to demonstrate his peculiar value to that party.

As early as 1702 Harley wrote to Godolphin in a fashion that seemed to foreshadow Defoe's later rôle in government service. The letter read in part: "I will again take the liberty to offer to your Lordship that it will be of great service to have some discreet writer of the Government side, if it were only to state facts right; for the generality err for want of knowledge, and being imposed upon by the storys [sic] raised by ill-designing men."¹ On September 26, of the next year, Godolphin concluded whatever correspondence had developed from this suggestion by writing to Harley: "What you propose about Defoe may be done when you will, and how you will,"² and from then until Queen Anne's death brought the Tory power to an end, Defoe never freed himself from the control of one or the other of these two politicians. His service began definitely on February 19, 1704, with the first issue of the *Review*, admitted by Defoe in a letter of July 7 to be a government organ.³ Until Harley's fall he constantly maintained the journal. The *Review* owed its foundation in part to the vigorous attacks of the opposition journals

¹ *Brit. Mus. Add. MS* 28,055: quoted by E. S. Roscoe, *Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford*, p. 72.

² *Portland MSS*, IV, 68.

³ *Ibid.*, IV, 98.

but likewise to the discernment of Harley, Lord Oxford. He alone recognized in Defoe the factor necessary to the success of such a project.

Nothing discloses more clearly than these early letters how well a few party leaders realized their need of trained journalists. Proof of Harley's understanding lies in his prompt resolution to get Defoe into government service, a desire that compelled him to secure the release of his chosen editor from Newgate prison. This step was taken secretly in order that as few people as possible might know of the relations existing between the two, and in later years Harley frequently repeated the procedure in getting Defoe free from the hands of his own subordinates. Narcissus Luttrell often referred to the constant threats made by minor officials⁴ who wished to prosecute the editor of the *Review*; but such menaces were fruitless against one who was secretly protected by the head of the ministry.

As has been shown recently, very soon after promoting the *Review* Harley had further reason for assisting its editor.⁵ Not only by published writings but through private recommendations in matters of state Defoe served the administration and proved invaluable to his master. He first drew up a comprehensive plan for political procedure, apparently for Harley's personal use; then in July 1704, he submitted written proposals for the establishment of a secret news service throughout England and the continent. The detailed exposition of both documents is a sufficient indication that they were prepared for serious consideration.⁶ In the earlier statement Defoe asserted that £12,000 was then spent annually in England for obtaining secret intelligence in comparison with £11,000,000 used yearly for similar purposes by the King of France. Not only did he advise the use of secret agents in Scotland and in Paris, Toulon, Brest, and Dunkirk: he also strongly urged the need for greater secrecy in the home offices. These recommendations the government followed with a vigor that brought its natural result in a most complicated system of state payments for all forms of secret service. Defoe thus was the originator of a far-reaching policy that was followed by

⁴ Specific references to such attempted prosecutions are to be found in his *Brief Relations*, etc., V, 469; VI, 98, 216.

⁵ An article by Sir George Warner contains Defoe's letter of recommendation regarding intelligence, a definite proof of his practical aid to the administration in an advisory rôle. See the *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXII (1907), 130 ff.

⁶ *Portland MSS*, IV, 106.

Harley's successors.⁷ When Harley sent him his own instructions for secret service in Scotland, he merely restated the plans outlined by Defoe in this earlier communication,⁸ so that the agent actually drew up the regulations for his own guidance.

Still other forms of government service fell to Defoe before he ventured upon his mission to Scotland, but they were merely preliminaries. In 1704 he canvassed the eastern counties of England shortly before the election, and the next spring performed similar duties in the west. On the second journey he spent money freely,⁹ but seems to have waited vainly for a promise of regular payment for his work. He failed in the spring of 1704 to get "the convenient private allowance"¹⁰ that he sought, and again, on July 9, 1705, vainly petitioned for a government pension.¹¹ The administration leaders were unwilling to enter into a permanent agreement of any sort, and they seem likewise to have paid Defoe very little more than expense money for his secret journeyings.

Some months after his experiences in country elections Defoe boldly asked for two or three hundred pounds that he might satisfy various importunate creditors, but this letter of May 6, 1706, was as fruitless as his earlier requests.¹² In spite of such discouragements he seems to have found some encouraging signs, for he kept up the *Review* without a break and that fall made plans for an important mission to Scotland. His purpose there was to work in behalf of the Union, and before setting out from London he made preparations for an extended stay. Harley supplied twenty-five pounds for equipment,¹³ all of which must have been expended by the time Defoe completed his purchases, finally, in Newcastle. From October 2 to December 31, 1706, he received in all £103 8s. for his service in Scotland, an estimate based upon the account kept

⁷ Defoe made an interesting plea for secret service by citing the example of John Milton. It was his practice, wrote Defoe, "to keep a constant epistolary conversation with severall foreign ministers of State and men of learning abstracted from affairs of state, but so woven with political observacions that he found it as usefull as any part of his foreign correspondence." Warner, *ibid.*, p. 136.

⁸ The assumption that Harley's instructions, which are undated, were later than Defoe's long communication, rests upon the probability that Defoe would not have stated in such detail plans of action that had previously been settled. The entire tone of his statement is that of a newly outlined plan.

⁹ *Portland MSS*, IV, 214.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, IV, 89.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, IV, 203-4.

¹² *Ibid.*, IV, 301.

¹³ *Ibid.*, IV, 327.

by John Bell of Newcastle, his paymaster.¹⁴ This sum was small, inasmuch as Defoe paid all his expenses as he went from place to place; moreover, he frequently published news-letters in the provincial cities.¹⁵ In April 1707, Harley seems to have discontinued his payments, which evidently had been made from private funds with the expectation that Godolphin would soon supply Defoe from the Treasury. The deprivation brought a harsh letter from his agent, who was then in Edinburgh without money and with nothing more assuring than an encouraging letter from Godolphin promising help in the near future.¹⁶ To enforce his importunate requests for ready money instead of promises, Defoe probably put upon his brother-in-law, Robert Davis, the duty of seconding these appeals; at any rate, Davis wrote to Harley in behalf of his messenger's "sickly, large and needy family in London."¹⁷ Defoe himself sent on another importunate letter, and finally, on November 28, 1707, received an order for one hundred pounds.¹⁸

During these years in Scotland, Defoe kept requesting some government appointment in recognition of his work for the Union. To him such a reward would have been an acknowledgment that his service had been highly honorable and successful—at least his letters to Oxford show a desire for such recognition in addition to payment in money. But these requests were ignored, probably because his secret service duties were too important to be laid aside; at any rate, he was not able after repeating a first appeal to get a place in the Scottish custom service.¹⁹ A like fate befell his plea of June 10, 1707, when he asked for an accountant's post,²⁰ and so Defoe waited on unsatisfied until finally, in February 1708, Harley lost political control without having made any public recognition of his work in the north. Harley was able, however, to have

¹⁴ John Bell to Robert Harley, January 4, 1706-07: *ibid.*, IV, 378.

¹⁵ On December 9, 1706, he spent six guineas in circulating 2,500 pamphlets in the neighborhood of Glasgow. *Ibid.*, IV, 367.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, IV, 444.

¹⁷ *Portland MSS*, IV, 450.

¹⁸ Mr. T. Bateson has summarized Defoe's receipts as being "about £100" from October to December 1706, and adds that he was "almost without supply" in 1707. The correspondence in the *Portland MSS* warrants a somewhat more definite statement. Mr. Bateson's article, "The Relations of Defoe and Harley," *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XV (1900), carries the story down only to 1710 and does not contain all the data given above.

¹⁹ *Portland MSS*, IV, 377 and 412. Letters of January 2 and May 21, 1707.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, IV, 418.

the *Review* kept up under Godolphin's direction, a service that Defoe gratefully acknowledged.²¹

Having had but slight encouragement from either his old or new master, he set out from London soon after Godolphin took control of affairs, in order to renew his secret service work in Scotland. He had been treated never with liberality, often with but scant courtesy, and the inducements to fidelity were not great. The government still continued its policy of concealing its connection with the *Review* and its editor, and assisted him only when prosecution seemed to threaten the existence of the journal. In this respect Godolphin followed Harley's example, as appears from a secret report on the *Review* submitted to George Tilson, Esq., by a government spy. The investigator, who signed himself W. E. Borrett, began his report of November 16, 1708, as follows: "Upon Enquiry, I find that M^r Defoe the supposed Author of the *Review* is in Scotland, M^r Matthews who lives about little Brittain is the Printer, and M^r Morphew who lives near Stationers hall is the Publisher thereof. M^r Attorney Generall desires, that M^r Secretary would be pleased to order the S^d Printer and Publisher to attend at yo^r Office to answer that matter, and if M^r Secretary pleases, I will attend at the same time to settle that affair."²² . . . The report continues with definite plans for getting further information regarding the management of Defoe's paper. Clearly Godolphin concealed from his subordinates the actual facts, so that they unwittingly investigated the character of a political journal that was at the time under constant direction from the state offices. Godolphin kept encouraging Defoe to write for the administration, though nothing shows the nature of his promises or actual performances. It appears, however, that Defoe applied to the Earl of Sunderland for assistance as well as to Godolphin.²³ Sunderland gave him some help,²⁴ but neither looked after him in a systematic fashion. In spite of this, the deceptive tone of Defoe's occasional letters suggests that he got substantial gifts from both and thus did not fare badly.

²¹ *Ibid.* IV, 562-3.

²² *S. P. Dom. Anne*, Vol. 10, fol. 41.

²³ On May 20, 1708, Defoe wrote Sunderland from Edinburgh thanking him for some favor. To this he added a request that all account of the affair be kept from Godolphin for fear it might "cool the inclination my Lord Tr[ea]sure[r] has been pleased to express of doing something for me." *Hist. MSS Comm.* Eighth Report, 48.

²⁴ On May 25 Defoe repeated his request to Sunderland regarding secrecy, with the ingenious plea that he was fearful lest each patron might neglect him through thinking that the other was giving him funds. *Ibid.*, 49a.

When at length it became evident that the Whig power was breaking, Defoe was quick to trim his sails to meet the change. His *Review* became more moderate in tone as he gradually did all that he could to prepare for a return to the Tories. When he had changed sufficiently the style of his articles to recommend him to his old master, he wrote to Harley, and his congratulatory letter upon the favorable turn of events paved the way for a return. The proposal made in this letter of July 17, 1710, was entirely pleasing to the new favorite of Queen Anne, and soon after that date Defoe entered upon his most distinguished period of party service. Under Harley's patronage he was freed from restraining counsel far more than during earlier years, and so realized a more gratifying independence. Neither Bolingbroke nor Swift, the directors of the Tory press, seems to have had any dealings with Defoe, and Lord Oxford (i. e., Harley) put little restraint upon him. From 1710 until 1714 he seems to have written his *Review* and *Mercator* very much as he pleased.

During these last years of Queen Anne's reign he continued to make secret service journeys while keeping up the regular issues of the *Review*. He also acted as Oxford's advisor in matters of trade. The weight of his opinion is evident to one who reads Defoe's correspondence bearing on state affairs. For example, on July 17, 1711, he sent Oxford a "short general" concerning a new scheme for promoting trade in the South Seas.²⁵ The form of expression proves that the plan which later was put into actual use, was originally Defoe's. The *Portland Manuscripts* contain many other documents of similar sort, all proof of Defoe's importance as secret counselor. Publicly through the essays appearing in the *Review* and the *Mercator* he defended the peace plans of the administration. His only noteworthy difficulty with the Whigs arose over an anti-Jacobite tract²⁶ that gave them ground for a charge of treason. Defoe was arrested in May 1713 on their charges, but Oxford promptly secured his release; furthermore, some months later he got Defoe a general pardon from past offences as an effectual protection against all such attacks in time to come.²⁷ After this flurry of excitement he continued undisturbed in the service of the administration until the end of Queen Anne's reign.

²⁵ The letter is included in E. S. Roscoe's biography, *Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford*, as from the *Harley Papers*, III, 50.

²⁶ *Reasons against the Succession of the House of Hanover*, 1713.

²⁷ Abel Boyer, in his *Reign of Queen Anne* (p. 658), commented on Defoe's release: "About this time [October 17, 1713] it was publicly declared, that the Queen had

In the course of his regular duties under Oxford's administration Defoe accomplished a few services that entitled him to large reward. As noted previously, the 1710—1714 period was his time of greatest political importance. Of all his acts then nothing so distinguished him as his own writing, but he also engaged in political intrigues similar in purpose to Addison's devices against Pope. Defoe instituted a plan that was carried through successfully by the Tory leaders after he had made clear the method to be pursued; his part in the expulsion of Steele from the House of Commons was secret but none the less important.

It is evident now that he was among the first to fathom the new plans of the Whigs in 1714 and to see the motive behind Steele's appearance as a candidate for parliament. On February 19, he wrote urging Oxford to prevent the addition of Steele's oratorical power to his existing influence as a journalist,²⁸ and on March 10 he sent on specific evidence upon which Steele could be prevented from holding a seat in the House.²⁹ The second letter contained excerpts from the *Guardian*, the *Englishman*, and the *Crisis*, all bound together and labelled "Collection of Scandal." These were offered as seditious statements furnishing ground for a trial, and thus fortified Oxford immediately took active measures towards an expulsion. Two days after receiving Defoe's evidence he presented, through his brother, formal charges against Steele. The charges were sustained, and the Tories were spared a test of his ability in parliamentary pleading.

The successful outcome of the trial must be counted a personal victory for Defoe. His warning had made the Tories realize their danger, and his quick assembling of evidence afforded the means for prompt action. The Whigs were defeated in a sharply defined party controversy, and Steele, their most competent speaker, was disqualified from parliamentary service. The loss of this test trial had an effect upon Whig activity throughout the remainder of Queen Anne's reign.

Shortly after this success Defoe devised another subtle plan for weakening the Whigs. This time he directed his attack against the *Flying Post*, in 1714 the leading journal for the opposition. His plan

been pleased to grant her Royal Pardon, under the Great Seal, to *Daniel Foe, or de Foe*, against whom an Information of *High-Treason* had been lodg'd for writing several Pamphlets, which seem'd to favour the Pretender's Interest." Knowing Oxford's political stratagems and also his secret interest in Defoe, one to-day can easily decide what special motives he had for pressing Defoe's case with the Queen.

²⁸ *Portland MSS*, V, 384.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, V, 392-4.

was to involve the paper in a state prosecution for seditious libel and also to discredit it completely among its conservative supporters. Defoe had long sought to destroy the *Flying Post*, and had made the topic subject of a special letter to Oxford under date of March 11.³⁰ Shortly after this his opportunity appeared, and he wrote to Oxford as follows: ". . . It has been long that I have been endeavouring to take off the virulence and rage of the *Flying Post*. Mr. Moore has been witness to the design and to some of the measures I took for it, which were unsuccessful. After some time an occasion offered me which I thought might be improved effectually to overthrow it. The old author Redpath quarrelled with his printer Hurt, and takes [sic] the paper from him; Hurt sets up for himself and applies to a certain author to write it for him, but being not able to get anyone to publish it, he lost ground.

"It occurred to me that to support Hurt would be the only way to bring the paper itself out of Redpath's hand, and to this intent I frequently at his request sent him paragraphs of foreign news, but declined meddling with home matters. The publisher received a letter very unhappily for me, and finding it full of reflections desired it to be softened, as he calls it, and sends it to me. I left out, indeed, a good deal of scandalous stuff that was in it, but added nothing, and sent it back. This they have printed from my hand, and I am charged as the author of the letter, am sent for by a warrant and held to bail. The use they make of this is that I have insulted Lord Anglesey, and that your Lordship has employed me to do so. God knows that all I did in it was to prevent their printing several scandalous reflections on his Lordship, which I therefore struck quite out, and wrote the rest over again. I humbly beg your intercession with Lord Anglesey in this matter, assuring him that I never knew anything in this matter other than the above, and did nothing in it but with design to serve his Lordship. . . ."³¹

Defoe's *Flying Post and Medley* appeared on July 27, 1714, with the results stated in his letter. Though convicted for libel the following July, he escaped sentence by agreeing to give service to the new Whig administration, and so, as before, he purchased his release from prison at the price of service as a party journalist. Oxford by then was out of office and the Tory rule completely broken. Consequently Defoe felt free to make the best terms possible by joining the Whigs, even though the decision meant another complete change in his political opinions.

³⁰ *Portland MSS*, V, 395.

³¹ August 31, 1714. *Portland MSS*, V, 492.

As is well known, he had begun to dispose of articles to the Whig papers while still in Oxford's employ. As early as 1710 he seems to have aroused his employer's suspicions while in Scotland on secret service duty; he was then strongly suspected of having written a Whig pamphlet published in Edinburgh with the title of *Atalantis Major*. This appeared in December. In reporting to Oxford the publication of this and the *Scots Atalantis*, another anti-ministerial pamphlet, Defoe showed great concern and asserted that the *Atalantis Major* was certainly the work of an Englishman.³² Whether or not this solicitude was merely a ruse intended to cloak his own part in the publication, he seems from Mr. Lee's evidence³³ to have had a hand in it. Perhaps Oxford's suspicion was aroused even then. But if this first unfavorable indication passed unnoticed, he assuredly could not have overlooked later charges made openly to the effect that Defoe was writing for the *Protestant Post-Boy*, a very hostile opposition journal. Whig pamphleteers made party capital out of the reports in circulation,³⁴ so that Oxford could scarcely have missed the current tales. The fact that this astute politician gave no sign, is no indication that his mind was not fixed instantly against trusting Defoe thereafter. Such distrust might easily have been the cause for his subsequent failure to treat Defoe liberally.

The measure of Oxford's generosity is more readily distinguishable than that of Godolphin during the two years of Whig rule. From 1710 until 1714 several letters were written that show what were Defoe's approximate receipts from the Tory government. These accounts in no way justify the statement that he was "adored and caress'd by that mighty Statesman, who gave him, as that Mercenary said himself, to

³² C. Guilot [alias De Foe] to [Robert Harley] Dec. 26, 1710. *Portland MSS*, IV, 647-48.

³³ Mr. Lee's evidence is implied in the statement made in his life of Defoe, I, 177. The thoroughness of his tests demands that consideration be granted his statement that this pamphlet was "certainly written by Defoe."

³⁴ *Judas discover'd*, etc. (1713), p. 3: "Of all the Writers that have Prostituted their Pens, either to encourage Faction, oblige a Party, or for their own mercenary Ends; the Person here mentioned [Defoe] is the Vilest and an *Animal* who shifts his shape oftener than *Proteus* and goes backwards and forwards like a *Hunted Hare*; a thorough-pac'd, true-bred *Hypocrite*, an *High-Church Man* one Day and a *Rank Whig* the next. . . ." On page six of the same pamphlet appears the statement: "This profligate Author having prostituted his Pen for Hire to Write on both Sides, some Persons of Interest who had an esteem for the House of Hanover, resolv'd of their own selves, to prosecute him for some Scurrilous Reflections that way."

the value of £1,000 in one Year",³⁵ yet they prove that Oxford was considerate.

After offering to serve the Tory administration,³⁶ Defoe soon began work, and almost as promptly he asked for payment. On August 2, 1710, he showed uneasiness because money was not forthcoming immediately, but he courteously assured the Treasurer that he fully relied upon previous promises.³⁷ On September 2 he wrote from Scotland that he had spent large sums "for expensive travelling, maintaining useful intelligence abroad, family subsistence, and a little clearing of encumbering circumstances." He noted further how costly had been the installation of a general "system of intelligence" over all Britain.³⁸ Three days later he wrote thanking Oxford for favors "daily" received.³⁹ Again, on September 21, 1710, he acknowledged gratefully a notification that Her Majesty had "directed the affair" in his favor,⁴⁰ and he obscurely mentioned the same matter in a letter of September 29.⁴¹ No evidence indicates the nature of the royal grant to Defoe, but the amount involved was surely of some moment, inasmuch as it required the Queen's consideration. His payments evidently increased, for excepting an acknowledgment of twenty pounds⁴² and occasional directions as to ways of sending him money, he made no further reference to such matters during the remainder of 1710.

It was but natural that, upon his return to London, Defoe should summarize the results of his journey. Such a report was submitted on February 13, 1711. In this general account he wrote: "A long and expensive journey, family importunities and all the *et ceteras* that make a dependent always importunate—these forced me, in spite of blushes, to remind you of the usual period being passed of that relief, which by whatever hand I received it, was originally owing to your goodness."⁴³

³⁵ John Oldmixon, *History of England*, etc. (1735), III, 519.

³⁶ Defoe to [Robert Harley], July 17, 1710. *Portland MSS*, IV, 550-51.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, IV, 562.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, IV, 581-82.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, IV, 584-590.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, IV, 597.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, IV, 602-3.

⁴² This letter (*Portland MSS*, IV, 631) was sent from Edinburgh on November 21, 1710. Sums of money were being sent Defoe then under the name of "C. Guilot," and were consigned to various addresses. At other times he used the name of "Mr. Goldsmith."

⁴³ *Portland MSS*, IV, 659.

Six days later, on February 19, he wrote another letter that shows Oxford to have responded promptly to this request by sending some amount not "part of her Majesty's appointment."⁴⁴ The indications are that temporarily he supported Defoe from his private purse or from his own secret service funds.

Thereafter payments ceased for some time. In his letters of February 26 and March 2, Defoe made no mention of money matters, probably because Oxford's gift was not yet exhausted. On June 19, however, he wrote complaining that the pension promised by the Queen had not been paid, adding that Oxford had "had the goodness" to supply "the first quarter."⁴⁵ Here it becomes difficult to determine the precise meaning of the letter of June 19. In mentioning "her Majesty's appointment" he was referring either to the settled pension promised in Godolphin's 1707 letter—of which nothing further was said after Oxford relieved Defoe—or to the new appointment referred to in their recent correspondence. In support of the theory that Defoe was referring back to Oxford's present of a hundred pounds in 1707, we have Defoe's statement in his *Appeal to Honour and Justice*: "As for consideration, pension, gratification, or reward, I declare to all the world I have had none, except only that old appointment which her majesty was pleased to make me in the days of the ministry of my lord Godolphin."⁴⁶ As further evidence one has the fact that in that year Defoe's thanks for Oxford's hundred pounds were given after his pleas to Godolphin had proved futile. The pension had then been promised, but as usual during Queen Anne's reign payment was not made promptly. If, therefore, Oxford's advance of a hundred pounds can be considered as the "first quarter" on Defoe's account with the Treasury, one may assume his salary from November 1707 to August 1714 to have been four hundred pounds a year.

Against such a conclusion is the fact that on September 29, 1710, Defoe was likewise expecting favor at the hands of the Queen. Nevertheless on February 13, 1711, he referred to the "usual period" of payment as past, quite evidently meaning some rate of payment established before Oxford on February 19 sent the amount "not part of her Majesty's appointment." It hardly seems probable that Defoe, in February 1711, would have referred to his quarterly payment as "usual" if the Treasury warrant dated back no further than October 1 of the preceding year. From his letter of September 29 it is clear that before that date

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, IV, 662.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, V, 13.

⁴⁶ Defoe, *Works*, II, 184.

nothing definite had come from Oxford's dealings with the Queen; so that even had quarterly payments been made in advance upon a warrant issued October 1, only one payment could have been overdue in February 1711. The improbability of the assumption that Oxford's present of February 19 was made in lieu of a quarterly allowance is increased by Defoe's moderation in his letter of acknowledgment. A gift of one hundred pounds would have called forth profuse thanks similar to that expressed in his letter of November 28, 1707, from Edinburgh, when Oxford had advanced such a sum out of his own funds.

The necessary deduction from these details is that in September 1710 Oxford attempted to get a new grant for Defoe. Perhaps it was to be merely a renewal of that obtained in 1707 from Godolphin, which, on Defoe's statement, was the only one made him at any time. At least it was not a grant that Defoe was willing to acknowledge in 1715, when it was to his advantage to praise Godolphin as a recommendation to the new Whig administration. All indications are that in 1710 Defoe was expecting only a renewal of the warrant made in 1707, that Godolphin had actually obtained for him his only Treasury warrant at Queen Anne's hands, and that throughout the period Oxford had shown a personal interest by advancing or giving such sums as Defoe needed from time to time. On such assumptions the reference in Defoe's letter of June 19, 1710, to Oxford's kindness in advancing the first quarterly payment on his warrant, goes back to the hundred pounds paid on November 28, 1707, when Oxford had actually met the delayed obligation of the state Treasury. It seems reasonable, therefore, to assert that from that date until the death of Queen Anne, Defoe received with fair regularity the salary of four hundred pounds a year. From a letter to Oxford, under date of July 26, 1714,⁴⁷ it is certain that payments were continued until the end of the reign, for Defoe acknowledged at that time the payment of the "usual sum" on his "particular account." This and other references to payments from the Treasury on Defoe's warrant prove that from 1708 to 1715 Defoe received regular payment from state funds as well as frequent gifts from Oxford's private purse.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ *Portland MSS*, V, 475.

⁴⁸ Volume five of the *Portland Manuscripts* contains several slight references to Defoe's income in addition to those noted. On July 13, 1711 (V, 44-45), he acknowledged Oxford's prompt response to his appeal of June 19. Also, on August 18, 1712 (V, 212-14), he wrote somewhat rudely because two quarters were then overdue, but admitted that Oxford had always made him "large allowance." Again, on April 14, 1713 (V, 282), after his release from jail on eighty pounds bail, Defoe wrote, "This is the third time I am rescued from misery and a jail by your generous and uncommon goodness."

In reviewing the entire matter of Defoe's dealings with successive party leaders, one finds a good measure of justice in the acts of Godolphin and Oxford. Both of them met their obligations to the extent of keeping Defoe in funds for his secret journeys. Next, delays in payment upon his Treasury warrant cannot be counted entirely to their discredit. It is quite clear that charges of insincerity ought not to be made too freely against the ministry, for an element always to be considered in regard to state payments during Queen Anne's reign is the notorious laxity of the Treasury. Many men, like Swift's friend Harrison, obtained appointments but failed to get their regular payments. It is true that Godolphin, as early as 1703, turned Defoe over to the direction of his co-worker, with the remark, "What you propose about Defoe may be done when you will, and how you will":⁴⁹ but he did not thereupon release himself from all obligation in the matter, and perhaps did whatever could be done to promote Defoe's affairs with the Queen. Oxford, evidently enough, gave many proofs of his good will during the period preceding 1707. Whatever dissatisfaction with Defoe's actions may have deterred him after 1710 from making permanent provision for his secret agent, he at least concurred in the plans under which Defoe was paid from the state Treasury. He clearly discerned the value of the services rendered and paid moderately well. As Oxford was the first political leader to promote aggressively the use of party journals, he must be credited with having made possible for writers a new form of profitable service. For the time being this new mode of support amounted to little more than an exchange of private patronage for the less personal attachment to a political group; yet this was in a measure release from an abnormal state of dependence and a turn towards the fuller freedom of popular support based solely upon literary merit.

Defoe himself revealed the motives prompting him during these years in his *Appeal to Honour and Justice, Tho' it be of His Worst Enemies*. This comprehensive defence of his actions deserves more recognition as a historical document than many with a fixed belief in Defoe's dishonesty have granted it hitherto. Many statements in its pages previously suspected are now substantiated by the Oxford correspondence, while the recollection of Defoe's anonymity in political circles ought likewise to win consideration for one unable to defend himself properly against false charges.

In this pamphlet Defoe recounted his attempts to moderate party and factional strife. "Party moderation" was a political tenet that he

⁴⁹ Lord Godolphin to Robert Harley, September 26, 1703: *Portland MSS*, IV, 68.

and Oxford held in common—possibly because the peer took his hint from Defoe. He also reviewed his theories of trade, which now are recognized as deserving serious consideration in any study of England's foreign policy during the century. His personal dealings with others are also presented with fair accuracy; so far as existing documents afford proof in the matter, Defoe seems to have stated honestly in what measure he was under obligation to the Queen and to her successive leaders. To relieve Oxford from the common charge of having subsidized him for ends apart from government service, Defoe wrote: "It is a general suggestion, and is affirmed with such assurance, that they tell me it is vain to contradict it, that I have been employed by the Earl of Oxford, late Lord Treasurer, in the late disputes about public affairs, to write for him, or, to put it into their own particulars, have written by his directions, taken the materials from him, or by other persons from him, by his order, and the like; and that I have received a pension, or salary, or payment from his lordship for such services as these. . . . In answer to the charge, I bear witness to posterity, that every part of it is false and forged. . . . In all my writing, I ever capitulated for my liberty to speak according to my own judgment of things; I ever had that liberty allowed me, nor was I ever imposed upon to write this way or that against my judgment by any person whatsoever."⁵⁰

But Defoe made a much more significant statement concerning his settled theories of party government and his own duty to the state. He continued in a passage that characterizes his party activity throughout the Queen Anne period: "It occurred to me immediately, as a principle for my conduct, that it was not material to me what ministers her majesty was pleased to employ; my duty was to go along with every ministry, so far as they did not break in upon the constitution, and the laws and liberties of my country; my part being only the duty of a subject. . . ." It is not possible to believe, in the face of some very apparent facts, that Defoe kept to this high level of patriotism, but many acts in his life support his assertions. He was not so devoted as Swift and others who, having changed parties, thereafter honestly restricted themselves to working for that side alone; Defoe worked for both at once. Yet he was as open in his dealings as were the party leaders employing him. Moreover, in advancing his theories of trade he showed sincere desire to benefit his country, and even under a Tory administration he clung to many of his principles as a Whig.

⁵⁰ *An Appeal to Honour and Justice*, etc., (1895 ed.), II, 181-83.

CHAPTER V

PARTY JOURNALS AND JOURNALISTS FROM 1710 TO 1714

GENERAL CONDITION OF ENGLISH JOURNALISM BEFORE 1710—THE *London Gazette*—JOURNALS FOUNDED UNDER THE TORY MINISTRY—DEFOE'S *Review* AND THE *Examiner*—MINOR TORY JOURNALISTS—MATTHEW PRIOR—OPPOSITION OFFERED BY THE WHIGS—THE *Whig Examiner* AND *Medley*—THE *Flying Post*—STEELE'S *Guardian* AND *Englishman*—MINOR WHIG JOURNALS—THE STAMP ACT OF 1712—EFFECT OF PARTY INFLUENCE UPON JOURNALS AND WRITERS.

The last part of Queen Anne's reign is known among literary historians as the time when the periodical essay became an established type in English literature. Any mention of this form of writing brings to mind Addison and Steele, and their *Tatler* and *Spectator* essays; but perhaps few except the historians recall anything regarding the other periodicals produced within the same period. Such oblivion for the other journals is to be expected for writings deficient in enduring qualities. As the Queen Anne periodical was distinctively an occasional production, it has quite properly fallen completely out of common recollection. It is, however, quite essential to realize that the *Tatler* and the *Spectator* were not the only journals published between 1710 and 1714, to attract general interest: many others, lacking the literary merits of these two, still held important places in public regard because of their relation to current events.

Some notion of the number of periodicals then in circulation can be secured from William Lee's account.¹ From his lists it appears that forty-five journals, some copies of which are still preserved, were begun in England between 1712 and 1715. Of this number four were printed outside of London, seventeen of the remaining forty-one were purely political, and twenty-four contained either literary essays or general news. Defoe estimated² that a little earlier, in 1711, 200,000 copies of established journals went weekly to subscribers throughout England. From such a sweeping statement as the last, one cannot assert confidently that the production of periodicals was a flourishing industry; the information is too vague for that. One must, however, conclude that

¹ Wm. Lee, "Periodical Publications during the Twenty Years 1712-1732." *Notes and Queries*, Third Series, IX, 72-75.

² The preface of the *Review*, vol. VII.

England had many substantial journals before Addison and Steele won popular favor.

In a few instances the sales of a journal can be determined with fair accuracy—with enough to prove others besides the *Tatler* and *Spectator* self-supporting. *The British Apollo*,³ a paper now utterly forgotten, was one of these successful enterprises. In 1709 the editor announced to the subscribers that conditions then warranted an increase to three issues a week at the old rate. He added that a Christmas amusement had originally been planned for all subscribers, but that later the intended "Consort of Musick" had been dropped. This was made necessary, he wrote, because "the Number of our Subscribers now is so large, that neither the Playhouse, nor any of the usual Halls for Musick, will near contain them, which renders it absolutely impracticable."

Clearly the *British Apollo* was a flourishing paper in 1709. More exact proof of success in such an enterprise exists in an account book of the *London Gazette*, which in 1710 was being published three times weekly. This publisher's memorandum, preserved among the State Papers of Queen Anne's reign, is a record of receipts and sales of the six numbers issued during the first half of June 1710.⁴ The first five issues contained uniformly 8,500 copies; the sixth, 8,250. Each time 1,087 papers were given away, and the average number sold amounted to 5,402 copies. £38. 10s. from advertisements added to the sales receipts made up a total of £103. 6s. 6d. for the six issues. Expenditures for printing amounted to £40. 12s., and Richard Steele, *Gazetteer*, was paid his half-monthly salary of £11. 12s. After all other general expenses had been met, there were left £24. 3s. 8d. for the Earl of Sunderland, Secretary of State for the Southern Department, and an equal amount for the Secretary for the Northern Department. As one of the two conductors of the *Gazette*, Sunderland was expected to pay with his share all expenses arising in the south of England for correspondence.⁵ After doing so, he

³ *The British Apollo; or Curious Amusements for the Ingenious. To which are added the most Material Occurrences Foreign and Domestick.* November 18-23, 1709. Three volumes totalling four hundred and seven issues as well as twenty issues of a fourth volume are in the Hope Collection. These appeared between March 13, 1708, and May 11, 1711. Burn, *Catalogue*, etc., p. 15.

⁴ *S. P. Dom. Ann.*, vol. 16, fol. 39.

⁵ He distributed his money as follows: to Mr. Paizant, £3. 17s; Messrs. Bo[r]rett, Brocas, and Whitaker, £1. 18s. 6d. each; Mr. Newcomer, £1. 4s.; Messrs. Smith and Marlow, 16s. each; the office cleaner, 10s.; miscellaneous, £2. 10s. He then held unspent £8. 15s. 2d.

still held £8. 15s. 2d. as his profit from a half share in the issues for the two weeks—a good net return.

These records for the *London Gazette* confirm the evidence of prosperity seen in the announcement of the *British Apollo* for November 18-23, 1709. Both journals demonstrated that the public was ready to support such enterprises before the days when Steele and Addison gained popularity. The law of supply and demand was operating well enough in 1709 to make journalism a profitable venture. Without actual records one would not have believed the *Gazette* self-supporting, for it was then, as it is now, a distinctively government publication and so likely to be subsidized. A political journal was apt to have either state or private backing and its circulation was often stimulated artificially. Free distribution was so common, that the public may have ignored utterly a periodical with a long "subscription list." On this account one cannot draw conclusions regarding popular taste from facts concerning the number of papers published; he can use such data only as proof that party organizations were at the time exceedingly strong.

It will be recalled that William Lee listed seventeen out of forty-one newspapers as being purely political. All of these were published in London and appeared first between 1712 and 1715. Many others, such as Defoe's *Review* and the *Flying Post*, had been running for several years, so that by the addition of old papers one would increase Lee's list considerably. Another account, similar to the one mentioned, appeared in the *Examiner* for April 17-24, 1712, and in this instance only political papers were considered.⁶ It seems that then six Whig journals were appearing weekly. The *Daily Courant* was issued six times a week; the *Protestant Post-Boy*, the *Flying Post*, and the *Postman*, three times each; the *Observer* and the *Medley*, each twice. Opposing this total of nineteen separate issues, the Tories supported only the *Postboy*, with its three issues weekly, and the *Examiner*, a weekly. The writer's comment that "certainly their zeal must be greater than ours, or their Pay much better," was a plea to the Tories for more generous assistance. The chief value of the list to-day lies in its proof of the contemporary belief in party journals for political purposes.⁷

⁶ Vol. III, No. 21.

⁷ Nothing can be deduced from the *Examiner* account except that newspapers were considered highly serviceable in politics. The list is incomplete; since Defoe's Tory journal, the *Review*, is not mentioned, surely others of less importance may also be wanting in this statement.

In order to determine what valuation was put upon newspapers during Oxford's ministry, one must study the records of all party publications. This involves a review of all available information regarding the Whig and Tory writers concerned, particularly of such details as demonstrate political patronage to have been a source of substantial support. Other matters of interest in such an examination will be proofs of collusion between writers and politicians in order to cripple their rivals, evidences of persecution, and facts that show why many writers changed completely their style of production. All such details should have a bearing upon the political importance of the journals.

At the beginning of Oxford's ministry no political journal matched Defoe's *Review* in effectiveness. With changes of policy suited to the course of events, this journal had been appearing under a similar name since February 19, 1704. When Godolphin fell from power, the *Review* became at once the property of Oxford's party, and Defoe in characteristic fashion set about popularizing their measures. When finally peace with France had become a reality, the *Review* gave way to a new administration journal, the *Mercator*.⁸ With this Defoe labored to establish in favor the new commercial treaty with France, a service that he continued until the end of Oxford's term of power.⁹ His work on the *Mercator* completed a continuous service in the government party extending from 1703 to the close of 1714. It is true that he was not wholly faithful, yet perhaps no one will ever determine precisely what evil fortune led him to write against Oxford as well as for him during the last years of this service. At least his Tory writings were of great value to that party. His worst enemies at that time credited him with marked ability, particularly in matters of trade, and to-day no question is raised

⁸ The French negotiators signed the Utrecht treaties on March 31-April 11, 1713. The last issue of the *Review* came out on June 11, 1713. *Mercator* appeared three times each week from May 26, 1713, to July 20, 1714. The idea of a trade journal had been in Defoe's mind long before the *Mercator* appeared. In the *Review* for July 8, 1710 (VII, No. 45) he had announced his plans for such a paper and had asked for advance subscriptions.

⁹ Defoe professed most disinterested motives for this service. The closing lines of the last *Mercator* (June 17-20, 1714) were: "As no selfish design has been carried on, so no Fee, or Payment, or Reward has been the Motive, nor have the Persons who have been concerned in it received any. The Party who have opposed the *Mercator*, have endeavored to fix the work upon several Hands, and at last upon one, with an universal Consent, who, however they have not been Opposed, yet has much wrong done him in the Charge: but he bears it, knowing the Truth will clear up the Case at Last."

as to the high merit of his discussions of trade policy in his *Review* and *Mercator*.

The *Review*, however, could not serve completely the requirements of Oxford's new party. Its tone was too conservative, too free from abuse for the controversial style of the day. Consequently, as a new means of reaching the public, Bolingbroke established the *Examiner*.¹⁰ This journal was founded as an organ of abuse in order to offset the violent attacks of the opposition writers. From the first the *Examiner* dealt directly with current measures and with the actions of individuals, in a style rarely displayed in the *Review*. For such work several writers were needed. Swift became the central figure in the group soon formed as an editorial staff, and in conjunction with Bolingbroke he worked to draw others into the service.

As the Tory leaders began forming the editorial staff of the *Examiner*, party matters began to affect vitally the lives of many competent journalists. The writers realized that a new premium was being put upon their services. Some tried to keep in favor with both Whigs and Tories: some openly asked one party or the other for patronage.

It seems that the first to seek Oxford's favor was Mrs. Delia Manley, a satirist of recognized merit. In May 1710, when Oxford apparently was rising rapidly in the Queen's favor, Mrs. Manley offered her aid to the party. With her petition she sent proof of her ability—satirical sketches of Oxford's political opponents—and urged upon him the necessity for prompt action.¹¹ The dexterity of her appeal had its effect, and Mrs. Manley soon became a member of the *Examiner* staff. The specimens enclosed with her petition and Oxford's previous knowledge of her famous court satire, *The New Atalantis*, convinced him that she was fully competent for service in the new Tory press organization.

¹⁰ The first issue was that of August 3, 1710: it ran to vol. VI, No. 19, the issue for July 26, 1714.

¹¹ The letter is instructive in showing how clearly this able journalist appreciated the possibilities of Oxford's favor. She wrote:

"My respect only prevents me from waiting upon you in person (to beg your acceptance of this book), lest I be thought to have the honour of your acquaintance, which I can only covet, never hope.

"Your merit, Sir, your great capacity, your zeal for the Church has made me an unwarrantable intruder. I willingly devote my ease and interest where my principles are engaged, and, if I have the fortune to do some small service, my design is answered. I have attempted some faint representations, some imperfect pieces of painting, of the heads of that party who have misled thousands. If anything moves your curiosity, I will explain what you desire, if you send a note (but without a name) directed to me

As Mrs. Manley began her work under Oxford's personal patronage, and with Swift as her friend, she obviously was in a position to receive generous payment for her writings. The circumstances make her case an excellent example of the manner in which the ministry treated its writers for the *Examiner*, particularly as the effectiveness of her service is above question. Moreover her letters to Oxford were fortunately frequent, so that proof of her dependence upon his favor can be obtained directly. First of all, these letters demonstrate that the *Examiner* staff did not receive fixed salary payments; the party writer appealed for special favors after giving his services. From the time of her first work for the Tory party, Mrs. Manley regularly sent in such appeals for money, most of them based upon the particular needs of the moment.¹² In these letters she never raised the question of a fixed salary, and her few acknowledgments of gifts prove most conclusively that Oxford was never generous.

Some vague statements in one of these letters show that Oxford was not her only source of aid. The passage in question reads: "Lord Masham and Sir Wm. Wyndham, two of the society [for the rewarding of merit]," were commissioned by the rest to desire in their name "that a hundred pounds be given Mrs. Manley"¹³ for her work. This letter seems to show that the Tory nobles systematically disbursed funds to their journalists. If so, the payments were perhaps made through Bolingbroke's club, an organization devised to provide common ground for politicians and writers;¹⁴ or Lord Masham and Sir William Wyndham may have controlled the distribution of funds, for both were leaders in Tory affairs between 1712 and 1714. Yet without other facts we must believe that the chief payments to writers were made by Oxford personally or in some secret fashion at the direction of Bolingbroke.

Though all the members of the *Examiner* staff expected some personal advantage from the service, not all began work with such mercenary

and under cover, to Mr. Markham at the Bell and Dragon in Paternoster Row: I give the address to none besides, and therefore can't fail to know from what port your commands shall come.

"Yet perhaps I am all this time offending where I aim and hope to please, the uncertainty of that gives me to ask your pardon for my presumption and to conclude with my profound respect." *Portland MSS*, IV, 541.

¹² Volume five of the *Portland Manuscripts* contains a series of Mrs. Manley's letters to Oxford, all of them cast in the form of petitions.

¹³ Mrs. Manley to Oxford, June 3, 1714. *Portland MSS*, V, 453-4.

¹⁴ See page 34 ff.

intentions as appear in the cases of Mrs. Manley, Defoe, and Swift. These three made direct appeals to Oxford, while other writers waited for Bolingbroke or Swift to make the advances.¹⁵ Some, too, were so patently Tory in sympathy that the party could count on their services without formal agreements. Among such were Matthew Prior, Francis Atterbury, Joseph Trapp, Dr. Arbuthnot, and Dr. Freind. These occasional contributors to the *Examiner* never identified themselves fully with any party journal, but in other ways rendered good service. Such men were better satisfied with other employments within the gift of the party, and consequently never became completely dependent upon uncertain and irregular payments in return for news writing.

One writer who began work on the Tory *Examiner* only under persuasion was William King, who edited issues one to fifteen of the first volume. Thereafter his duties were assumed successively by Swift,¹⁶ Mrs. Manley, and William Oldisworth—the last named having the place from December 6, 1711, until the last issue on July 26, 1714.¹⁷ These names collectively represent the strength of the *Examiner* staff in its first year. After that time, as will appear, some of the group went into more important service for the party; some continued dependent upon the patronage extended to all Tory writers. Swift's *Journal to Stella* contains some vague comments upon the rewards granted these writers. According to Swift one would receive as his portion a minor church or state appointment, another would receive a small money payment. These entries are so indefinite in most cases that nothing can be concluded regarding the amounts paid out annually to the writers mentioned. Yet the record of a cash gift of twenty guineas to William Oldisworth is highly important, for the entry shows that the money came direct from the Chancellor of the Exchequer.¹⁸ Unquestionably this payment was but one of the many having such an origin, and had

¹⁵ One other writer, Abel Boyer, made a direct appeal to Oxford, but was unsuccessful. In a letter of October 7, 1710 (*Portland MSS*, IV, 615) he asked for Steele's old post as gazetteer, but his reputation for Whig partisanship was too great to please Oxford and Swift. Both suffered in consequence of this refusal through Boyer's later slanderous attacks.

¹⁶ Swift personally edited numbers fifteen to forty-six, and Mrs. Manley the further issues in the first volume. Swift mentioned the change of editors in his *Journal* for June 7, 1711.

¹⁷ The *Examiner* of December 18, 1712, announced that in future the days of publication would be Monday and Thursday. At the next issue, however, the days were changed to Monday and Friday, and the paper kept to this plan thereafter.

¹⁸ *Journal to Stella*, March 12, 1712-13.

not the Treasury records been kept most discreetly they would to-day furnish proof of state subsidies to party writers.¹⁹ Another inconsequential Tory writer, Joseph Trapp, was mentioned by Swift²⁰ as one to receive patronage. In 1711 the Tory ministers saw to it that Trapp got the chaplainship with the Lord Chancellor of Ireland as a recognition of his pamphleteering in behalf of Dr. Sacheverell.²¹ A year later, having written a serviceable defense of his party, Trapp won Swift's help to a chaplainship with Lord Bolingbroke.²² It seems that he remained in England enjoying profitable livings and lectureships until his death in 1747.²³

Of the other *Examiner* writers Matthew Prior was most fortunate in his dealings with the Oxford administration. His prominence during those years was due to an intimacy with the Tory lords dating back to the beginning of Queen Anne's reign. Though he had no part in domestic politics, the events of his life were determined by the rise of Oxford and his friends. Prior began his party work in 1691 as a secretary to the Hague embassy, a post granted in recognition of his Whig poem, *The Hind and the Panther Transvers'd to the Story of the Country-Mouse and the City-Mouse*. He thereafter continued to write court verses—one noteworthy instance being at the death of Queen Mary²⁴—, he had a place in King William's household, and also obtained appointments abroad. In 1697 he held an important place as secretary to the embassy treating for peace at Ryswick, and before 1700 had served as gentleman to the king's bed-chamber, and as secretary to the Paris embassy. In

¹⁹ As for Oldisworth, who at the time was editing the *Examiner*, the records of his life show only that he was ignored after passing his time of usefulness. In 1734 he died in a debtor's prison, never having risen above the station contemptuously referred to by Swift as that of "under spur-leather" on the *Examiner*.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, January 7, 1710-11.

²¹ Previous to these events of 1709 Trapp had obtained the place of Professor of Poetry at Oxford. The appointment and his retention in office from 1708 until 1718 were due to his Tory zeal. In the Sacheverell case Trapp proved himself worthy of further patronage by defending the Tory cleric in his pamphlets, "A Letter out of the Country to the Author of the Managers Pro and Con" and "An Ordinary Journey no Progress" (1710). In 1711 he served the Tories further by writing "The Character and Principles of the present Set of Whigs."

²² *Journal to Stella*, July 17, 1712.

²³ Probable political cause appears for his appointment in February 1713-14 to the lectureship of four London parishes, in 1714 to a Wiltshire rectory in the grant of Lord Peterborough, and in 1732 to Lord Bolingbroke's rectory at Harlington, Middlesex.

²⁴ *To the King. An Ode on his Majesty's arrival in Holland* (1695).

1700, having become an under-secretary of state, he went again to the French court. During the same year he produced his celebrated *Carmen Saeculare*, a poem that marks the end of Prior's attachment to the Whig party. The immediate reward for this final poem praising King William was a place as commissioner of trade and plantations. Four months of 1701 in parliament completed his service as a Whig. Thereafter Prior rapidly broke off his old friendships in order to begin a more promising relationship with Tory politicians, whose ascendancy became evident upon the crowning of Queen Anne in 1702. Though marked for discipline at the hands of the Whigs for this complete desertion, he could complacently endure the loss in 1707 of his commissionership of trade,²⁵ for he was promptly given new government posts when the Tories regained power. Having throughout the years of his public work shown real diplomatic ability, he had special reasons in 1709 to expect a good Tory post. He had by then greatly strengthened his attachments, and his prestige as a writer and politician gave him a rank second only to Swift in the esteem of the Tory leaders.

In 1711, when he began to write for the *Examiner* so effectively as to draw insults from the Whigs,²⁶ Prior was reproached most severely for deserting his old friends. The opinion of Arthur Mainwaring, for example, sums up well the feeling of the Whigs towards him. John Oldmixon stated his friend's opinion of their former party ally: "Upon this [Prior's writing for the *Examiner*] he used to express the utmost abhorrence of that man's ingratitude, who had been rewarded by the Whigs, from a very mean Beginning, to be a C[om]m[issioner] of Trade and a M. P. He got into the House of Commons by the Interest of the Earl of Dorset and had not sat theré a year before he deserted the Party that had prefer'd him, and fell in with those men whose Merit was a constant opposition to all King William's measures to reduce the exorbitant power of France."²⁷

The Tories were quite as prompt to recognize Prior's importance by granting him government posts. In 1711 he became a commissioner of customs, and while holding this sinecure position was sent to Paris as a negotiator for peace. The year following he again went abroad for the same purpose, and in spite of Queen Anne's expressed disfavor, had charge of the English office in Paris until after her death.²⁸

²⁵ In the same year he was expelled from the Kit-Kat Club.

²⁶ *Journal to Stella*, February 9, 1710-11.

²⁷ John Oldmixon, *Life of Arthur Mainwaring*, etc., p. 157.

²⁸ Queen Anne complained to Oxford (November 19, 1711) that she had "always thought it very wrong to send people abroad of meane extraction." *Bath MSS*, I, 217.

On account of his continued employment at foreign courts, Prior kept free from journalistic service at home; yet during the months when Swift and Bolingbroke were promoting the *Examiner*, he was an occasional contributor. His interests were identical with theirs, but his established reputation for diplomatic ability put him beyond the influences affecting literary men in London.

The Whig journals of the time give excellent proof of the extraordinary measures taken to promote Tory journalism. Probably a knowledge of the sums being disbursed by the administration led Whig editors to lament the deplorable state of their craft. They asserted that free speech was no more; that writers were losing their self-respect; and that the majority were becoming so involved in party interest as to be completely dependent upon influential politicians. The *Examiner*, being the official organ of the ministry and the support of so many writers, quite naturally became the chief object of their abuse and vituperation. One critic declared that it was "employed . . . to display the wisdom and blazen the integrity of her Ministers during that period; to contrast their skill and virtue with the ignorance and vices of their predecessors; to whitewash or blacken characters; to state or mis-state facts; to varnish men and things, as simulation and dissimulation thought proper, and just as the nature and exigencies of their weak and wicked administration required. As it was directed at a variety of purposes it was played off by a variety of hands, who from highest to lowest were venal, who did as they were desired to do, and all wrought, to borrow the elegant words of one of their principals like 'scrub hang-dog instruments of mischief, and under spur-leather,' rather *fortiter in re* than *suaviter in modo*."²⁹ Among the statements of contemporary writers, Addison's comment is important. In *The Freeholder* for February 24, 1716, he wrote: "It was ushered into the world by a letter from a secretary of state, setting forth the great genius of the author, the usefulness of his design, and the great consequences that were to be expected from it. It is said to have been written by those among them whom they looked upon as their most celebrated wits and politicians, and was dispersed into all quarters of the nation with great industry and expense."

The editor of the *Medley* was the most outspoken in attacking the *Examiner*. This was to be expected, for his paper had been established for this single purpose. No terms of abuse were too gross for him in his charges of dishonesty and servility; when considering the lot of a Tory

²⁹ v. Burn, *Catalogue of . . . Early Newspapers*, etc., p. 20.

journalist, the *Medley* editor stopped at nothing.³⁰ Such became the mode of arguing with a political opponent.

As circumstantial evidence that the *Review* and the *Examiner* depended upon state subsidies, it is necessary only to recall how these two journals became the property of Oxford's party, how secretly the editorial staff was organized for the *Examiner*, and how abruptly both journals disappeared when they had accomplished particular ends. No public patronage was sought for either journal through an announcement of the editor's name; such an announcement would have been an invitation to personal attack. Usually a party journal appeared anonymously³¹ and for a limited time. To be sure, the Tory *Review* and *Examiner* were not of this short-lived sort, but all other evidence indicates their dependence upon the party leaders.

Typical of the journal created for specific purposes, the *Tory Tatler* appeared in November 1710 and was discontinued within three months.³² The *Tory Plain Dealer* was also short-lived. After appearing for a few months during 1712, it disappeared as soon as its issues had accomplished a specific end. *A General History of Trade* was in evidence during August and September of 1713, and then gave place to that most effective Tory trade journal, Defoe's *Mercator*. Still another sheet, the *Britain*,³³ was founded solely to popularize Oxford's plan for an Anglo-Dutch alliance, but very soon lost its usefulness. Such papers as these, existing only for special services, would scarcely have come into being without patronage from the state.³⁴

*

³⁰ See particularly the *Medley* for Monday, June 25, 1711.

³¹ Defoe, however, admitted that he was editor of the *Review* by answering an abusive article addressed to him personally. This admission appeared in the issue for August 5, 1710, and seems to have been his first statement of such sort. Later he freely admitted himself the editor, and openly referred to his political foes. See the *Reviews* for May 10, 1711, January 5, 1711-12, and July 26, 1712. It may be interesting to observe that in Vol. VII, No. 13, issue for April 25, 1710, first appeared the following note: "Printed for the Author: and sold by John Baker, at the Black Boy, in Pater-Noster Row, 1710." Thereafter this legend was used regularly.

³² *The Tory Tatler* appeared three times a week from November 27, 1710, until January 3, 1711. The *Plain Dealer* was in circulation weekly from April 12 until July 26, 1712. Burn, *Catalogue*, etc., pp. 23-24.

³³ It appeared on Wednesdays and Saturdays until the issue of No. 13 on February 18, 1713.

³⁴ Knowledge of the later history of the *Post Boy*, an important Tory organ in 1711, is limited to a few chance references. The British Museum contains various

These defenders of Tory policies did not go their way unchallenged. On September 14, 1710, a few weeks after the first issue of the *Examiner*, there appeared a *Whig Examiner*. Addison conducted this as a weekly journal until October 12; meanwhile the *Medley* was established to take up the work under a more individual name. The discontinuance of the *Whig Examiner* could not have been due to lack of funds, as has been implied by a recent writer,³⁵ for in that case resumption under a new name would not have followed at once. Addison's dislike for political writing may have led to the change, or it may have seemed best to reorganize the management of the journal and to imitate the *Examiner* by employing several writers. Richard Steele, John Henley, Samuel Garth, John Oldmixon, and Bishop Kennett contributed articles occasionally, and Arthur Mainwaring served as editor.³⁶

As stated in the first issue of the *Whig Examiner*, the Whig papers were "to give all persons a re-hearing who have suffered under any unjust sentence of the *Examiner*." Many years later John Oldmixon stated the facts which led the Whigs to start a new journal in 1710. "The old Ministry," he wrote, "saw it was absolutely necessary to set up a Paper in Opposition to the *Examiner*, to dispel the Mists it cast before the People's Eyes. . . . The learned and ingenious Mr. Mainwaring was in the strictest Confidence with the old Ministers, who knew well his capacity for all literary Productions, and he undertook to deal with the *Examiner* in an opposite Paper [i. e., the *Medley*]."³⁷

copies dated from June 1695 to November 1710, but the journal may not have appeared continuously. The name was a common one for periodicals during Queen Anne's reign. Abel Boyer edited a Whig *Postboy* from 1705 until 1709; then, having quarrelled with his fellows, he established his shortlived *True Postboy*, through which he hoped to win Tory patronage. Boyer has left some account of the established Tory *Postboy*, which was edited by Abel Roper, in his *Political State of Great Britain* for 1711, p. 678.

In his *Journal to Stella* (March 21, 1711-12) Swift called Roper his "humble slave" and later (November 17, 1712) mentioned his own contribution of a malicious paragraph to Roper's *Postboy*. During Oxford's ministry the paper clearly had Tory patronage and was subservient to Swift's will. Some issues of a paper bearing this name are preserved in the Burney Collection. They are for the year 1722, and are interesting chiefly for their advertisements of contemporary books.

³⁵ D. Brewster, *Aaron Hill*, p. 155.

³⁶ The *Medley* appeared in weekly issues from October 5, 1710, until August 6, 1711; then on Mondays and Fridays from March 3, 1712, until forty-five numbers had appeared under the new plan.

³⁷ John Oldmixon, *Memoirs of the Press*, p. 80.

With such definite duties before it, the *Medley* began to annoy the Tory leaders. Its corps of writers was much like that of the *Examiner* in one regard; it was formed of men from more than one class, some of whom entered the service without thought of profit. But if the account of John Oldmixon is trustworthy, Mainwaring, the editor, was the most aggressive writer on the staff and author of nearly all articles that appeared during the first year.³⁸ Apparently he was badly treated by the Whigs,³⁹ in spite of the unusual success of his journal.

While the *Medley* was keeping up the contest with the *Examiner*, the Whigs also kept alive their old party organ, the *Flying Post*. Since May 11, 1695,⁴⁰ this journal had been in the thick of political warfare, and now in the closing years of Queen Anne's reign the first editor, George Ridpath, was still at work for his party. Though a journal called the *Flying Post* was almost constantly in circulation until 1730, Ridpath's service finally ended in 1713. In that year he was tried and convicted of libelling the ministry.⁴¹ At the suggestion of Robert Walpole⁴² Stephen Whately then became editor of the *Flying Post*, and in spite of hindrances the journal kept on opposing the Tories.⁴³

In the closing month of 1712, when both Addison and Steele were assuming added political duties, the *Spectator* was discontinued by mutual agreement. Revived a year and a half later, it appeared as usual from June 18 until December 20, 1714, then under Addison's sole direction. Though no explanation was offered for the ending of the original *Spectator*, there are indications of political reasons. Addison was becom-

³⁸ John Oldmixon, *The Life and Posthumous Works of Arthur Mainwaring, Esq.*, pp. 167-203. The tenth issue, according to Oldmixon, contained some verses by Prior, and the twenty-third was entirely Steele's. Occasional helps from other writers are noted in the account of Mainwaring's life.

³⁹ Mainwaring said of the Whig nobles: "[They] did not expect I should make a Dependance on the sale only, that I should have £100 down, and £100 a year as long as the Paper continued . . . but alas! that emolument I heard of, but never received." John Oldmixon, *Memoirs of the Press*, p. 10.

⁴⁰ *The Flying Post; or, the Postmaster* was issued three times a week.

⁴¹ Ridpath escaped into Holland before sentence could be passed, and returned in 1714 to get his reward from George I.

⁴² See page 29.

⁴³ At least one of the prosecutions directed at the paper can be charged to Defoe. On March 11, 1713-14, he specified as treasonable "the first 26 lines of the second column, Flying Post, No. 3,462, March 11," and he urged Oxford to act. (*Portland MSS*, V, 395.) Two months later, on May 19, Bolingbroke published his signed offer of a hundred pounds reward for the arrest of Ridpath. (Boyer, *Political State*, etc., V, 378.)

ing more deeply involved in party affairs, and was unwilling to break his resolve that the *Spectator* should be nonpartisan. Steele chafed under the restraint of the tradition, particularly since the loss of his Tory employment as Gazetteer had removed his chief hindrance to work for the Whigs. He very promptly gave expression to his political opinions.

On March 12, 1713, he brought out the first number of the *Guardian*. If Swift in former days had grumbled rightly over the Whig tone of Steele's *Spectators*,⁴⁴ he found far greater cause of offence in this new daily. Berkeley, Addison, Tickell, and Pope contributed at various times during the spring and summer, though owing to the increasing reputation of the journal as a Whig organ Pope soon withdrew. The *Guardian* had begun its career with Steele's announcement that political topics were to be included in his discussions, but Pope's timidity probably developed only after the editor began a quarrel with the *Examiner*.⁴⁵ From that time, the last of April, the articles became more and more controversial, until the literary charm of the earlier issues disappeared. During these weeks of his controversy with the *Examiner* Steele passed from literary to political pursuits.

One result of Steele's growing party interest was a relinquishment of his place as Stamp Commissioner. On June 4, 1713, he wrote Oxford to the effect that a resolution to stand for Parliament at the ensuing election would oblige his retirement from a Tory office. About the same time and for the same reason he gave up an annual pension of one hundred pounds, which he had received regularly since August 1706. As the grant—though from Queen Anne in reward for Steele's services to the late Prince George—might appear to be patronage from political opponents, he freed himself from this hindrance to his party activity.

The general recognition of what these steps meant for Steele's future is shown by a letter sent to Addison by John Hughes on the day when Steele issued his first *Englishman*. The *Guardian*, which had been the means of involving its editor completely in political affairs, had played a part in bringing him into Parliament as member for Stockbridge, Hants—though to be sure the patronage of Whig politicians was chiefly responsible for the successful campaign. The election had occurred on August 25, and on October 1 appeared the last *Guardian*. On October 6, Steele boldly announced through his first *Englishman*, *Being the Sequel of the Guardian*, that the present was not a time "to improve the taste of men," but to open their eyes to dangers threatening the state. This

⁴⁴ *Journal to Stella*, July 1, 1712.

⁴⁵ *The Guardian* for April 28, 1714: No. 41.

definite proclamation of purpose convinced Hughes, and all Steele's friends, that the new journal would be exclusively political.

Hughes believed that the *Guardian* should have kept free of party matters, and that either Addison or Steele should have felt obliged to keep alive the *Spectator* tradition.⁴⁶ But Addison was not at all disposed to interfere with Steele, or to change his own plans. By that time he was himself so concerned with political duties as to neglect his former pursuits, and he knew well enough the disposition of his friend. In fact, the tone of Addison's reply gives the best evidence that he and Steele alike were henceforth to be politicians, not men of letters.⁴⁷

The *Englishman* appeared regularly three times a week until February 15, 1714. The day after its discontinuance Steele took his seat in the House of Commons, with the purpose to win a better hearing. Pamphlets and speeches before the House were henceforth to be his means of reaching the minds of his countrymen.

The incidents leading to Steele's expulsion from the House are hardly related to his journalistic endeavors; they rather form part of his career as a politician and pamphleteer. Yet he did not, even when doing duty in parliament, for long let his pen lie idle. On February 25, only nine days after entering the House, he issued the first number of a new periodical called the *Lover*. Its topics were chiefly social.⁴⁸ Steele announced that it was his purpose to reform public morals by contrasting tales of proper and illicit love. This temporary return to older themes was his only noteworthy defection from the political interest boldly professed in his first *Englishman*. The *Lover* was soon followed by a truly political journal called the *Reader*.⁴⁹ Its career was very brief and its political influence slight. Perhaps its only value in the present connection is as a demonstration of Steele's zeal for aggressive attack upon the *Examiner*. The second issue contained an exact statement of reasons for the appearance of another Whig paper. Steele wrote: "The Title of my Paper may sufficiently explain the Design of it,

⁴⁶ October 6, 1713. Drake's *Essays* . . . *Illustrative of the Tatler*, etc., pp. 376-78.

⁴⁷ Addison to Hughes, October 12, 1713, *ibid.*, pp. 378-79.

⁴⁸ No. 11 and No. 14 contain satirical accounts of his treatment in the House of Commons. The *Lover* appeared thrice a week and ran to forty issues, being dropped on May 27. It contained much matter similar to that in the *Spectator*, and professed an intense desire to reform public morals, but in somewhat dubious fashion. Frequently Steele seems to tell his salacious story for its interest quite as much as for any moral end.

⁴⁹ The *Reader* began on April 22, 1714, and ran to nine numbers by May 10. Of these Addison wrote two.

which is chiefly to disabuse those Readers who are imposed upon by the licentious Writers of this degenerate Age. The greatest Offender in this Kind is the *Examiner*. . . . While he is tolerated or any other that scribble to the Disadvantage of my Country, I will, in Justice to all my Countrymen and Readers, explain their Sophisms, and bring them to the Examination of Reason and Justice.⁵⁰ The animus here is personal, not general. This introductory essay reveals as much settled hatred of the *Examiner* as do Steele's earlier attacks upon the Tory party, and in that illustrates how much he had fallen into the illogical practices of political controversy.⁵¹

With this passage from the *Reader* before us it seems easy to trace to its culmination the development of Steele's partisan interest during the time of Queen Anne. He at first was content to be a Tory dependent and only secretly a sympathizer with the Duke of Marlborough. Slowly he recognized the division arising more and more sharply between Whig and Tory, until he finally threw over his state appointment in order that he might frankly write news articles against the government. Following the abandonment of the *Spectator*, he established in succession his *Guardian*, *Englishman*, *Lover*, and *Reader*, meanwhile becoming more and more involved in politics. His shift to pamphleteering was the next step, and the attempt to plead as a member of the House the final expression of his party zeal. His expectation of a parliamentary career had been made possible through the work as a journalist; that service had been for Steele, as for Swift and Addison, the means to more important appointment within the gift of his party.

A survey of the periodicals marshalled on either side in this political war would be incomplete without an account of the 1712 tax upon stamped paper, particularly as the history of the measure reveals some facts regarding less important Whig journals. This government device for controlling periodicals was the most comprehensive of all the plans for hampering the opposition press. The importance of the measure has been commented upon frequently since the time of Swift's exultation over the prospect of immediate ruin for all the Whig journals of England. That was precisely the intent of the measure, but its effect was not to be so great as its projectors expected.

⁵⁰ The *Reader*, No. 2, April 24, 1714.

⁵¹ Mr. Aitken has included in his *Life* (I, 405) Steele's first draft of what was to have been the opening number of another periodical, to have been called the *Scavenger*. The chief objects of abuse therein were again the *Examiner* and Abel Roper, editor of the Tory *Postboy*.

Agitation for some mode of checking the opposition writers had begun long before the passing of the law. The most distinguished plea for action came from Queen Anne in her speech from the throne on January 17, 1702. In 1711 Swift had expressed himself as opposed to the course that was later adopted,⁵² but in 1712, seeing the political expediency of such action, he changed his opinion completely. The Act of 10 Anne, c. 18 should be remembered as one passed chiefly for political ends: the income to be gained, though it was undoubtedly large, was of secondary importance. The following tariff was imposed under the Act. All print-paper was to be stamped at the rate of half a penny for half-sheets or less, and of one penny for any size between a half and a whole sheet. Pamphlets containing more than six sheets octavo, twelve sheets quarto, or twenty sheets folio, were considered books, and so were exempt. All paper in stock was to be stamped, but the tax upon unsold copies might be recovered later upon application to the Commissioners appointed under the Act. Penalties for attempts to evade the law were also established by further provisions. The first penalty was the loss of all copyright protection. Next, in order that anonymous publications might be suppressed, a penalty of twenty pounds was set for the omission of the name and address of printer and publisher.⁵³

One Whig periodical to suffer under these provisions was the *Observer*. It had been established as a Whig journal on April 1, 1702, and with occasional breaks in its issue had been appearing twice each week until this heavy burden of taxation fell upon it. It had been a very serviceable journal. During the earlier years Captain John Tutchin endured heavy persecution for conducting the paper. His death in September 1707, still held to have been brought on by rough usage at the hands of his political enemies, stopped the issues temporarily. In 1709 it is supposed that George Ridpath brought out a new series of the *Observer*, and in April, 1712, the *Examiner* listed it⁵⁴ among the periodicals then opposing vigorously all government policies. Later editors of the journal kept secret their identity, so that nothing but surmises are possible regarding what Whig writer kept up the paper. The last important reference to it was Swift's exultant cry that the *Observer* had fallen under the added cost upon stamped paper.

⁵² *Journal to Stella*, January 31, 1710-11.

⁵³ John Macfarlane, "Pamphlets and the Pamphlet Duty of 1712." *The Library*, New Series, I, 298-304. Professor J. M. Thomas of the University of Minnesota will soon publish an article on the same topic. (v. P. M. L. A.)

⁵⁴ The *Examiner*, III, No. 21. April 24, 1712.

Other Whig journals also failed to survive the test put upon all periodicals by the new Tory tax. The *Postman*, which had been in existence since February 1704, and probably much longer,⁵⁵ was alive in 1712; but after the Stamp Act became effective, nothing more was heard of it. The *Protestant Post-Boy*⁵⁶ also served the Whig cause effectively in the year 1711, a fact demonstrated by Swift's angry protest to Bolingbroke that its editor deserved prosecution.⁵⁷ Apparently his protest was not completely successful, for the paper survived the threatened "squeeze extraordinary" and was still in circulation the following spring. Yet it did not survive the tax levied on August 1, 1712.

The failure of these Whig journals did not bring much relief to the administration. A decrease in number meant only that larger subsidies would be available thereafter for those still in circulation, and that such a merging as that of the *Flying Post* and the *Medley* would keep up the range of circulation at smaller operating expense. Practically no advantage excepting in income resulted from the levy, while many non-partisan papers conducted solely on their merits and not objectionable to the government suffered severely under the burden. Contemporary comment upon the Act in the *British Mercury* shows that news-writers saw the political motive behind the measure and doubted its success. One asserted as his opinion, that though the number of papers would be made smaller, the final blow to party journalism would come only upon declaration of peace with France.⁵⁸ Political controversy was recognized as a necessity if partisan sheets were to persevere, and to the discerning a settlement of the greatest matter of party contention seemed the only means to an ending of party journalism.

But this natural conclusion as to the future of party writing was upset by the constant appearance of new matters of dispute. The attraction of public office was then as now sufficient ground for differences of opinion, and therefore the partisan sheets did not die out. Their number rose or fell in proportion to the heat of the immediate controversy. In October 1709, when strife was hot over questions of Church

⁵⁵ This journal, or another of the same name, was satirized in the second number of Defoe's *Review*.

⁵⁶ No. 36 is in the British Museum. I have discovered little regarding the paper except that it appeared three times a week. Its editor was one of fourteen Whig journalists committed to Newgate during 1711.

⁵⁷ *Journal to Stella*, October 9, 1711.

⁵⁸ *The British Mercury*, No. 369. July 3-August 2, 1712.

and state, over fifty-five papers were appearing weekly in London.⁵⁹ Three years later the course of events had created a new condition, in which it was unprofitable to keep up so many separate journals. Party leaders then centralized their energies by merging their periodicals and subsidizing only a few, so that when Bolingbroke's Stamp Act was about to take effect, there were appearing in London, weekly, only twenty-one papers—less than half of the number in circulation three years earlier.⁶⁰

Both of these lists are probably incomplete. Without a doubt, many papers not mentioned by contemporary writers were in existence during Queen Anne's reign. Likewise, it seems certain from the incompleteness of the large collections of eighteenth century periodicals⁶¹ that many news-sheets once in circulation are not now known to us.

In spite of inadequate information regarding less important periodicals, the matter available affords good evidence of conditions. Clearly enough the interest in news journals was increasing throughout the period. Before the *Tatler* and *Spectator* drove such thriving trade there existed an intelligent reading public which consistently purchased journals for domestic and foreign news. This circumstance proves that however much these two periodicals may have developed the public taste, they by no means created the liking for reading matter. Men read intelligently before 1709: they did not learn to enjoy periodical literature solely through the work of Steele and Addison—a belief that has given these two essayists an undeserved prominence in the general account of such writing. The *Tatler* and *Spectator* improved the popular taste for periodical literature, but they by no means created the market.

The steady growth of political journalism from 1702 until 1710 was a most potent factor in the preparation of conditions suitable for a finer type of writing. Men depended upon newspapers more and more for their opinions, and many writers—notably Defoe—discovered the new possibilities of party work. After 1710 the conditions of production were affected in increasing measure by the artificial stimulation of subsidies, until eventually every competent writer was forced to decide whether or not he would accept political patronage. This pressure

⁵⁹ John Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, etc., I, 3.

⁶⁰ *The British Mercury*, No. 369. July 3-August 2, 1712. In both instances the total included periodicals of all sorts, but the largest class was political. What few lists remain show that party journals were the most numerous and also most dependent upon current events.

⁶¹ The Burney Collection in the British Museum and the Hope Collection at Oxford are the best known and most complete.

changed the conditions of literary production and in the end completely altered the materials.

The most striking result of the new interest in party writing was a marked increase in the number of periodicals. When Oxford made the journal a fundamental part of his political organization, he fostered indirectly far more papers than ever came under Tory patronage. Others followed his example until every special faction, often for a single party measure, established its own paper. This increase in numbers was followed by a rapid reduction as the Tory leaders centered their subsidies upon a few chosen representatives, and as government restrictions made it advisable for the opposition to follow their example. The final direct result was to make circulation depend on the private interest of a few rather than upon a natural demand of the general public. The party organ became simply a tool in the hands of a special group, and in consequence its readers were also subjected to party control. In this final development appeared the last stage of a steady progression. Party leaders used the public press for special ends and established papers not dependent upon sales. To do this they drew in serviceable writers, making the decision as to what topics should get consideration, until at last they virtually controlled the thought of both writer and reader.

The rapid decline of purely literary periodicals furnishes excellent proof for this conclusion. It has been shown that the *Spectator* fell before the new demands being made upon its editors; and though Addison temporarily returned to the periodical essay, neither he nor Steele really revived his original interest. Defoe never freed himself from the increasing demands of party-writing, while Swift merely exchanged the labor of actual production for other duties quite as engrossing. Since the best writers were all interested in political papers, it is not strange that those of literary type quickly degenerated, and that in great measure party journals usurped their place in public esteem. In less competent hands a new *Tatler*⁶² quickly failed; the *Hermit*,⁶³ the *Lay Monk*,⁶⁴ and others speedily came to an end. It is not, therefore, too great a charge against the party journal as a type, to assert that between 1710 and 1714 it changed completely the conditions of literary support in England, and temporarily perverted public taste from a wholesome liking for the new literary form commonly called the periodical essay.

⁶² Harrison's *Tatler*, begun on January 13, 1711, under Swift's patronage, ran to fifty-two numbers. Burn (p. 17) credits Harrison with only forty-five issues.

⁶³ *The Hermit*, by *Way of Short Essays on Several Subjects* appeared from August 4, 1711, until February 23, 1712. Thirty issues were brought out during that time.

⁶⁴ *The Lay Monk* was the title chosen by Sir Richard Blackmore and John Hughes for a periodical in imitation of the *Spectator*. It appeared thrice a week from November 10, 1713 to February 15, 1714. As the *Lay Monastery* the collected articles went through two editions in the year of its discontinuance.

CHAPTER VI

WHIG REWARDS UNDER GEORGE I

EXPECTATION OF REWARD TO WRITERS—STEELE'S EMPLOYMENTS—IN HIGH FAVOR WITH THE KING—HIS *Hanover Post* AND SECOND *Englishman*—HIS THEATRICAL DIFFICULTIES—STEELE AND ADDISON ON THE *Peerage Bill*—STEELE'S RELATIONS WITH WALPOLE—ADDISON AND LORD HALIFAX—ADDISON'S PETITIONS AND STATE GRANTS—HIS INFLUENCE AS LITERARY ADVISOR—BUDGELL AND TICKELL REWARDED—NICHOLAS ROWE—CONGREVE—AMBROSE PHILIPS—CIBBER, HUGHES, ODELL, RIDPATH—DISAPPOINTED PETITIONERS.

When George I became king of England, Tory supremacy ended abruptly. The king knew how earnestly the Tories had striven to prevent the Hanoverian succession and to restore the Stuart line, and as a result was entirely disposed to put his affairs into the hands of Whig leaders. Oxford and Bolingbroke disappeared from political life, and simultaneously Charles Townshend, General Stanhope, Robert Walpole, and the Earl of Sunderland got control of the state council chamber. The completeness of their power was to some extent due to the king's ignorance of the language, a circumstance that contributed to the rapid growth of cabinet government during the decade from 1715 to 1725. Partly for this reason and partly because party leaders under Queen Anne had enlarged the duties of the ministry, George I could not dominate his council, and as a result the ruling party leader soon became virtual head of the state. Part of this leader's public power came from another source; namely, from a continuance of Oxford's policy as to the patronage of party journals. The press was again employed as a means of controlling popular opinion, and the writers at hand were recognized as necessary to the integrity of the party organization.

This established opinion favoring party writing prompted Whig journalists to ask favors from the new ruler and his aids. George I encouraged them by announcing publicly, in his first address, an intention to reward all who had promoted the Hanoverian cause, and this statement caused a flurry of expectation among the journalists. Even before his arrival the English writers had prepared for his coming by expressing in prose and verse their joy over the peaceful succession. To be sure ignorance of the language hindered the new king in under-

standing the panegyrics showered upon him by the Whig poets, but the flatteries were easily translated. Everyone not irreparably branded as Tory promptly wrote verses of greeting to the new ruler, and the Whig lords encouraged their individual favorites to expect generous return. Among those to greet King George in verse were the poet Young, Nicholas Rowe, Ambrose Philips, Thomas Tickell, George Ridpath, Steele, and Addison. The two named last most confidently expected Whig patronage.

After his expulsion from the House of Commons Steele was temporarily restrained from party service, partly by reason of events that made the summer of 1714 a time of political unrest. The Whigs had lost power when he went from the House on March 18, and the Tories were also greatly disorganized before July 27, the day upon which Oxford received his dismissal at the hands of the Queen. Steele's friends had been nonplussed by their successive reverses following the Treaty of Utrecht, and meanwhile the Tory party was being disrupted by factional disputes. Consequently for the time being the old subjects of party contest became insignificant in comparison with the private quarrel of Oxford and Bolingbroke. The latter had seemingly won his way to the head of affairs when Oxford was dismissed, but charges of corruption proved sufficient to deprive him of the coveted place in the Treasury. All Bolingbroke's plans were upset by the death of the Queen on August 1, whereupon factional disputes and personal ambitions were again submerged in the resurging tide of party controversy. At that time all disabilities were removed from Steele, who had been inactive following his expulsion from the House. At once his political importance rose; the Whig lords were in a position to treat him generously, and he could confidently look forward to new state employment.

With a clear understanding of what had been the value of his party service before the death of the Queen, Steele at once began seeking favor at the court of George I.¹ He first mentioned his expectations in a letter² written only three days after the Queen's death. It reads

¹ The year 1714 had been profitable for Steele. On the authority of a contemporary pamphlet, Aitken estimates (*Life of Steele*, II, 6 n. 2.) that the *Crisis*, published on January 19, brought in £2,000, aside from Steele's secret service money. Later, when expelled from the House of Commons, he received a £3,000 gift from an unnamed friend.

² Aitken, *Life*, etc., II, 36.

THATCHED HOUSE, S^{NT} JAMES STREET,
AUGST 4TH 1714.

Dear Prue

I have been loaded with compliments from the Regents and assured of something immediately, but have not heard w^t answer Philips brings from Scott. I desire you to send me a Guinea. I shall have cash in the morning. I wait Here to Speake with Cadogan, with whom I would explain the posture of my affairs more earnestly.

Faithfully Y^{rs},

RICHARD STEELE.

In another letter dated August 15,³ Steele ventured to hope for success in seeking the patent for farthings, but General Cadogan's assistance to that end was evidently useless. It was not long, however, before the King's arrival made his office-seeking more productive, for within a few months Steele was made Surveyor of the Royal Stables at Hampton Court,⁴ a Justice of the Peace, Deputy-Lieutenant for the County of Middlesex, and Supervisor of the Theater. These appointments were made through the active interest of Marlborough and other party leaders, but his personal reputation among the Whigs also had its effect.

As supervisor of the Theater, Steele shared a license with Robert Wilks, Colley Cibber, Thomas Doggett, and Barton Booth. This new document was given them by King George I. It gave them the power formerly vested in William Collier, and under its terms Richard Steele was the main beneficiary. This royal grant is dated October 18, 1714, and by its terms Cibber, Booth, Wilks, and Doggett, the licensees, were required to pay Steele their license fees, a sum that Cibber states netted Steele £1,000 a year as a sharer, but which had brought Collier under the pension plan only £700. The place of supervisor was granted as "an earnest of future favour," a promise that the King fulfilled shortly after; on January 12, 1715, he gave Steele £500, and on the nineteenth of the same month, a patent on his theatrical holdings for life and three years over. This took the place of the old license, and gave protection against sudden interference from the Lord Chamberlain or other influential persons, a possibility that was a real disadvantage of the temporary appointment.⁵ It was under this grant that Steele made about £1,000 a year by entering into an agreement with Cibber and the others

³ Aitken, *Life*, etc., II, 36.

⁴ This appointment is mentioned in the *Weekly Packet* for March 26-April 2, 1715.

⁵ The warrant for Steele's license is summarized in Aitken, II, 53. However profitable the theater grants may have been, Steele evidently was not fully satisfied.

to take a share instead of the fixed pension formerly paid to the supervisor.

During the year 1715 he was honored in various ways, and in return gave faithful service. On February 2 he was made member of parliament for Boroughbridge, an honor easily obtained through Whig assistance. As to the manner of his election, Steele left good proof some years later, when he wrote in his diary, "The Duke of Newcastle brought me into this present Parliament for the town of Boroughbridge,"⁶—simply one of the many such cases to be found on record during this time. Surely elevation to the knighthood exactly a week after his election was also due to powerful Whig noblemen.

Later in the year Steele received further reward when five hundred pounds were secretly paid him from Treasury funds. This sum was sent by Walpole through the hands of Leonard Welsted, a government clerk, and the transaction illustrates exactly the methods then used in paying out secret service money. A state employee would receive a sum of money, and it was then charged to him in the Treasury accounts. This sum was not for his own use, but was to be disposed of according to oral—never written—instructions. Thus all trace of the transaction was lost after the money left the hands of the Treasury employee. In this particular case Welsted told Alderman Walthoe "that he received the money for the use of Sir Richard Steele, and paid it to him,"⁷ a statement that is verified by the following letter of Steele's:

AUGST 14TH, 1715.

SPEAKER'S CHAMBERS.

Dear Prue

I write this before I go to L^d Marlborough's to let You Know that there was no one at the Treasury but Kelsey, with Whome Welsted left the Order and He is to be at the Treasury again tomorrow between two and three when, without doubt, the money will be payd. I have

A contemporary record states: "About this time the celebrated Mr. Steele, to his great mortification, was made Governor of the Playhouse, when he expected a post among the first Ministers of State, on the merit of his immortal libels, particularly the *Crisis*, published in the reign of Anne." Quoted *ibid.*, II, 55 n., from Salmon, *Chronological Historian* (1747), II, 45.

⁶ *Brit. Mus. Add. MS.*, 5,145c., fols. 148-9.

⁷ *Biographia Britannica* (1763), VI, 3830 n

no hopes from that or any thing else; but by Dint of Riches to get the government of y^r Ladyship.

Y^{rs}

RICHARD STEELE.⁸

In addition to these favors Steele sought to gain the vacant mastership of Charterhouse, a post for which he was disqualified by a statute requiring the appointment of an unmarried man. Yet he wrote in his own behalf to Lord-Chief-Justice Parker, to Mrs. Clayton, Mistress of the Robes to the Princess of Wales, and finally to the King himself. Though he pleaded loss of employments amounting to £700 a year when he entered parliament, the mastership of Charterhouse went to another. At the close of 1715 he had good reason for satisfaction in spite of this disappointment, inasmuch as he was getting a comfortable income from other sources. A close estimate would probably put the total at about the £2,000 asserted by a contemporary to have been his yearly income.⁹

These favors acted as incentives to renewed journalistic effort. In the same year Steele planned to start a new Whig paper under the name of the *Hanover Post*. His party interest then is well indicated by the unpublished announcement of this journal, which reads: "The design of this paper is more extensive, and its view to the public good more direct, than is usuall in works of this kind. On one hand, the want of skill in writers of intelligence produces such mistakes that explanations are frequently wanting both wth respect to persons and things; on the other, so many libels are successfully dispersed under the notion of public News, that scarce anything comes to us in its genuin & naturall colours; it is very reasonable therefore, that our country should have a friend in this rank of Authors, and that one of them should more immediately regard the interests of Truth and honour. This is what has engaged me in the present undertaking . . ." ¹⁰ The journal was never begun, however, probably because a new series of the *Englishman* was about to serve the same party demand. Number one of the second series under the famous title appeared on July 11, 1715, and on November 21, the thirty-eighth and last. In these issues it was Steele's chief desire to foment popular hatred towards the fallen Tory leaders, Oxford and Bolingbroke, and thus to break up any plans for a Jacobite rebellion.

⁸ Aitken, *Life*, etc., II, 73.

⁹ By the author of *A Letter to the Right Worshipful Sir R. S. concerning his Remarks on the Pretender's Declaration*. Aitken, *Life*, etc., II, 81, n. 1.

¹⁰ Printed from the *Blenheim MSS*, *ibid.*, II, 71.

Within a month of the discontinuance of the second *Englishman*, Addison began his equally famous *Freholder*, which kept up the contest for six months longer. It continued to appear regularly from December 23, 1715, until the issue of number fifty-five, the last, on June 29, 1716. Meanwhile Steele began his weekly *Town Talk*, the fifth number of which was devoted to a long letter to the Pretender. Though his interest in theatrical and social gossip reasserted itself in this periodical, he could not long remain silent on political topics, so that a prompt return to such materials was to be expected. Very soon after dropping this social journal, which came out weekly between December 17, 1715, and February 13, 1716, his impetuous nature led him to attack Addison, and from this disagreement developed an ill-will that was undoubtedly increased by Addison's rapid advancement in state affairs. In the *Freholder* for March 17 Addison had called upon Englishmen to show their fidelity to the existing government, partly because the nation was thought abroad to be naturally fickle and unstable. Steele's retort took the form of an essay, which was never published, in defence of his countrymen against this charge of instability.¹¹ Though of no political importance, the disagreement contributed to the unfriendliness that reached its climax in 1719, shortly before Addison's death.

The other interesting items in Steele's party activity during 1716 are summarized very well in the pages of *Chit-Chat*,¹² a short-lived paper that devoted much space to his affairs. Briefly, the journal aimed at reëstablishing Steele among his fellow Whigs in the position lost through his honest opposition to certain party measures. This loss of standing had not, however, cut him off from patronage, for on June 7 he was appointed Commissioner to act with twelve others in condemning for state use the lands of Scottish property owners who had taken part in the 1715 rebellion, an appointment that was to prove of considerable importance.

In this new employment Steele received £1,000 annually, probably until the Commission was discharged in April 1725. His last signed report was made on November 16, 1722. Perhaps final proof of his income during these years is to be found in his letter of May 14, 1718, in which he defended himself before his fellow-commissioners against a charge of neglect of duty. Having asserted that he was too deeply involved in his fishery project to venture heavy loss through making a

¹¹ Printed from the *Blenheim MSS*, Aitken, *Life*, etc., II, 82.

¹² Extracts printed by Aitken (II, 88-91) are from scarce copies of the second and third issues, dated March 10 and 16, 1716.

trip into Scotland at that time, he summed up the situation as follows: "Tho' (besides what I have to leave behind) my present income is £2,000 per annum, I cannot this moment leave town without almost irreparable detriment."¹³ Before obtaining this place, Steele may have received less than this amount annually from state appointments, but the letter indicates that he submitted to the established rule forbidding one to receive other Treasury payments while acting as a Commissioner. The account books for the Townshend and Stanhope ministries show no entries of other Treasury payments to him, so that whatever came to him through means apart from his Scottish Commission or the theatrical holding was paid through secret channels. He may possibly have tried for the post of laureate, made vacant in December 1718 through the death of Nicholas Rowe, but of this there is no proof.

In the meantime his receipts from the theater were augmented on one occasion through the King's favor. On April 13, 1717, the Duke of Newcastle had been made Lord Chamberlain, and differences at once arose between him and Steele. Newcastle questioned the right of Steele and his confrères to their patent and had offered them a license in exchange: naturally, they refused. As appears from a query addressed to the Attorney-General on October 25, 1718,¹⁴ this dispute reached its height in the fall of that year. The question raised was whether or not Steele was accountable under his patent to the King alone. No opinion was handed down, but through the indirect evidence of the King's patronage of the Drury Lane Company immediately after this dispute, it appears probable that he suppressed the Lord Chamberlain's protest. Steele's company received a royal invitation to perform at Hampton Court, and after giving seven plays, was rewarded with £374 1s. 8d. as expense money and two hundred pounds as a gift from the King.¹⁵

In 1719 the Lord Chamberlain had opportunity to renew his ill-natured attacks, for Steele was then in general disfavor with the party leaders. He had neglected his duties as Commissioner of Forfeitures, and this failing had caused several complaints, which were sent to the Treasury Commissioners on July 23, July 30, and October 10, 1719.¹⁶ A greater source of ill-will towards him was his attitude in the matter of

¹³ *Hist. MSS, Com. Var. Coll.*, VIII, 101.

¹⁴ Lord Chamberlain's Records, Warrant Book 25, p. 142. Quoted in Aitken's *Life*, II, 189.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 190.

¹⁶ I have found nothing in the *Treasury Papers* on this point beyond what is given in Aitken's *Life*, II, 199-200.

the 1719 Peerage Bill, an administration measure. In this he opposed Addison through his periodical, the *Plebian*, which came out four times between March 14 and April 6. Addison replied on March 19 and April 2 with a paper called the *Old Whig*, while Walpole and others were also busy publishing their pamphlets on either side of the controversy. Steele's ardor in behalf of the measure was due wholly to conviction, not to any secret understanding with the Tories. Yet his situation as a Whig became still more peculiar when at the fall session of parliament he appeared working on the same side as the Earl of Oxford, who, only two years before, had obtained release from the Tower. An unalterable foe of the government, Oxford was addressed in *A Letter to the Earl of O[xfor]d, concerning the Bill of Peerage, by Sir R[ichar]d S[tee]le*, published on the eighth of December, the day when the Peerage Bill came up for final vote. The result was a decisive defeat for the ministry, who thereafter were naturally unfriendly towards opponents of the measure.

As one consequence, they set out at once to penalize Steele. On December 19, the Lord Chamberlain indirectly took revenge by forbidding Cibber from acting thereafter with the company. Incidentally, he paid off a score against Cibber himself for an uncomplimentary dedication to *Ximena* and for refusing to give a certain player the part previously assigned to one of the managers.¹⁷ Steele was also deeply injured by the action and protested bitterly. Shortly after this incident, on January 25, he was deprived of his patent. Five days later his old associates opened the house without him, and he remained in disfavor until May 2, 1721. Then Walpole, his friend from the days of Queen Anne, compelled the other patentees to readmit Steele to his former standing and to settle for all shares from which he had been excluded. Incidentally, Walpole forced Newcastle, the Lord Chamberlain, to sign the writ that made restitution for his earlier misdeeds.

Until 1724, Steele continued to live in fair circumstances, though constantly involved in debt. In that year he reached some agreement with his creditors and retired to the country. His last favors from George I were a gift of five hundred guineas for the dedication of *The Conscious Lovers* (1722) and a hundred pounds, in February, 1725, from the King's bounty.¹⁸

A survey of Steele's career after 1715 shows that he was well cared for as long as his opinions conformed to those of his party. At the accession of George I he received important appointments, and his

¹⁷ For details see Lowe's (1889) edition of Cibber's *Apology*.

¹⁸ *Treas. Minute Book*, 1724-27. Vol. XXV, p. 13 n. Aitken, *Life*, II, 302.

popularity diminished only after the events of 1719. In that affair Robert Walpole, as in 1713, was on Steele's side; in both instances he showed an appreciation of the value of political writing. Thus George I and Robert Walpole, both usually ranked as archenemies of the professional writer, demonstrated in Steele's case a willingness to patronize when a past record and promise of present usefulness were the recommendations to favor. It is entirely clear from the records that neither was insensible to the current opinion regarding the utility of party journalists and pamphleteers.

*

At Queen Anne's death Addison was made Secretary to the Regency, probably, as Halifax said, that he might thus be in place to become a Secretary of State. This is sufficient proof of how he stood with the leading Whigs. At the time of King George's accession Halifax boldly aimed at securing the white staff, and he swore that Addison should go into office with him. Walpole effectually blocked these plans, but through other means Addison got his employments. Before the new king was due to arrive at Greenwich, he had gone thither with Halifax by barge, and Budgell had also gone in their company in hopes that he might win some favor through the help of his illustrious cousin. In this move Addison was simply transferring to royalty the attentions he had previously paid to the nobility. During Queen Anne's reign he had constantly worked for the good will of Somers, Halifax, Wharton, and others; it was in such manner that he had first won recognition, and in 1714 he followed his old procedure.

At that time his position in parliament as well as his work under the Regency gave him public prominence. For years he had been in the Whig councils. In 1708 he had failed to hold his Lostwithiel seat against a petition, but on December 20, 1709 Wharton's assistance had put him into parliament for Malmesbury. Upon such reputation he became chief secretary to Sunderland, then newly-appointed lord-lieutenant to Ireland, only to lose the post when his patron resigned in August 1715. That this patronage did not satisfy him, appears from his letter of October 17, 1714, to Halifax, in which he wrote: ". . . I fancy if I had a friend to represent to his Majesty that I was sent abroad by King William, and taken off from all other pursuits in order to be employed in His service, that I had the honour to wait on your Lordship to Hanover, that the post I am now in is the gift of a particular Lord [Sunderland], in whose service I have been employed formerly, that it is a great fall in point of honour from being secretary to the Regents, and

that their request to his Majesty still subsists in my favour, with other intimations, that might perhaps be made to my advantage, I fancy I say that his Majesty, upon such a representation, would be inclined to bestow on me some mark of his favour. I protest to your Lordship I never gained to the value of five hundred pounds by all the business I have yet been in, and of that very near a fourth part has been laid out in my elections . . . His Majesty has yet done nothing for me, though it was once expected that he would have done something more considerable for me than I can at present have the confidence to mention . . . I will humbly propose to your Lordship's thoughts, whether his Majesty might not be inclined, if I was mentioned to him, to put me in the Commission of Trade, or in some honorary post about the Prince, or by some other method to let the world see that I am not wholly disregarded by him."¹⁹

His request was heeded, apparently, for upon his loss of the secretaryship in August 1715, he was promptly made a lord commissioner of trade; this post he held until April 1717, when he resigned in order to become a Secretary of State. The place as commissioner, worth £1,000 a year,²⁰ was granted only after Addison had addressed a memorial to the king in person. In this document, written about June 1715, Addison recounted his services during Queen Anne's reign; he made references to his work as under-secretary to Sir Charles Hedges and Sunderland, to his journey to Hanover as Halifax's attendant, and to his secretaryship in Ireland under Wharton.²¹ The entire letter is an excellent example of the direct pleas for patronage common at the accession of George I. In one sentence he revealed what pressure had previously been applied by those wishing him to turn Tory, by asserting as ground for immediate patronage, "[I] never departed from those who were well-wishers to your Majesty's interest, though often pressed and tempted to it by the opposite party." He added that modesty prevented his listing his "endeavours, which were not thought unsuccessful, in securing such a spirit among the people as disposed them to favour the interest of a prince who is so justly esteemed a friend to the liberties of Europe." In addition to such comments upon his past record in the Whig party, Addison used, in this memorial to the King, an ingratiating tone unbecoming for one who is supposed to have stood above his fellows

¹⁹ *Works*, V, 424-5.

²⁰ *The Weekly Packet*, December 17-24, 1715.

²¹ *Works*, VI, 634-6. The appointments were made in 1706, 1707, and 1708 respectively.

in self-esteem. Unquestionably he was as eager as any to get the fullest financial return for his political fidelity.

Another letter, directed to Charles Delafaye of the State Office, shows as clearly Addison's servility to party policy. It was written on June 18, 1715, to justify his leaning towards the Duke of Ormonde, then in great disfavor with the administration. It reads: "I have great difficulties with myself in relation to the Duke of Ormonde. When I was of the University of which he is Chancellor, I was favour'd with his Countenance and Encouragement. When he succeeded my Lord Whar-ton in Ireland he resisted many solicitations which were made for the place that I have ever since enjoy'd in that Kingdome. I shall never pardon myself if I give a Vote that may have a tendency to the taking off his Head, and have reason to believe, my Lord Lieutenant would condemn me for such a piece of Ingratitude. I do not remember that since I have been in the House I have separated from my friends in a single Vote: and all I propose to do in this case is to be absent as by Accident if this Impeachment goes on. I desire you to acquaint His Ex^{cy} with this particular, that it may not make any Impression with him to my disadvantage."²² At the time Ormonde and Oxford were being toasted everywhere by the Jacobites, and violent riots throughout England were looked upon as preliminaries to a serious revolution. Under such conditions Addison's caution was probably due to self-interest—to a determination that under any circumstances he would be prepared. The ingratiating tone of his last sentence makes the letter particularly ignoble.

Other appeals during these years of reconstruction prove his activity in his own interest. On October 4, 1715, three lords presented a memorial asking the King to raise Addison's pay as keeper of the records in Birmingham Tower. This was promptly endorsed with directions that the allowance on this item thereafter should be five hundred pounds, a hundred more than under Queen Anne's favor.²³ On April 26, 1717, he was granted £1,850 per annum as Secretary of State,²⁴ and on April 13 £3,000 secret service money "without imprest, or other charge."²⁵ The salary was increased a hundred pounds a year through the patent fee. Finally, on March 19, 1718, he was granted a retiring pension of

²² *S. P. Dom. George I*: Bundle 3, No. 69.

²³ *Works*, VI, 637-8. He was granted the place in May, 1710.

²⁴ *Works*, VI, 639.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, VI, 640

£1,600 a year, and on May 8 silver plate valued at £337 17s.²⁶ These sums came into Addison's hands after 1715 through political channels. His income from such sources seems to have averaged over £2,200 a year, or about two hundred pounds more than Steele received annually during the same period.

It is not in income or distinguished employment that Addison most clearly surpassed his old friend of *Spectator* days; he was still the recognized literary advisor of the Whig party, while Steele was merely an agent of greater men. Regarding the Peerage Bill the latter asserted an individual opinion, but this break from conformity simply emphasized the extent to which he usually worked under guidance. Addison meanwhile maintained carefully his party standing and kept the unofficial place of advisor that had been his during Queen Anne's reign.

An interesting proof of this fact lies in an anonymous letter sent to him from New York immediately after the death of the Queen. It opens with congratulations to Addison upon his new political employments, with the obvious end of gaining his favor. Though undated and unsigned, the letter is marked on the reverse side, "Govn^t Hunter New York Nov. 8, 1714." The passage that makes such an appellation proper to the writer compares Addison and Swift as follows: ". . . I shall not now Disturb you with my private Affairs but in Generall Assure you that I have suffered beyond the Force of human Nature without haveing Received the least Answer to my Enumerable Complaints during the whole course of y^e late Administration. Tho' your old Acquaintance the Tale of a Tub who it seems had power with the Ruined Faction was pleased to Interpose in my Favour as my Lord Marr informed me . . ." ²⁷ Clearly Addison was known to many as a serviceable agent at court. Similar evidence is to be found in his own letter to Halifax—without address or date, but certainly written about the time of King George's accession. It reads: "Your Lordship having given me leave to acquaint you with the names and pretensions of persons who are importunate with me to speak to your Lordship in their behalf, I shall make use of that liberty, when I believe it may be of use to your Lordship, or when I cannot possibly resist the solicitation. . ." ²⁸ There can be no question regarding Addison's power at the opening of the new reign; his influence at court was very great.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, VI, 641-42. The *Dictionary of National Biography* records the pension as being £1,500, but this does not agree with the copy of the warrant.

²⁷ *Brit. Mus., Eg.*, 1,971.

²⁸ *Harl. MSS.*, No. 7,121; the letter is printed in his *Works*, V, 429.

Much of the Whig patronage in 1715 was due to the natural disposition of the party to reward its adherents, not to the interposition of any single person. No Swift or Bolingbroke urged men to fidelity by means of promises, for in 1715 such a plea was unnecessary. Party writers in abundance were at hand to defend the government against the Jacobite rebels. They counted on the immediate need of the government as well as upon their loyalty to the party when out of power, and confidently awaited Whig appointments. For this reason it is improbable that Addison personally had a share in the grant of employments to all these applicants, but several proofs of his interest are available.

His most prompt action was in behalf of Eustace Budgell, who had been dependent upon him during Queen Anne's reign. In 1714, Budgell had been made Addison's under-secretary; then he became chief secretary to the Lord Justices of Ireland, deputy clerk of the Council, and finally a member of the Irish House of Commons. When leaving Ireland, in 1717, Addison completed this series of favors by procuring his cousin the post of accountant-general, a place worth over four hundred pounds a year.²⁹ This Budgell held from August 10, 1717, until displaced on December 11, 1718. During 1719 he complained of ill-treatment in Ireland under the Duke of Bolton and thus lost favor with his influential relative. Another cause for displeasure was a pamphlet written against the Peerage Bill, for Addison would naturally dislike such opposition to the measure of his own patron, the Earl of Sunderland. Before this Budgell had written very little that could be classed as political; consequently he cannot be considered as a party man of importance, nor can his rewards be listed as due to service. His prosperity continued as long as he held Addison's good will. Having lost that, he could get no more hearings from the administration. During the next reign, however, he was to reappear as a vigorous writer against the government, when under the patronage of the Earl of Orrery he contributed to the *Craftsman*, a violent foe to everything advanced by the administration.

Thomas Tickell was another writer to depend upon Addison both before and after the death of Queen Anne. His name became well known during the course of his patron's famous quarrel with Pope over the editions of Homer, but before that Tickell had enjoyed some prominence. In November 1714 he accompanied Addison to Ireland, probably in part because he had previously invoked the King's favor through a poem, the *Royal Progress*. This is undoubtedly the one that Addison recom-

²⁹ Drake, *Essays* . . . *Illustrative of the Tattler*, etc., III, 6.

mended to the Hanoverian Secretary, Monsieur de Robethon, as a "master-piece of its kind:"³⁰ it was further stamped with his approval through publication in the *Spectator* for November 14, 1714. In June 1715 Tickell used the method of his master when he dedicated his *Iliad* translation to Lord Halifax as a way to patronage—doubtless at Addison's suggestion. The existence of this dedication adds weight to the belief that the entire Homer project was to have been fostered by Whig patronage in competition with Pope's version.³¹ Certainly thereafter Tickell was a party poet, for from that time on he wrote nothing notable in non-partisan vein except his lines, *To the Earl of Warwick, on the Death of Mr. Addison*. An appointment as Addison's under-secretary of State, in April 1717, gave Tickell excuse for definitely partisan composition. The same year he brought out his party pamphlet, "An Epistle from a Lady in England to a Gentleman at Avignon," which passed through five editions; in 1718, "An Ode occasioned by the Earl of Stanhope's Voyage to France"; and in 1720, "An Ode inscribed to the Earl of Sunderland at Windsor." Aside from editing his patron's writings in 1721, he did no further literary work of importance, but remained content with small Whig employments.³²

In these two cases Addison evidently applied pressure in order to help Whig writers, and his success demonstrated his court influence. Another bit of evidence regarding his power, even after resigning his secretaryship, exists in a petition sent by Charles Gildon on February 12, 1719.³³ It is a most pitiful appeal from one who had apparently lost most of his natural powers and was finally pleading for some state employment as a means to existence. The mere fact that Addison was the recipient of such a letter in 1719 indicates that his influence at court was well understood and that less influential writers turned to him for the necessary recommendation.

*

Nicholas Rowe had much more claim than either Tickell or Budgell to the type of patronage granted in earlier days on ground of literary

³⁰ Letter of September 4, 1714: *Works*, V, 420.

³¹ Pope's dedication of his *Iliad* to Congreve was but one move in his plans for obtaining favor from men of both political parties. To divert Whig purchasers to his own version would have been Tickell's object.

³² From May 4, 1724, until his death on April 23, 1740, he served the Lord Justices of Ireland as secretary. In 1733 appeared his only significant poem for this period, "On Queen Caroline's rebuilding the Lodgings of the Black Prince and Henry V at Queen's College, Oxford."

³³ *Brit. Mus. Eg. MS*, 1,971, fol. 33.

merit: he also deserved something for his loyalty to the Whig party. From youth Rowe had been interested in literary work, and with his second play revealed a willingness to live under court patronage. In 1702 his "Tamerlane" appeared with William III as its hero, and from this beginning the poet developed a popularity at court that reached its height late in Queen Anne's reign. Rowe persistently sought either royal or party favor by means of judicious dedications,³⁴ and unequivocally professed his loyalty to the Whigs. The only suspicion of his fidelity to his party arises from Spence's doubtful anecdote, according to which the poet learned Spanish upon the hint of Oxford that it would be to his advantage, only to be told finally that he was then ready to read Don Quixote in the original.³⁵

In the account of Swift's work mention was made of an attempt to turn Rowe into a Tory. Having rejected such proposals, he was rewarded on August 1, 1715, by appointment as poet-laureate. This brought him the usual hundred pounds and a tierce of Canary wine annually. The election of Rowe was a clear case of political favoritism, for Nahum Tate, who had held the place throughout Queen Anne's reign, was removed in order that the new favorite might come into office. Thus the post usually given for life was subjected to the rules of the political game, and Rowe went in—as Thomas Hearne thought, "a great Whig, and but a mean Poet."³⁶ In October 1715 he obtained a two hundred pound place as land-surveyor of customs for London. Thereafter he was in the Prince of Wales's court, and had he lived would surely have had

³⁴ "Ulysses," 1706, was dedicated to Lord Godolphin; "The Royal Convert," 1707, to Charles, Lord Halifax; "Jane Shore," produced on February 2, 1713-14, to the young Duke of Queensberry; "Lady Jane Grey," 1715, to the Princess of Wales. His edition of Shakespeare, out in 1709, was dedicated to the Duke of Somerset, who proved to be a good patron: his urgings got Rowe an appointment as under-secretary to the Duke of Queensberry, secretary of state for Scotland. He held the post from February, 1709, until the death of the Duke in 1711.

In this connection the following letter is of interest:

Peter Wentworth to Lord Raby at Berlin.

Twickenham, Sept. 5, 1710.

" . . . Mr. Rowe in the didication of his Edition of Shakespare gives him [the Duke of Somerset] the caractor of the Greatest patriot and best Patron in the world; and truely to him he was so, for he stickled hard for him to be in the Duke of Q[ueensberry's] office, so much that he had like to have quarrell with the Duke who had a mind to have shuffled him off. . . ." J. J. Cartwright, *The Wentworth Papers*, 1705-1709, p. 141.

³⁵ p. 174.

³⁶ *Remains and Collections*, V, 105. Entry for August 26, 1715.

greater favors. The Prince made him clerk of his council, and in May 1718 appointed him clerk of presentations. He died on December 6 of that year. In this case official rewards had their usual effect; Rowe turned his poetic ability to political ends, and from 1715 on, produced nothing but trivial verses in celebration of state occurrences. His writings were never influential in the manner of Swift's or Defoe's, and clearly he was not highly valuable to his party as a writer. It was not on this score that Rowe received his appointments. The recognition was due to his fidelity to Whig principles during the reign of Queen Anne, and also to the individual patronage of the Duke of Somerset. In this instance the Treasury was made the means of literary patronage without much regard to returns except as credit accrued to party and patron through honors paid to the first editor of Shakespeare.

William Congreve experienced similar good treatment without deserving Whig favors on grounds of political service. His first state employments had come through Montagu (Lord Halifax) during the reign of William and Mary, but no one then or later pretended that his comedies had political importance. He was made a literary dependent of the state through the favor of a party leader. As has been seen, both Halifax and Swift influenced Oxford to retain Congreve in state service, and after 1714 his old patron was in a position to assist him through direct channels. But before 1714 Halifax had done much for his favored writer. He had made Congreve a commissioner for licensing hackney coaches and had held him in the place from July 12, 1695, until October 13, 1707; he had also kept the dramatist, from December 1705 until December 1714, in the post of commissioner of wine licenses. At length, with Whig control reëstablished, Halifax speedily aided Congreve to the secretaryship of Jamaica at seven hundred pounds a year, to a patent-place in the Customs worth six hundred, and to a place in the pipe-office. Until his death the dramatist enjoyed an income from these posts far beyond that of the majority of active Whig writers; it is usually estimated as about £1,200 a year, but seems to have been greater.

Both Congreve and Rowe were patronized for sufficiently practical reasons. The political leaders clearly understood the value of prominent men of letters, for every distinguished writer exercised great personal influence. London was the literary and political center of all England, and was sufficiently local in its interests so that Congreve personally had high political value, simply as a Whig, without writing a line of party material. Addison's early influence over his fellows had its source in similar circumstances, and on the same grounds Pope was long sought

after by both parties. It was through their individual distinction that Rowe and Congreve became of real value to their party.

It has been noted that in 1710 Swift made a futile effort to buy Ambrose Philips by the offer of a post as queen's secretary at the court of Geneva. When Philips rejected this Tory offer, he at once became one of Addison's circle. Near the close of Oxford's ministry he filled a party place of importance in serving as secretary to the Hanover Club, a society formed solely to assure the Hanoverian succession. By the time of George I's accession he had given many similar proofs of Whig attachment, and his rewards were promptly forthcoming. He immediately became justice of the peace for Westminster, and in 1715 became a paymaster for the state lottery. An entry in the Patent Books shows that Philips was appointed to the latter post in February in place of John Morley, Esq., with an annual grant of five hundred pounds, to be paid quarterly.³⁷ In 1720 he was still receiving money from the Treasury, for on August 27 of that year he acknowledged receipt of £60 10s. 6d.³⁸

His name is connected with what was probably the first noteworthy journal published after 1714. *The Freethinker*, a journal established by Philips in 1718, had a political purpose, though it professed also to provide non-partisan news of various sorts. Chancellor Richard West is said to have contributed articles on English law and constitutional questions; Gilbert Burnet wrote on superstitions; Dr. Boulter, primate of Ireland, discussed questions in education. Other writers were Dr. Pearce, Rev. George Stubbs, Henry Stephens, and Mr. Welsted.³⁹ Steele also assisted Philips somewhat.

Shortly after dropping the paper, Philips received an appointment as secretary to the Bishop of Armagh, and this led to his election to the Irish Parliament during the same year (1724). Two years later he became secretary to the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, in 1733 was made a judge of the prerogative court, and in 1748 returned to London after purchasing an annuity of four hundred pounds. This completed his public employments.⁴⁰

³⁷ *Patent Books*, 1714-15; Vol. 29, fol. 120. A note on the warrant indicates that he entered office on the twenty-first of February. I cannot identify this entry with the *Dictionary of National Biography* record of Philips's appointment in 1717 to the post of lottery commissioner.

³⁸ *S. P. Dom. George I*: Vol. 22, fol. 130.

³⁹ Burn, *Catalogue*, etc., p. 37. The paper appeared twice weekly from March 24, 1718, until July 28, 1721.

⁴⁰ Philips died on June 18, 1749. Biographical data concerning him is scant.

Colley Cibber also obtained recognition from the new government. He had enjoyed court favor throughout Queen Anne's reign, and after 1714 was continued as one of the group in control of Drury Lane Theater. In spite of the hostile intervention of Newcastle he held this profitable place for many years. In 1717 he appealed to an unnamed lord in government service for a pension in recognition of his anti-Catholic play, the *Non-Juror*.⁴¹ The result of this appeal was a royal grant to Cibber for two hundred pounds. In December 1730 he became poet-laureate, and held the post until his death on December 12, 1757. Except as he put political comment into his plays, he had no claim upon the Whigs to bring about these appointments.

Several other writers deserve mention in an account of the rewards meted out at the accession of George I. Vanbrugh, the dramatist, then regained court favor, having been dismissed from his employments late in the previous reign, and resumed his duties as architect of Blenheim.⁴² On September 19, 1714, he was knighted, and in January 1715 was reappointed comptroller to the board of works. In 1716 appointment as architect to Greenwich Hospital gave him an added two hundred pounds yearly—as in other cases, because of his earlier literary labors and his consequent contemporary reputation. John Hughes, another Whig petitioner, had had some insignificant political employments during Queen Anne's reign; he had always been looking for such aid. The Earl of Wharton, when appointed in 1708 to the place of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, had offered Hughes a small post in recognition of a dedication,⁴³ but Hughes injudiciously relied upon another patron and thus lost both possibilities. It was only in 1717 that he became independent through appointment as secretary to the commissioners of peace in the Court of Chancery. This place, obtained through Lord Chancellor Cowper, Hughes retained until his death on February 17, 1720.

⁴¹ *S. P. Dom. George I*: Vol. 11, fol. 49.

⁴² Though not an active Whig writer, Vanbrugh had held several places before 1715. On March 29, 1704, he became Clarenceux king-at-arms through the aid of the Earl of Carlisle. In 1706 he conveyed the insignia of the Order of the Garter to Prince George at Hanover. Previous to that, in 1702, he was made comptroller of the board of works, and in June 1705, through Godolphin, architect of the palace to be erected at Woodstock. At the end of 1711 difficulties arising over this project caused his dismissal from all his employments. In 1725 Walpole aided Vanbrugh to obtain the £2,000 due him for the work at Blenheim.

⁴³ To "Dialogues of the Dead . . . With a Reply to some Remarks in a Critique call'd the Judgment of Pluto &c., and two original Dialogues," London 1708.

Another protégé of Wharton's, Thomas Odell, began his obscure career in London during the last year of Queen Anne's reign. He came to town resolved to write for the Whigs, and through Sunderland and Wharton soon secured a two hundred pound pension. Thereafter he was in Walpole's service, but none of his party writings are known under his own name. It is certain, however, on the authority of William Oldys, that he wrote much for the government. On July 31, 1749, Oldys made the following note: "Was at Mrs. Odell's in Chapel Street, Westminster. . . Saw several of her late husband's papers, mostly poems in favour of the Ministry, and against Mr. Pope. One of them printed by the late Sir Robert Walpole's encouragement, who gave him ten guineas for writing and as much more for the expense of printing it; but through his advice it was never published, because it might hurt his interest with Lord Chesterfield and some other noblemen who favoured Mr. Pope for his fine genius. . . ."⁴⁴ These papers, which might have shown something concerning Pope's political activity during Walpole's ministry, were at least written against both Pope and the opposition with the entire consent of the administration. For such service Odell kept his two hundred pound pension until the death of his hereditary patron, the fourth Earl of Sunderland, in 1729. After that he held, from 1738 until 1749, the place of deputy licenser of plays, with the same yearly return.

Of the writers little known for literary merit who secured rewards from the new ministry, John Ridpath ranks with Hughes and Odell. Ridpath had been in hiding in Holland since his trial in Guildhall on February 19, 1713. At that time serious charges had been lodged against him for his articles in the *Flying Post*. While a refugee in Holland he had kept on writing for the party, so that returning in safety at the accession of a Whig ruler, he naturally expected a reward for his loyalty. Current news items show that he had a good deal to say regarding what the reward should be. The *Weekly Packet* for December 18-25, 1714 reads: "Mr. Ridpath, the Author of the Flying-Post, has been offer'd the Place of Treasurer of the King's Kitchin, but refus'd it upon Account of his Nonconformity; and desired his Patron to interceed, that he may be employ'd in some Post in Scotland, by reason he can much better conform to the Religion us'd in that Part of Great Britain." The *Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer* for February 15, 1718, then reported his appointment as follows: "Mr. Ridpath, the Author of the Flying-

⁴⁴"Notes from Manuscript *Adversaria* of William Oldys:" printed in *Notes and Queries*, Second Series, XI, 161.

Post, having suffer'd in the late Reign for the Service he did by that Paper against the Enemies of the present Government, his Merits are now rewarded by the unparallel'd Justice of the Crown, which has been pleased to grant him and two Booksellers a Patent, for furnishing the Offices in Scotland for 40 years, with blank Books, Paper, and all Stationary Wares; which, 'tis said, will bring in £900 per Annum." Aside from the date at which Ridpath began this service in Scotland⁴⁵ little is known regarding his last years. In 1722 he acted as secretary to a government lottery at Harburg, Hanover, but nothing is known of his last years except that they were passed in disrepute.

Another Whig writer, George Sewell, was engaged at the close of Queen Anne's reign in a series of bitter attacks upon Bishop Burnet, and he continued to show his strong Tory inclinations by writing further against Thomas Burnet, the bishop's son. Shortly after, in 1718, he began active work in direct opposition to his earlier opinions, and became a Whig writer for Walpole. In that year his "Resigners Vindicated: by a Gentleman" went through four editions. Nothing remains to show what was Sewell's source of income, but undoubtedly his change of heart between 1715 and 1718 was due to patronage.

From the life records of such men as Hughes, Odell, Sewell, and Ridpath it seems clear that minor writers were not supported by the Whigs except as they could enter good claims by reason of service to be rendered. In other words, there was no thought of traditional obligations to a man of letters. The political leaders expected nothing from them but honest craftsmanship, and had no delusion regarding their possible debts as leaders in English society to men of literary ability.

This opinion is verified through examination of the fruitless appeals for assistance. Some men who had done work for the Whigs during Queen Anne's reign, but who gave no promise of future usefulness, vainly asked for help from the ministry. Three of these were Hugh Speke, John Dunton, and John Oldmixon. Speke had been trying his hand at party writing ever since the days of William III, and in 1683 had suffered three years imprisonment for writing a pamphlet against the government. Following his release in 1687, he had actively worked for the Hanoverian succession, and in December 1688 had concocted a bogus

⁴⁵ *The Dictionary of National Biography* makes an indefinite reference to *Read's Weekly Journal* for February 12, 1726, for the time of his appointment, but my quotation from the *Weekly Journal* gives a more exact date. Reference to Dunton's *Life and Errors*, etc. (II, 734) would have been sufficient to show that Ridpath was still out of employment in 1716, the year within which the modern biographer presumed that he was appointed.

proclamation that increased popular prejudice against the Roman Catholics. On this ground he had appealed to Queen Anne for a return of the £5,000 paid for his release in 1687, but had received only a hundred pounds. Now, with a new member of the House of Hanover on the throne, he again asked for patronage. Under a new title he dedicated the old Declaration of 1688 to George I, an act equivalent to an appeal.⁴⁶ Though finally the document was translated into French that the King might read it in person, Speke received nothing.

John Dunton had little more claim to favor. He had been writing Whig pamphlets for years, but his work had not been taken seriously from the time of his odd *Life and Errors*, published in 1705. Yet his 1716 account of neglect at the hands of the Whigs states some facts with accuracy—so much is sure from outside evidence. This pamphlet, called "Mordecai's Memorial: or There is nothing for him," was signed as by "an unknown and disinterested clergyman," but was by Dunton himself. After some account of his services at the end of the preceding reign, the pamphleteer went on by way of contrast to point out what had been done for others. After an assertion that Swift had had £1,000 a year from the late ministry for his *Examiner*, Dunton ended his anonymous dedication to the Prince of Wales with an appeal for "£1,000 and a handsome pension, to be put in a future position to serve King George and his native Country." The other writers named in the petition as unrewarded were John Toland and Stephen Whately.

In 1723 Dunton issued a signed petition⁴⁷ directed to the King himself, but failed again. His plea was based upon a sentence from the first speech of George I. The King had said, "I will never forget the obligations I have to those that have distinguished themselves by their zeal and firmness to the Protestant Succession, against all the open and secret practices that have been used to defeat it." With this assurance Dunton asked for £2,000 in order to liquidate debts contracted on the basis of his hopes, and for a life pension. He acknowledged the receipt of a gold medal sent through the Count de Bothmer, with such promises of fidelity to King George as ought to have convinced anyone of his faithfulness. As final proof of his worth to the government Dunton appended a list of forty Whig tracts written during the preceding ten years. One was entitled "Royal Gratitude; or, King George's Promise never to forget his obligations to those who have distinguished them-

⁴⁶ "The Secret History of the Happy Revolution in 1688. . . humbly dedicated to his most Gracious Majesty King George by the principal Transactor^s in it [i. e., Hugh Speke.]" 1715.

⁴⁷ Printed in Dunton's *Life and Errors*, etc. (1818 ed.), II, 735-50.

selves in his Service critically considered. In a Letter to Robert Walpole, Esq., occasioned by a general Report that Mr. John Dunton (Author of 'Neck or Nothing') will speedily be rewarded with a considerable Place or Pension." No reward was granted, in spite of the sanguine tone of this particular title, so that Dunton's political-literary career may be considered as having ended with Queen Anne's reign.

The third disappointed petitioner, John Oldmixon, was more deserving. He had spent his life in party pamphleteering, and during the early years of the century had celebrated Whig victories in passable verses, quite after the current fashion. Later the party leaders employed him on the *Medley*, with promise of a hundred pound gift and an annual salary of a hundred pounds; but after the work was completed, he was still unpaid.⁴⁸ He consequently had fair reason to expect something from George I.

In 1715 Oldmixon made his formal appeal for Whig favor by dedicating to Robert Walpole his *Life and Posthumous Works of Arthur Mainwaring, Esq.* Both in the dedication and in the text he referred freely to his services and to his hopes for proper recognition. In his *Memoirs of the Press*, he included similar data regarding himself and, by way of contrast, facts concerning writers who had been more fortunate. It appears that Stanhope had failed to keep his promise of making Oldmixon consul at Madeira, and that the petitioner had at least that much cause of complaint. Though he was not cared for immediately, in 1716 John Dunton wrote of him: "Was not that first rate Poet, Mr. *Oldmixon*, by having a friend at Court, (for kissing goes by favour), lately advanced to a considerable post for the great service he had done by his loyal rhymes?"⁴⁹ This is probably a reference to a promise of place that was made good the following year, when he became collector at the port of Bridgewater. The hundred pounds yearly was not sufficient to satisfy him, however, for his subsequent writings are full of references to his unfortunate lot. The last accounts of Oldmixon during the reign of George I exist in letters to the bookseller Jacob Tonson. In December 1718 and again in 1720 he laid his case before his friend in London.⁵⁰ The first letter asked that Tonson use his influence with the Duke of Newcastle that Oldmixon might be made laureate in Rowe's place. This, he said, he "was to have had before had it not been for him [Newcastle] as S^r Sam^l Garth knows." His best argument was: "No Body

⁴⁸ J. Oldmixon, *Memoirs of the Press* (1742), p. 13.

⁴⁹ *Life and Errors*, II, 732.

⁵⁰ *Brit. Mus. Add. MS* 28,275, fols. 46, 84, 95, 133.

will appear that has my Pretences. If some of 'em have done more for ye Muses, which I question, I will prove that I have done more than all of them for the crown. Besides I am the best Claimer. Long have I been in the Service of the Muses and the Press without any Reward and the Life I lead here is not worth living." He complained of neglect still more bitterly after the place went to Eusden.

Though ungenerously treated, Oldmixon had little ground for appeal; under the practices then in force no writer whose term of usefulness was so clearly at an end had reason to expect attention. The ministry cared for such as promised to be effective, but for very few others. Even on the score of past merit Oldmixon has been somewhat overrated by James Ralph, almost contemporary with him. Ralph wrote: "His merits as a Party-Writer, his connections with the fam'd Professor of Politics and Philanthropy of Pall-Mall and his submitting to labour at the Press like a Horse in a Mill, till he became as blind and as wretched, ought to have been, what they were not, so many Preservatives from the accumulation of Miseries that befell him in his old Age, when he stood most in need of consolation."⁵¹ This plea for a wornout party writer rested upon the old supposition that the aristocracy, or someone, was morally obliged to care for men of letters. This was the very practice that political leaders had begun to ignore; when they demanded of every writer some immediate productivity, the foundation for private patronage was gone. Both Oldmixon and Dunton had outlived their usefulness. Seeing this, the Whig leaders disposed of them as speedily as possible and reserved their substantial favors for those able to give service in return.

⁵¹ *The Case of Authors by Profession, Trade, etc.* (1762 ed.), p. 3 n.

CHAPTER VII

DEFOE AND WALPOLE IN THE SERVICE OF GEORGE I

PROSECUTIONS BEFORE 1721—DEFOE'S STRATAGEMS ON THE SIDE OF THE MINISTRY—HIS SUPERVISION OF THE PRESS—ADMINISTRATION JOURNALS IN CIRCULATION BETWEEN 1715 AND 1721—THE *London Journal*—WALPOLE'S SUBSIDY PLAN—THE *Briton*—THE NEGUS INVESTIGATION OF 1723.

During the reign of George I, while Charles Townshend and James Stanhope were in control matters continued in the usual course; moderate patronage was extended to administration writers and irregular modes of prosecution were used to restrain the opposition. Such was the state of affairs from 1715 to 1721. Defoe was as before able to get into the administration camp, where he directed ingenious schemes for hampering Tory writers; Walpole, always aggressive, was then pushing many individual prosecutions. Aside from the work of these two, little was done to make party writing of a different sort from that produced during the reign of Queen Anne.

From 1714 until 1721 sudden arrest, imprisonment, and fine were the usual punishments for indiscreet writers, printers, publishers, and news hawkers. Government spies became more active in collecting evidence for court proceedings, an indication that rewards for information were fairly generous. Yet aside from Defoe no writer was interested in a centralized organization for protecting the administration. He alone seems to have worked out intelligent plans for checking the opposition to Townshend and Stanhope.

A few instances of prosecution before 1721 will show how the government treated the opposition press. In November 1714, the Attorney General was given orders to prosecute several writers for attacking the ministry,¹ a general order that apparently had little effect; yet some attention was thereafter given to individual cases. In January 1715 a proclamation announced £1,000 reward for information against the author of a pamphlet called *English Advice to the Freeholders of England*, and five hundred pounds for the detection of the printer.² This was a return to the methods of Oxford and Bolingbroke. During the same month William Hurt, printer of the *Flying Post*, successfully spied upon Robert

¹ *The Weekly Packet*, November 20-27, 1714.

² *Ibid.*, January 8-15, 1715.

Mawson, caught him at four in the morning while printing off a pamphlet,³ and finally saw him face the grand jury.⁴ At times hawkers and peddlers were caught when leaving seditious papers at private houses, or the manuscripts themselves were intercepted between the home of the writer and the printing house. Such were the methods of repression in force during the first year under the new ruler.⁵

The failure of the ministry to pass general measures restricting the freedom of the press was in part due to the instability of their situation. During 1715 men's minds were disturbed by the Jacobite rebellion and by the excitement caused by the prosecution of fallen Tory leaders. Following the exciting events of 1715 a readjustment made possible more frequent and more severe prosecutions, these chiefly against the libellers of Walpole. In April 1716 many arrests followed the publication of a new weekly entitled *Robin's Last Shift*,⁶ only one of a myriad published during ensuing years against that statesman. In June several hawkers went to Newgate for selling a "scandalous pamphlet, entitled *King George's Farewell to England; or, the Oxford Scholars in Mourning*,"⁷ and in September government spies ferreted out a press in Moorfields busily turning out copies of *The Shift shifted*, a new anti-Walpole paper that ran through at least twenty numbers by September 15, 1716.⁸

During the same summer charges were prosecuted in most unrelenting fashion against a Mr. Harvey. According to a contemporary, Harvey lay in jail while the government kept trying to force Fantio, a Jew, under fear of death to bear evidence against him. This course was

³ *Ibid.*, April 16-23, 1715.

⁴ *Ibid.*, December 10-17, 1715.

⁵ The formal trial of Matthew Prior in 1715 was not a part of the general prosecutions, for he had written nothing important politically since the early *Examiners*. They, however, had added to his unpopularity among the Whigs, which dated back to his desertion to the Tories in 1701. Having enjoyed substantial patronage for Tory writing and for helping to negotiate the preliminaries to the French peace, in 1715 he lost his office in the Paris embassy. After three years in prison he was released without penalty.

Between 1718 and 1721, the year of his death, Prior regained sufficient influence to draw requests from Dennis, Gildon, and other writers who were looking for Oxford's patronage. Bathurst, Gay, Swift, and Oxford saved him from penury by promoting a subscription edition of his works, which is said to have brought in £4,000.

⁶ *The Weekly Packet*, No. 198, April 14-21, 1716. The paper reached its eleventh issue on April 26

⁷ *Ibid.*, No. 208. June 23-30, 1716.

⁸ *Ibid.*, No. 222. September 29-October 6, 1716.

adopted only after the Jew had proved firm "against a bait of £500 a year to him and his heirs for ever."⁹ Such stern measures quickly increased fear of the administration leaders, and particularly of Walpole; men saw that England was fast falling under new press regulation as stern and unyielding as that of L'Estrange. Consequently printers lost some of their old courage. The Duke of Mar complained bitterly that he could not find in England or France printers willing to turn out his Jacobite pamphlets,¹⁰ but it was simply because the risk had become too great. The fear shown by several contemporary writers might be adduced as additional evidence to the same conclusion.

Similar methods were in force in 1717. Isaac Dalton in that year endured three months imprisonment and paid ten marks fine for publishing *English Advice to the Freeholders of England*;¹¹ Thomas Weston and Charles Hornby were indicted for their *Hymn to the Pillory*; and John Sunderland, coffee-man, was taken up for writing a "scandalous Libel," entitled "*An Ode*."¹² In June *Mist's Journal* announced the arrest of many pamphlet hawkers for selling *Truth found out, or who has the best Right to the Scaffold, John or Robin*.¹³ The administration was not particularly active during this year, but in 1718 it began vigorously by ordering the Attorney-General to prosecute the news peddlers with the greatest severity.¹⁴ The free distribution of pamphlets throughout the Westminster, St. James, and Whitehall districts had increased rapidly during the last months of 1717,¹⁵ and this order of the following January was the natural consequence. Nothing remarkable developed from this new plan for prosecutions, except that state spies were thereafter more active. One of them obtained an unusually good reward for informing against Mr. Howell, a non-juring parson, who was imprisoned for writing *The Case of Schism in the Church of England truly stated*. Thomas Nast, the spy in the case, got a two hundred pound pension with promise of weekly subsistence while in service.¹⁶ It was the possibility of such returns that led many volunteers to offer their services to the State

⁹ Hugh Thomas to Th. Bayard [L. Inese], June 11-22, 1716. *Stuart MSS*, II, 227.

¹⁰ Letter to Robert Teeshe, April 28, 1716. *Stuart MSS*, II, 128.

¹¹ Nothing is known of the recipient of the five hundred pounds reward offered in January 1715 for information regarding the printer of this pamphlet.

¹² *The Weekly Packet*, No. 252. May 4-11, 1717.

¹³ *Ibid.*, No. 258. June 22, 1717.

¹⁴ *S. P. Dom. George I*, Vol. 11.

¹⁵ *The Weekly Packet*, No. 274. September 28-October 5, 1717.

¹⁶ *Cal. of Treas. Papers*, 1714-19: entry for December 22, 1719.

Office. Among others, the notorious printer, Edmund Curll, thus got into government employment—a circumstance that probably emboldened him in printing his questionable books.

About this time the government began to buy off the dangerous writers. There is evidence that this method was used at least once under George I before Walpole made it a standard course of procedure. In May 1718 the State Office sent the following refusal to a spy offering information—"Give Mr. Tooke his answer in these words: That I had laid his proposal before my Lord, and he does not think that y^c punishing one of those Rascals supposing that could be effectually done is [so much] worth the Governm^{ts} while as y^c Expence of providing for any Person for their Life. . ."¹⁷ Delafaye, the lord in question, and Samuel Buckley, the government news agent, later on answered Tooke again in similar fashion, a sign that the pension system had had a thorough trial and had proved effective. Consequently it seems certain that by 1718 three satisfactory methods of controlling the press were in use; offenders were being arrested and imprisoned, papers and manuscripts were being destroyed in printing shops or in the coffee houses,¹⁸ and first-class writers for the opposition were getting state pensions.

In 1718 Defoe proved his value to the administration and fully repaid the Whigs for protection and patronage. He had turned to the Whig side in 1715 in order to avoid punishment for libelling Lord Angelsey. Though the charge was an old one, dating back to the issue of his mock *Flying Posts* of July and August 1714, it was some time before October 1715 was finally set as the time for his public sentence. Before that date Defoe had made his peace with the administration by agreeing to write thereafter only for the government. Chief Justice Parker persuaded Townshend to accept the offer, and for the last time Defoe changed his party. The terms of his new service are best stated in his own letters, which were published by Mr. Lee in 1869. "In considering

¹⁷ *S. P. Dom. George I*: Vol. 12, fol. 18.

¹⁸ On this method note the following proposal (Stowe MS 246, fols. 82-3), sent to Secretary Craggs by an unknown hand.

March 25, 1718.

"I send you inclos'd a very vile Paper—it is distributed this day at the Cocoa. The pamph[let] I mention'd contains as I am inform'd Mr. Shippens, Mr. Snells, and other speeches, with the Lords protests in relation to the Mutiny Bill. [T]hey will not I find be seen in town till they are sent all over the Country. I am inform'd also that this week they will actually be sent for the great Towns by the Wagoners and Packhorses. If the officers in the Country have orders no doubt but they may Seize most of them. . ."

after this, which Way I might be rendered most useful to the Government," he wrote, "it was proposed by my Lord Townshend that I should still appear as if I were, as before, under the displeasure of the Government and separated from the Whigs; and that I might be more serviceable in a kind of Disguise than if I appeared openly; and upon this foot a weekly paper, which I was at first directed to write, in opposition to a scandalous paper called the *Shift Shifted*, was laid aside, and the first Thing I engaged in, was a monthly Book called *Mercurius Politicus*, of which presently. In the interval of this, Dyer, the *News-Letter*-writer, having been dead, and Dormer, his successor, being unable by his Troubles to carry on that Work; I had an offer of a Share in the Property as well as in the Management of that Work. I immediately acquainted my Lord Townshend of it, who, by Mr. Buckley, let me know that it would be a very acceptable Piece of Service; for that letter was really very prejudicial to the Public, and the most difficult to come at in a judicial Way in Case of Offence given. My Lord was pleased to add, by Mr. Buckley, that he would consider my Service in that Case, as he afterwards did. Upon this I engaged in it; and that so far, that though the Property was not wholly my own, yet the Conduct and Government of the Style and News was so entirely in me, that I ventured to assure his Lordship the Sting of that mischievous Paper should be entirely taken out, though it was granted that the Style should continue Tory, as it was, that the Party might be amused and not set up another, which would have destroyed the Design; and this part I therefore take entirely on myself still. . . ."¹⁹

This plan was a preliminary to the move that Defoe made in 1718 against *Mist's Journal*, another Tory paper. He had begun writing for this sheet under secret orders from Sunderland in August 1717. At first Defoe deceived Mist as he had the others, but soon his dupe became suspicious. For one thing, Curll had been badgering Mist to speak out against the government, simply that he might get the reward of an informer. Consequently out of necessity, Defoe protected his own game by making a bargain with the Tory editor. As he wrote to Delafaye, Mist had bought immunity from arrest by agreeing to "seem on y^e Same Side as before to rally the *Flying Post* y^e Whig Writers and even y^e word Whig &c and to admit foolish and Trifling things in Favour of the Tories." He continued: "This as I represented it to him he agrees is liberty Enough and resolves his paper shall For y^e Future Amuse the Tories But not affront the Governm^t. I have Freely told him That this

¹⁹ Letter of April 26, 1718. Lee, I, xi.

is the Onely Way to preserv his paper, to keep himself from a Jail and to Secure The advantages which Now rise to him From it."²⁰ After this understanding Defoe continued, except for a short interruption at the end of 1718, to write for *Mist's Journal* until November 1724. If Mr. Lee's gatherings are to be accepted as surely Defoe's, it must be admitted that he contributed to the late issues, as well as to Applebee's *Original Weekly Journal* between June 1720 and March 1726. Stylistic tests alone indicate this to have been the case.

During 1718 other journalists, discovering that *Mist* had been suborned by Defoe for the government, satirized the agent of the State Office. One paper for December 6th published a long satire, which reads in part:

"As Rats do run from falling Houses,
So Dan another Cause espouses:
Leaves poor Nat sinking in the Mire,
Writes Whitehall Evening Post for Hire;
Deserts his Tory-Rory Prigs,
And finds new Fools among the Whigs.
We wish the Gentleman much Joy;
And since they're fond of a Decoy,
May Daniel dive into their Pockets
And laugh to think he found such Blockheads."

A much longer poem in the issue of the same paper for November 8 exposed Defoe's whole career of party chicanery. Lines relating to his actions during the first years of George I's reign read thus:

"A fawning, canting, double hearted Knave
Is the Inscription fittest for his Grave.
Look there's the Bribes with which this Wretch was paid
When he his Country and its Rights betray'd.
To *France* and *Rome* by Mercenary Pen,
Commending Rogues and slandering honest Men,
See the vile Measures w[hic]h the Rascal took,
With tricking [Oxford] and Lewd B[olingbro]k[e].
Some time he did for *Hanover* appear,
Then tack'd about wrote for the *Chevalier*.
A Rope wou'd then have stopp'd his Impious Breath,
But Nancy's²² pardon sav'd the K[nave] from Death. . . .

²⁰ *S. P. Dom. George I*, 1718: Vol. 12, fol. 34. The matter is explained at greater length in letters printed in Mr. Lee's work.

²¹ *The Weekly Journal; or, British Gazetteer*.

²² Robert Walpole

Lo that false Vizard which this K[navel] put on;
 Wrote one day *Pro* and th'other day writ [*C*]on.
 There's no such *Proteus* to be found in Story,
 One hour a *Whig* and the next hour a *Tory*.
 Sometimes Dissenter and sometimes High Church,
 Strait turns his Coat leaves both sides in the Lurch.
 He wrote for all cause that did yield him most,
Mist's Weekly Journal, *White-Hall Evening Post*,
 Two *Mercury's* each Month one for the Whiggs,
 The t'other fraim'd to please the Tory Priggs.
 See how his Libels feed Infernal Flames,
 See there his Billet-Doux to Wanton Dames,
 His *Family Instructor* next Indites,
 Him or the Chief of British Hypocrites.
 Of all such K[naves] in II[ell] he leads the Van,
 A monstrous Wretch no *Truc Born Englishman*."

These satires prove that journalists of the opposition saw through Defoe's deceptions. If some few of the Tories still thought, in 1718, that he was on their side, certainly most of them appreciated the situation. Instead of duping the opposition into supporting a paper no longer Tory in its opinions, he simply made *Mist's* subscribers doubt whether the journal was still loyal. It seems probable, therefore, that news of the deceit that was revealed through Mr. Lee's discoveries in 1864, would not have surprised the Londoner of 1718. The Delafaye correspondence reveals only what contemporaries knew—that *Mist* and Defoe jointly were trying under a Tory guise to assist the ministry.

After this partially successful stratagem against the principal Tory journal, the ministry in 1719 renewed their direct prosecutions. They were unusually successful. In March Edward Cave was up in court for sending a parliamentary report by news-letter to Robert Raikes of Gloucester, and in April William Wye, John Stanley, John Willies, and Elias Delpuech suffered for the same offence.²³ In June a Roman Catholic trick was discovered through Thomas Gawen, a pamphlet seller, who swore that he had been given one hundred copies of *Vox Populi Vox Dei*, an anti-ministerial pamphlet. These he was to distribute free of charge.²⁴ Another trial, in November, proved fatal to a printer, John Matthews, who confessed that he "had been inveigled and seduced by the Nonjurors; but own'd the Justice of his Sentence, and the Right of King George." His sentence was to be hanged at Tyburn for high

²³ Boyer, *Political State*, etc., XXXV, 293, 364.

²⁴ *S. P. Dom. Reg.*, Vol. 63, fol. 88.

treason—so far had the haphazard process of irregular prosecution progressed at the close of 1719.²⁵

That such means were ineffective, is proved by the number of contemporary references to the seditious literature in circulation. One mercenary patriot offered to kill the Pretender as a way to national unity, provided that he himself were well paid. His plea was that he lived in the intolerable situation of "hearing and seeing every Day, and every Hour of the Day the Slight that is made of the King by the People in General: and y^e Reflections and Pasquinadoes dispersed in printed Pamphlets about y^e Streets . . . all in favour of y^e Pretender."²⁶ The repressive measures of Stanhope and Townshend did not end in such utter weakness as this writer asserted; in fact, at times the ministry effectively checked opposition plans.²⁷ But their ingenuity and force were inferior to that of their successor, Robert Walpole, who was soon to demonstrate, unhampered, his political resourcefulness.

It may seem that between 1715 and 1721 very little was done for the administration except in defensive ways; that Addison and Steele, with the *Freeholder* and *Englishman*, Second Series, were the only ones besides Defoe to write much on that side. But other government papers were appearing during these years. The administration immediately founded its own *Examiner*, with the idea that this sheet should imitate its Tory prototype in defending "the constitution in church and state." William Oldisworth acted as editor for the paper, which totalled fifty-six issues between November 3, 1714 and May 14, 1715. Ambrose Philips' *Freethinker*, another important Whig paper, appeared on Mondays and Fridays between March 24, 1718 and July 28, 1721. It was not limited to party writings, but it came to an end at the breakup of Stanhope's ministry—some sign of its source of funds. Steele seems to have helped Philips,²⁸ undoubtedly one reason why the *Freethinker* was the best English periodical to appear between the *Spectator* and Johnson's *Rambler*.

²⁵ Boyer, *Political State, etc.*, XVIII, 459.

²⁶ J. Paul Muller to Count Bothmar, translated in DeLafaye's letter of October 2, 1719. *S. P. Dom. Reg.*, 63.

²⁷ For example, the ministry in 1719 paid Jacob Tonson £40,000 for dropping a projected edition of *Thuanus*. *Bath MSS*, III, 409.

²⁸ Aitken, *Life, etc.*, II, 202n.

Journals of less importance ran for shorter periods. The *Reprisal*²⁹ and the *Plain Dealer*³⁰ hit back at such Jacobite and High Church journals as Thomas Lewis's *Scourge*—a single-page foe of the government that appeared first on February 4, 1717, and seems to have reached its final weekly issue on November 25. Steele's single issue of the *Spinster*, *A Defence of the Woolen Manufactures*, for December 19, 1719, was also an occasional paper, as were the *Moderator*³¹ and the *Director*.³² The last two were issued in defence of the South Sea project, and met the attacks of the *Projector*; this anti-ministry paper appeared on Monday and Friday from February 6 until March 31, 1720, but its influence was restricted by the activity of government spies who collected the issues as soon as they appeared on the coffee-house tables. Philip Horneck, whose *High German Doctor*³³ won him a five hundred pound place in government service, was opposed by the *Entertainer*, which reached forty-three numbers between November 6, 1717, and August 27, 1718. In addition to these the administration had Read's *Weekly Journal, or British Gazetteer*. Defoe's part in the conduct of Tory journals made the task much lighter for such Whig editors, inasmuch as both Mist's weekly and Applebee's *Original Weekly Journal* were under his surveillance. As contributor and censor he made these Tory sheets such only in name.³⁴

²⁹ Four issues appeared between November 22 and December 11, 1717.

³⁰ It was published on Wednesdays between May 22 and July 17, 1717. A journal of the same name, edited by Aaron Hill, ran to one hundred and seventeen issues between March 23, 1724 and May 7, 1725. In this case, as in all others where no specific mention has been made of a final issue, the data may be incomplete.

³¹ Fifteen issues appeared between April 21 and May 24, 1721.

³² Thirty issues appeared between October 5, 1720 and January 16, 1721.

³³ Fifty numbers were published between April 30 and October 22, 1714. But Horneck was still writing in 1717, for the *Entertainer* in its earlier issues abuses him freely. The latter was one of Mist's publications, so that possibly its change of tone, in the later numbers, was due to Defoe's work.

³⁴ Lee (I, 273) states that *Mist's* began on December 15, 1716. When its editor fled to France in 1728, the name was changed to *Fog's Weekly Journal*. It was under the new name that it printed Wharton's contributions, which were sent from the continent. Between September 28, 1728 and 1732 *Fog's* ran to a total of at least two hundred fifty-six issues, all full of violent attacks upon the government. Applebee's journal was also alive in 1732 and was frequently mentioned still later by contemporary writers. It was begun in 1718 as a critical paper, but soon changed to politics.

Read's paper was actively defending the government in 1717: so much is clear from copies preserved in the British Museum. Selected articles were printed in book form in 1723, and in 1733 it was still appearing each week as usual.

In addition to his work on Mist's and Applebee's papers, Defoe accomplished some constructive work for the ministry in other ways. It is true that he had no dealings with Addison and Steele, who were also writing for the Whigs; it is not probable that he was on the staff of the *Daily Courant*, which in 1716 was said to "speak the sentiments of much greater men"³⁵ on that side. Possibly, however, he was the one to suggest that the *Courant* be reëstablished in apparent opposition to the government—as it was on October 24, 1719, under the care of Meers in the Old Bailey.³⁶ The plan has the marks of a Defoe trick. But apart from these operations Defoe engaged in some work that definitely bears his name. A new Whig sheet, the *Whitehall Evening Post*, was created for his particular use, and thrice a week from September 18, 1718, until about June 1720 it published his comments upon affairs. Mr. Lee believes that the *Daily Post* was also established especially for Defoe, and that from the first issue of October 4, 1719, until April 25, 1725, it regularly contained his political articles.³⁷ Whether or not Defoe constantly produced party literature for all these journals, enough matter can be attributed to him without appealing to internal evidence to rank him as the most prolific writer on the side of the ministry.

In August 1719 appeared a new paper, the *London Journal*,³⁸ whose editors later became very influential. Articles against the South Sea scheme brought them to Walpole's attention, and during 1720 the violence of their attacks made the *London Journal* one of the best-known papers in circulation. Cato's letters, which evoked bitter replies from the *Weekly Journal*; or *Saturday's Post*, appeared in the numbers issued between November 1720 and December 1723. Previous to this work John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon, the editors, had opposed the High Church party with their *Independent Whig*, which ran through at least fifty-three numbers between January 20, 1720 and January 4, 1721. Both periodicals were frequently reprinted. Besides the articles of the two editors the *Journal* contained contributions from Archibald Hutcheson and Lord Molesworth. Gordon and Trenchard are noteworthy for their remarkable effrontery in the face of threatening prosecutions. Apparently the government officials realized that suits for seditious libel would not serve in this case—even though, as one contemporary wrote, their articles were "very well composed, definite in their exposure of

³⁵ [J. Menzies] to Thomas Bayard [L. Inese], August 2, 1716. *Stuart MSS*, II, 344.

³⁶ Fox Bourne, II, 107.

³⁷ I, 308.

³⁸ The first issue was called the *Thursday Journal*.

state abuse, and might well have disturbed the ministry."³⁹ Instead of prosecuting, Walpole proposed that the government should buy in the paper, and this was done. As late as February 1733 the *London Journal* was still referred to as a ministerial organ.⁴⁰

This purchase marks a turning point in the history of party writing. Defoe had independently bought off a few opposing writers, and such an expedient had been used occasionally before his work under Townshend. But after 1721 Walpole made this a regular practice. By means of purchase or subsidy he gained control of all but a few of the valuable mediums of publicity. Anti-ministerial writers were placed on the pension lists, with the result that political writing rapidly fell off in amount and in quality. Even administration writers lost individuality as the subsidy system continued to strengthen a few journals at the expense of others no longer needed.

The effect of Walpole's measures appeared before the end of George I's reign. On May 18, 1723, the editor of the hostile *Freholder's Journal* concluded his last issue with the following comment: "The crowd of papers which encumber the Town, and make the tables of the coffee-house look like the counter of a pamphlet-shop, persuaded him that it was high time his paper should die. . . . "It has been dead," he wrote, "some time in its political capacity, which was the soul and spirit of it, and when the Constitution either of a Government or a Journal is broken, when the liberty of a subject or writer is restrained, the consequence must be to languish out the remains of Life in a slow decay."⁴¹ With the town still full of party papers, some were then falling before the new modes of attack. Meanwhile the *St. James Journal*, founded as a Thursday paper on May 3, 1722, was vigorously expressing the contempt of the ministry writers for the opposition. As noted in its final issue,⁴² it had been established when "a parcel of madmen" had "by print got hold of public sentiment," solely in order to plead for the government. The early numbers warmly attacked the *London Journal*, the *Scourge*, and the *Freholder's Journal*, and during the year of issue it was Walpole's best medium.

³⁹ Manuscript note in the British Museum copy of *Cato's Letters*.

⁴⁰ Budgell's *Bee*, p. 46. The editor then had a custom house post. A writer in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1734 (IV, 91) asserted that the ministry bought the paper after Trenchard and Gordon had given it up, about 1726. Thomas Osborne was then made editor.

⁴¹ No. 76, May 18, 1723. It had appeared first on January 31, 1722. Burn, p. 47.

⁴² May 18, 1723.

In 1723, however, it was necessary to make special provision for discrediting the Duke of Wharton's *True Briton*, which on June 3 began to attack the ministry. Many contemporary news-letters contain comments upon this bold supporter of the Pretender and of Atterbury, all of them indicating that Walpole was perplexed at the futility of his subsidy method against the determination of a wealthy nobleman. In August one writer noted that "notwithstanding y^c Author of y^c True Britton is now said to have so many admirers, there are sev^l Pens at work ag^t him, particularly y^c Flying Post, Pasquin, and y^t called y^c Britton;"⁴³ another wrote that the editor, "notwithstanding his Printer is taken up almost as often as y^c Same is pub^d, Still goes on with his reflections on y^c late proceedings of y^c Parliament and of Ministry and also Places Pensions &c."⁴⁴ Inasmuch as thousands of the *True Briton* were being scattered throughout the country, the paper was having great effect upon public opinion. To offset this Walpole still had at hand the older Whig journals and *Pasquin*, founded on November 28, 1722;⁴⁵ but they were not sufficient. Consequently on August 14, 1723, he brought out the *Briton* to oppose Wharton's paper. Of the new sheet one writer said, "Y^c Author promises to keep Pace with y^c Writer of y^c True Briton from Week to Week and Root up his Hemlock and Henbane as fast as they sprout."⁴⁶ The plan was successful, for on February 15, 1724, the *True Briton* announced that its last issue would appear on the following Monday.⁴⁷ Triumphant over their fallen adversary, Walpole's aids immediately began an *Honest True Briton*, which ran from February 21 until June 8.⁴⁸ These journals, as the *True Briton* asserted,⁴⁹ were edited by "Hackney-Scriblers" who in Queen Anne's time had been employed to "accuse the Men that then were at the Helm, of breach of Trust, for having put an End to a long and Expensive War by the Treaty of Utrecht"; in 1723 they were employed to write "in Favour of Alliances

⁴³ News-letter of August 29, 1723: *Add. MS 27*, 980, fol. 136.

⁴⁴ News-letter of August 20, 1723: *ibid.*, fol. 127b.

⁴⁵ It appeared sixteen times after this date as a weekly and then at irregular intervals on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday to No. 120 on March 27, 1724. Burn, p. 48.

⁴⁶ News-letter of August 15, 1723: *Add. MS 27*, 980, fol. 123b.

⁴⁷ News-letter of February 15, 1724: *ibid.*, fol. 179b.

⁴⁸ It was not, as Burn states (p. 50), issued against the *True Briton*, which was then defunct. Walpole's *Briton* ran at least until February 1726; issues of that date are preserved in the British Museum. Burn also errs in dating the first issue August 7; actual publication was a week later.

⁴⁹ No. 13, July 15, 1723.

entered into on the same Foundation." This charge of changed opinions because of subsidy was unanswerable. The writers for Walpole frankly admitted that they served the court,⁵⁰ and observed that following the establishment of the subsidy plan there had been "an almost universal Revolt" of the opposition journalists.⁵¹ The means employed by the ministry were too well known to endure denial, and probably the writers for the state felt no need of concealing their source of income.

Walpole also pursued the old methods of checking the opposition through arrest and prosecution. The printer Redmayne, who had been prosecuted in 1719,⁵² was taken up in 1722 on a new charge.⁵³ Then in 1723 he paid a fine of three hundred pounds on another score before beginning a year sentence.⁵⁴ With him in this last affair was another printer named Phillips, who received the same punishment, and Redmayne's son, who was fined two hundred pounds. When released from prison, the father was almost immediately involved in a fresh trial, as before, through the work of Samuel Buckley and Delafaye.⁵⁵ The State Papers contain many letters regarding similar prosecutions, the correspondence of Buckley and Delafaye relative to proposed raids upon seditious printing houses, and notes from spies offering to sell information. Such documents, though less numerous, are to be found in the papers left by the preceding ministries. During the last years of George I's reign this work was carried on vigorously, but in no unusual or original manner.

In 1723, however, the State Office made an advance in proposing to take a complete census of all newspapers issued from London and the other corporate towns. The plan was to classify all journals according to their political opinions, so that pressure might be put upon such as were disaffected towards the King. Townshend is to be credited with carrying through the details of the plan, but Walpole was also concerned in it. Samuel Negus, a printer, agreed to gather the data, and in return was to have the first vacancy occurring among the King's messengers. He reported that in London and Westminster thirty-four presses were issuing matter favorable to King George. Three he classed as "non-Jurors, and four as "Roman-Catholics." He next classified thirty-four

⁵⁰ *Pasquin* No. 34, May 13, 1723.

⁵¹ *St. James Journal*, January 5, 1723.

⁵² *Col. of Treas. Papers*, 1714-19: entry for December 22, 1719.

⁵³ *St. James Journal*, December 8, 1722.

⁵⁴ News-letter of July 4, 1723: *Add. MS* 27, 980, fol. 87b.

⁵⁵ *S. P. Dom. George I*, 1724: Vol. 52, fol. 40.

as "High-Fliers," that is, as strongly opposed to the government, so that his investigation proved the opposition press in 1723 to be fully as strong as that of the administration. As to the twenty-eight provincial presses mentioned in his report, Negus asserted that they were largely dependent for matter upon the "rebellious pamphlets" published secretly in London. He urged a more severe supervision of London printing houses in order to stop at its source seditious literature that was later to be reprinted all over England.⁵⁶

The Negus investigation had no immediate results, even for Negus himself; a year later he was still pleading for some post that he might survive a general boycott placed upon his shop by the London printers. The government did not immediately move against the opposition journals, and not until the next reign was anything unusual accomplished in the way of checking them. The investigation has no special value in an account of party writing except as proof that the older methods of repression had been useless. Freedom of speech was clearly still possible in England in 1723; in fact, it was becoming more and more difficult to prosecute a paper out of existence. The only gain made by Walpole during the last years of George I's reign was in getting the government press into good condition by buying in such effective journalists as Trenchard and Gordon. He had thus put the administration into an efficient state of self defence, so that after 1727 it could more adequately control public opinion. He had also aided the writers towards independence by paying his journalists in money instead of rewarding them with appointments to state offices.

⁵⁶ Nichols, *Anecdotes*, etc., I, 289 ff.

CHAPTER VIII

POLITICAL AND LITERARY IMPORTANCE OF THE *CRAFTSMAN* GROUP

NEW POLITICAL METHODS—THE SECRET INVESTIGATION OF 1742—WALPOLE'S PAPERS AND EDITORS—SWIFT AND GAY TURNED TO THE OPPOSITION—SAVAGE AND YOUNG—FOUNDATION OF BOLINGBROKE'S *Craftsman*—POPE'S INTEREST—PRINCE FREDERICK'S GROUP OF DISAFFECTED POLITICIANS—MINOR OPPOSITION JOURNALS—NICHOLAS AMHURST—GAINS IN FREEDOM FOR THE PRESS—THOMSON AND OTHER DEPENDENT WRITERS—GENERAL CONSEQUENCES OF LITERARY PATRONAGE.

The change of rulers did not bring Robert Walpole's ministry to an end. He continued in control of state affairs from 1727 until 1742, and during that term of years completed many plans that he had merely begun during the reign of George I. Walpole's treatment of the journalists is typical of his methods. He continued to subsidize a few papers heavily, and also to buy off or to prosecute troublesome writers for the opposition; such had been his practice before. Very soon the profession of journalism under political control became unprofitable for the great majority, because only a few writers were needed under his centralized system of news dispersal. That the newspaper became merely part of a large organization, was but one result of Walpole's methods; everything that could be made effective for party ends was incorporated into his broad plan.

Other means to the same end of winning popular favor for the administration lessened still further the value of London party journals. Walpole encouraged the people in country districts to attend political meetings, which were then being called for the first time, under state supervision. He also electioneered for administration candidates through the provincial press. Both of these modern means to popular favor were new in 1722, when a London journal commented angrily upon such a "scandalous method" as this open solicitation of votes by means of the news column.¹ Genuinely unprincipled means were employed when state political materials were dispersed through the London post-office free of charge, while opposition papers, though properly posted, were often held from circulation. Such was the fate of issues of the *Crafts-*

¹ Applebee's *Original Weekly Journal*, January 6, 1722: quoted in Wright, p. 60.

man, whose editors in November 1728 charged the ministry with sending administration journals to the addresses taken from copies mailed to its own subscribers.² All these circumstances injured the craft as a whole and greatly lessened the importance of the individual writer. The whole process of editing and distributing journals fell into a routine, and the generous subsidies were disbursed to only a few papers.

Facts regarding the extent of Walpole's subsidies to government papers appear in the findings of the Secret Committee of 1742. This committee, appointed at the instance of the elder Pitt, sought to fix upon Walpole the blame for a wasteful use of public money. Incorporated in their report is all the information that could be gleaned regarding the newspapers dependent upon Treasury funds.

The Secret Committee was not permitted to examine the private accounts of the minister or the King's revenue record. Since King George II strongly upheld Walpole in his refusal to make any explanation of the uses to which he had put Secret Service funds, the investigators were compelled to make the most of cross-questioning subordinates in the Treasury. Because Secret Service expenditure was for all manner of ends that were entered as "without account," Walpole had made large use of this means for promoting his party propaganda; for these records were not open to examination. When sums were to be paid out from this fund, the final recipient was protected by a device of making out the Treasury order to men in the government service. These subordinates thereupon signed the orders, though they never received the money. That was paid to the true beneficiary in currency, whereupon the signed receipt bearing the name of a Treasury clerk was duly filed.³ Many of the subordinates so implicated refused to testify before the Committee, so that very little was learned through cross-examination.

The facts gathered regarding news subsidies were as definite as any others obtained by the Committee. Walpole admitted that he had spent £5,000 a year on the newspaper press, and consequently, in their general summary the Committee charged £50,007 18s. to this account. A check taken from the *Calendars of Treasury Books and Papers* tallies very well with their report in the *Commons Journals*.

The Treasury accounts show that very large sums were spent on the press between December 4, 1729, and February 6, 1736. William Arnall

² No. 126.

³ See the *Commons Journals*, (XXIV, 295) for the depositions of John Shepherd, a Deputy Messenger, and of Christopher Tilson, a Treasury clerk. The other facts in this matter are from Chaytor's translation of Ruville's *William Pitt*, etc., I, 199, and from the *Cal. of Treas. Papers*, 1739-41, xii.

received £9,115 on the account of the *Free Briton*. Payments to John Walthoe between March 21, 1732 and November 18, 1741 amounted to £22,649 10s. 8d., which were distributed as follows: for *Daily Courants* and *Double Courants*, March 21, 1732 to October 24, 1738, £8,474 2s. 4d.; for the *Daily Gazetteer*, July 1, 1735, to December 30, 1736, £4,422 1s. 8d.; for "printing and other disbursements," January 9, 1739 to November 18, 1741, £9,753 6s. 8d. Subsidies for the *Corn-Cutter's Journal* between October 1, 1733 and March 25, 1735, amounted to £1,222. 10s. W. Wilkins of the *London Journal* received £3,218 6s. 8d. between the dates of June 5, 1731 and June 28, 1735.⁴ Much of this expenditure was for printing cost, and probably very little went to writers aside from the editors. Payments usually were made every quarter.

In two instances the *Calendars* have separate entries of payments to W. Wilkins for writing. From June 5 to November 4, 1731, he earned a hundred pounds, so that his annual salary was then about two hundred and forty pounds. A later entry shows that in 1734 he received approximately eight hundred sixty pounds yearly.⁵ It is known from other sources that John Henley, editor of the *Hyp-Doctor*, was paid a hundred pounds each year.⁶ William Arnall was granted a four hundred pound pension in addition to his regular salary—which, added to the total recorded in the *Journals*, shows that he boasted honestly when asserting that the government paid him in all £10,997 6s. 8d.

Some government papers were not mentioned in the Treasury lists, and yet must have had subsidies. Such are the *Hyp-Doctor*, *Read's Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer*, the *Flying Post*, the *Weekly Register*, the *British Journal*, the *Briton*, and the *Honest True Briton*. From a satire in the *Craftsman* for August 2, 1735, it is known that the *Daily Gazetteer* was also founded as an administration paper, but it was soon merged with the *Daily Courant*. These papers are to be counted—often on their own evidence—as under subsidy.

The life records of the journalists concerned add little to the Committee report. William Arnall was the best journalist on the government side, but of his case we have little information. He began party writing before he was twenty years old—that is, about 1732—and was successor to Matthew Concanen as editor of the *British Journal*. Concanen him-

⁴ *Cal. of Treas. Papers, 1729-1745, passim.*

⁵ *Cal of Treas. Papers, 1731-34, p. 208; 1735-38, p. 43.*

⁶ This paper is not mentioned in the *Journals*. It ran from December 15, 1730, to January 20, 1741. Burn, p. 61.

self, according to Cibber, decided by tossing a coin to seek work from the administration, while his friend Sterling, by the same act, went to the opposition.⁷ He was working on the *London Journal* soon after the government bought that troublesome sheet, and wrote for it a series of articles later reprinted (1730) under the title of the *Speculatist*.⁸ His quarrel with Pope led to the preservation of his name in a *Dunciad* note, where he is called "a hired scribbler for the *Daily Courant*." The payment for his service was an appointment as attorney-general of Jamaica on January 30, 1732.⁹

Another writer, Roger Manley, wrote for the *British Journal, or the Censor*. Little more is known regarding him, and even less concerning the other administration journalists. In February 1733 a contemporary published in the *Gentleman's Magazine* his speculations regarding the various writers on Walpole's side, but his vague allusions are of no value to-day. With such meager information one cannot say whether or not genuine literary merit was debased by party service. It is more probable that the journalists were nothing more than hack-writers. William Coxe, the authoritative biographer of Robert Walpole, believed that the government journalists, though paid generously, were of only ordinary ability. It seems that Walpole ignored the protests of his friends, who tried to advise him regarding his choice of writers.¹⁰ Consequently, he refused to employ men of far greater merit than any in his service.

In 1726 Swift was among these unattached party writers in search of party favor. Like the others, he debated the question of Walpole's future greatness. As it seemed to him doubtful whether the minister could retain his place after the death of George I, he imitated many other place-hunters in looking elsewhere. Circumstances made clear what should be his course. Bolingbroke was then back in England plotting with Pulteney to break Walpole's power, and the Prince of Wales was also showing open hostility to his father's chief advisor. With these forces in the field against Walpole, it was evidently wise to take the side of the court faction in opposition. Swift, therefore, with an eye only to the future, set out to win the good will of the coming king. This he hoped to do through the aid of Mrs. Howard, the Prince's mistress; she instead of the Princess seemed privately influential. Gay was also in the plan, and Pope assisted his friends. With this single purpose Swift

⁷ *Lives*, etc., V, 27.

⁸ Burn, p. 52.

⁹ The warrant is in the *Hardwicke Papers*, Add. MS 36, 130, fol. 131.

¹⁰ Coxe, *Memoirs*, etc., I, 761.

returned to England in 1726, fully resolved upon the means to be used in winning the good will of the Prince. He was well received by both the Princess and Mrs. Howard, and at first seemed well pleased with his prospects.

Not content, however, with this provision for future patronage and employment, Swift determined that he would make what he might out of Walpole, the other possible medium to court favor. Dr. Birch has left a vivid account of the Dean's visit to the minister.¹¹ He wrote: "In the year 1726 Dr. Swift went to England in hopes of getting a Settlement there, and made one at S^r Robert Walpole's Levee at Chelsea, where he sat down by the door, and drew the notice of the Company by that singularity, which always distinguished him. But nobody knew him till Sir Robert entered, who went up to him very obligingly. The other without rising up, or other Address, said, 'For God's sake, S^r Robert, take me out of that cursed Country, and place me somewhere in England.' 'Mr. Dean,' said S^r Robert, 'I should be glad to oblige you, but I fear removing you would spoil your Wit. Look on that tree: pointing to one under the Window. I transplanted it from the [—?] Soil of Houghton to the river side; but it is good for nothing here.' The company laugh'd, and the Dean hurried away without reply." To this Dr. Birch added, "This happen'd four years before the Dean's Rhapsody appear'd, in which S^r Robert has his place of Satire."

In spite of this unfriendly treatment, Swift continued to hope until, at the accession of George II, he found that Walpole was to be retained and that Mrs. Howard's influence was of little value. Then in surprise and disgust he turned against the court. He could expect nothing from a minister who wanted "no better writers than Cibber and the British Journalist" [i. e., William Arnall],¹² but he kept up his intrigues through Mrs. Howard, then Duchess of Suffolk. As late as July 27, 1731, he wrote most friendly letters advancing his own claims.¹³ By then, however, he had begun to send complimentary messages to the opposition leaders through Gay and Pope,¹⁴ and it is probable that he was secretly

¹¹ *Birch MS 4,223*, fol. 320.

¹² Pope to Swift, February, 1727-28. Pope, *Works*, VII, 114.

¹³ Countess of Suffolk, *Letters, etc.*, pp. 14-16.

¹⁴ Of many such letters written between 1729 and 1731, see particularly Swift's letter to Gay (Pope, *Works*, VII, 230), dated June 29, 1731. In this he wrote boldly, "I always told you Mrs. 'Howard' was good for nothing but to be a rank courtier. I care not whether she ever writes to me or no. She has cheated us all, and may go hang herself and so may her [mistress]." Similar remarks are in several letters in Pope's *Works*, VII, 127-230.

writing for the *Craftsman*. One contemporary asserted that Swift was writing against Walpole as early as 1728, and that he had entered into an agreement to that end with the printer Mist.¹⁵

At the accession of George II, John Gay acted still more openly against Walpole in order to show his disgust with the proposal that he become gentleman-usher to the Princess Louisa. The disappointment came after he had waited in expectation for years, with nothing more than a hundred fifty pound post as lottery commissioner, which had been given him for his verses in honor of the first George.¹⁶ With his usual want of logic, Gay could see no relation between the insignificant place offered him and the fact that he had previously dedicated his *Shepherd's Week* to Bolingbroke. He also forgot that he was under suspicion of having written anonymous satires against the government. Through Mrs. Howard's influence he kept his place as lottery commissioner until 1731, but had nothing more. His final break with Walpole occurred at the presentation of *The Beggar's Opera* on January 29, 1728. In this he frankly satirized the minister.¹⁷ Thereafter he became "one of the destructions to the peace of Europe, the terror of Ministers," and "the chief writer on the *Craftsman*."¹⁸ Gay's turning to the opposition was another consequence of Walpole's unreadiness to make terms with competent party writers who, like Swift, were unattached at the accession of George II.

He did not always show disregard for literary merit, for he treated Lord Hervey with the greatest liberality. That nobleman changed his political coat in 1727, after he had been granted a warrant for a thousand pound pension. His writings at once became most effective on the side of the ministry. Sir Charles Hanbury Williams, even greater than Hervey as a satirist, also began in 1739 to write for Walpole, but his best work was to be done after that minister's dismissal. Another writer, Joseph Mitchell, joined himself so completely to the side of the

¹⁵ *An Essay upon the Taste and Writings of the Present Time*, etc., (1728), p. 8. All these facts regarding Swift's latest political interests have been ignored by Dr. Rudolph Meye, in his *Die politische Stellung Jonathan Swifts*, Leipzig, 1903.

¹⁶ *An Epistle to a Lady, Occasioned by the Arrival of Her Royal Highness, the Princess of Wales*.

¹⁷ The story of *The Beggar's Opera* belongs to eighteenth century stage history. Its fame had a great deal to do with the stringent Licensing Act passed in 1737. The same is true of Fielding's plays. For a full account of the stage satires see Watson's Nicholson's *Struggle for a Free Stage in London*, pp. 20-71.

¹⁸ Arbuthnot to Swift, London, March 19, 1729. Swift, *Works*, XVII, 233.

ministry as to be dubbed "Sir Robert Walpole's poet." He had been in favor at court since 1720 and was simply continued under the new ruler. These three, of actively serviceable writers dependent upon the minister's bounty, were the ones most noteworthy for literary merit.

Two poets, Edward Young and Richard Savage, were personally favored by Walpole, but not for their party work. The consideration given Savage was not significant, as it was only a gift of the customary twenty guineas for a dedication. In the same year, 1729, the poet had better results from a dedication to the Queen, through which he got a grant of fifty pounds and the same sum annually after that until 1737, the year of her death. Savage's friends drew a promise from Walpole in 1735 that he would give the writer the next court vacancy with an income not exceeding two hundred pounds, but he failed to keep his agreement. As Savage also sought patronage from the Prince of Wales, the minister probably felt justified in stopping the poet's annual pension instead of increasing his gifts from the state; at any rate, it was he who caused the discontinuance at the Queen's death. Like Swift in 1726, Savage overplayed the game of favor-seeking when he ventured into the camps of both court factions.

Young began more judiciously by appealing to none but sympathizers of the King. His first patron, the Duke of Wharton, had left England in 1725. Having lost the hundred pound annuity given by this patron after 1719, the poet turned to the Whig leaders. In 1725 Dodington took Young under his protection, and was properly rewarded in the dedication to the "Third Satire." In that year Young also dedicated his first two satires judiciously, one to the Duke of Dorset, the other to Sir Spencer Compton, Speaker of the House of Commons. The following year he rounded out his tribute of praise to influential men about court by dedicating to Walpole his "Seventh Satire" and his poem, "The Instalment." For all this he was repaid on May 13, 1726, with a two hundred pound pension. Not satisfied, Young then took orders as a means to church favor, and before July 1 of that year was made chaplain to the Princess of Wales.¹⁹

Under a new sovereign Young renewed his suit in a poem called *Ocean*, which was prompted by the first parliamentary address of George II. The only apparent result was an appointment as King's chaplain, a purely honorary post that gave the poet right with three others to

¹⁹ This is on the authority of Thomas Hearne. According to M. Thomas, the authoritative biographer of Young, the pension became operative from April 6, 1726. The facts herein regarding Young are from his work, pp. 90-213.

attend court during June each year. M. Thomas has discovered the explanation for the indifference of the King,²⁰ in a letter of April 1756, from Benjamin Victor to Richard Griffith. The writer of this letter referred to Bolingbroke's attacks upon Walpole in the *Craftsman*, and mentioned an instance when he personally had warned Young for the sake of his reputation at court to avoid Bolingbroke. It seems that the poet had already endangered his standing by meeting with opposition leaders. Very shortly after this incident Young openly joined Prince Frederick's court, so that apparently Victor's warning had proved useless. Shortly afterwards, in 1730, the poet left London to spend most of his later years in the rectory at Welwyn, Hertfordshire, a place in the gift of All Souls College. Several of his letters during this period reflect his disappointment at the King's neglect. One written on July 9, 1758, to the Duchess of Portland, displays his feeling as follows: ". . . I have lately, by a Dedication taken on me to put his Majesty in mind of my long service, but, I take it for granted, without any manner of effect. . . . For as I was Chaplain to his Majesty even at Leicester House, and as all other chaplains there were soon preferred after his Majesty's accession but myself, and as many, many years ago the Duke of Newcastle promised me, through the Duke of Portland's kindly presenting me to him, preferment after two then to be provided for before me, and as there is no instance to be found of any other so long in service under total neglect, there must be some particular reason for my very particular, as I cannot possibly guess at it. I most ardently long to know. Your Grace's interest with persons in power is at least so great as to be able to gratify my very natural and very strong curiosity a little in this point."²¹ This represents Young's attitude years after the events that determined his standing at court, when he had no expectation of patronage except through a renewal of the King's favor. Had the Prince of Wales lived to succeed his father, George II, Young would have been royally patronized. But the death of Frederick ended his expectations, as it did of all the weaker dependents in the opposition circle. Thereafter Dodington's individual patronage was Young's chief support.

*

Hitherto the *Craftsman* has been mentioned frequently enough to indicate that it was a very influential journal during the reign of George II. This outspoken opponent of Walpole's administration

²⁰ p. 120.

²¹ *Bath MSS*, I, 323-24.

appeared first on December 5, 1726.²² Bolingbroke was its foster-father. Unable to endure the inaction put upon him by his disenfranchisement, he set up the paper as a medium for expressing his own views, and chose Nicholas Amhurst, but recently expelled from Oxford for his biting satires, as the first editor. Under their guidance the *Craftsman* rapidly became spokesman for all having grievances against Walpole, whether they were writers or politicians; of the former sort, Swift and Gay were the most prominent.

Since Bolingbroke was behind the new journal, it did not necessarily need popular support. The paper soon gained a wide circulation, but never depended upon its subscription lists. Pope aided his friend materially, for through him Bolingbroke fell in with Swift, Gay, and the politicians who made the Twickenham villa a meeting place. In this way Pope became an important figure in the opposition group. He seems to have used the *Grub Street Journal* to express in writing his dislike for Walpole, and his enemies accused him of doing much more.²³ Some years after identifying himself thus with the opposition group, Pope openly attacked the ministry in his brilliant satire of 1738, and later boasted to Swift that the Prince of Wales had shown approval by giving him costly presents.²⁴ The prosecution of Whitehead about this time for writing a satire called *Manners* was the indirect check put upon Pope's growing party zeal.

In spite of his silence thereafter on political topics, he was still a willing host for all members of the *Craftsman* party. This group slowly enlarged after its inception in 1726 as one discontented nobleman after another joined Bolingbroke. Soon it was composed of the chief opponents of the ministry. The Pulteneys, Wyndham, and Chesterfield were of the number before 1729, and all either wrote for the weekly issues or assisted with funds. When Walpole's Excise Bill went to defeat in 1733, Chesterfield became much more active, and at the same time George Lyttleton went over to the Prince. But the greatest addition came in 1734, when upon Lady Suffolk's withdrawal from public affairs Prince Frederick became the recognized head of the opposition. Thereafter plans for

²² It was published weekly to No. 511, April 17, 1736, and the collected issues were reprinted the next year.

²³ The *Hyp-Doctor*, always hostile to Pope, charged him (No. 48, November 9, 1731) with writing against Walpole, as follows: "We are told that Mr. P[ope] wrote the Poem call'd *The Dawley Farm* and the *Norfolk Steward*, besides several Letters in *Fog* and *Craftsman*; if so, he is very ungrateful to some of his Subscribers and Benefactors. But is Gratitude to a Protestant a tye on a Papist. . .?"

²⁴ Letter of May 17, 1739. *Works*, VII, 374.

hindering Walpole and the King became much more definite. By 1737 George Bubb Dodington, former lord of the Treasury, was also in Frederick's court, and though by that time the *Craftsman* was no longer in circulation, he shared in the later literary and political interests that made the group famous. Lord Bathurst, Orrery, Cobham, and Queensberry were other prominent noblemen to come thus into intimate relations with Pope, Young, Thomson, Mallet, and Glover.

Of the opposition leaders who were themselves writers for the *Craftsman*, Bolingbroke himself was the most capable. He lent some variety to the contest when he published his four *Occasional Writer* pamphlets during January and February 1727; in these he ironically offered aid to Walpole as a hack-writer looking for employment. Other noteworthy articles for the opposition began to appear in the fall of 1728 in *Fog's Journal*, which was but a continuation of *Mist's Weekly Journal*.²⁵ A little later, after the discontinuance of *Fog's*, Chesterfield and Lord Lyttleton began *Common Sense*, with the declared purpose of taking "from the shoulders of the *Craftsman* some part of the burthen, which every man who is laboring against corruption labors under."²⁶ Before 1737, when this sheet first appeared, journalists in this frank fashion dared to charge the ministry with dishonesty—largely because the *Craftsman* had done so before. A special function of *Common Sense* was to rail at the writers for the ministry, with broad references to the pensions and fees to be gained in such service.²⁷

Only one other strong opposition paper appeared against Walpole, but this one, the *Champion, or Evening Advertiser*, was quite as bold as its predecessors. Under Fielding's direction it was issued three times weekly from November 15, 1739, to July 1741, and was in general circulation until March 10, 1742. James Ralph was one of his collaborators. In all of these papers is discernible a settled policy. With liberal backing they tried solely to discredit Walpole by whatever methods were possible. Heavy subsidies were needed for such plans, but as Nicholas Amhurst was probably the only one engaged in the work simply for personal gain, little of the expenditure was for news writers. Swift, Gay, and Pope were undoubtedly rewarded, but not by direct payment. Consequently the life records of Amhurst must supply whatever information is to be obtained regarding the generosity of the *Craftsman* group.

²⁵ *Fog's Journal* appeared weekly from September 28, 1728, until it reached a total of "at least two-hundred and fifty-six issues." Burn, p. 59.

²⁶ From the "Printer's address to the Reader" in the first issue.

²⁷ Good specimens of such abuse are in the issues for July 8, August 26, and October 7, 1738.

Most of the facts have been set down in James Ralph's interesting book, *The Case of Authors by Profession or Trade*. He wrote of his contemporary: "After having been a Drudge of his Party for the best Part of twenty years together, [Amhurst] was as much forgot in the famous Compromise of 1742, as if he had never been born. . . .! And when he died of what is called a broken heart, which happened within a few months afterwards, became indebted to the Charity of his very Bookseller for a Grave."²⁸ Though this stands without contradiction, it is improbable that Amhurst worked for the opposition during the ten years that the *Craftsman* appeared, without fair payment for service. Ralph was himself a writer for Fielding's *Champion* and perhaps was shabbily treated; for in serving men fully competent to write their own news articles neither journalist was in a position to demand large payments.

Apart from its direct political value the *Craftsman* had a part in promoting the cause of independent journalism. It gave final impetus to the movement towards democratic freedom of speech by demonstrating the possibility of publishing violent anti-ministerial news articles throughout a long period. Walpole's suits against the paper failed of their purpose because the journal was well supplied with funds: whenever the publisher was taken up for printing libels, his backers gave bail and at once the paper resumed its issues. The boldness of the *Craftsman* was also responsible for a growing tolerance on the part of the government in all matters of public interest. Before George II's reign, regulations prohibiting the publication of parliamentary debates had been rigorously enforced; but as the *Craftsman* kept up its attacks, discipline relaxed. The acts passed by the House of Commons in 1722 and in 1728 were not effective, for very soon the debates in abridged form appeared in print.²⁹ In June 1732 the *Gentleman's Magazine* published such accounts,³⁰ and the *London Magazine* soon imitated its rival. In 1736 Dr. Johnson made such reporting a leading feature of Cave's journal. By the year 1742 it was no longer venturesome to print in detail whatever was said on the floor of the House. This change dates back to the aggressive work of Bolingbroke's paper.

²⁸ p. 32.

²⁹ See D. M. Ford's article, "Growth of Freedom of the Press," in the *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, IV (1889), 2.

³⁰ It is a common error to consider 1736 as the earliest date, probably because of Dr. Johnson's part in the matter.

It is easy to prove the part played by the *Craftsman* in enlarging the freedom of the press. Correspondence passing between state officials shows that the government was gradually relinquishing plans for prosecuting all party organs, simply because of the ineffectiveness of suits against that powerful journal. Philip Yorke, Attorney-General, was often in communication with the Duke of Newcastle as to ways of protecting the names of the King and his minister, but they hesitated to go beyond the infliction of light punishments for individual offences. In 1721 Newcastle had overruled the appointment of a "general Libell-Committee" that would have handled prosecutions too roughly,³¹ but not through leniency; it was useless to arrest editors for reprinting from old journals, libels upon William III—libels that applied equally well to other foreign-born kings. In Yorke's words, ". . . When the Defend^t can produce a publick history of y^e times, touching which he writes, from whence he only copied, I should conceive that would exclude all Constructions and be a defence in point of law. As to the *Craftsman*, it is only a generall Dissertation concerning Speeches [and] Communications from the Throne to Parliament [and] tho' there is a saucy air in his manner of treating the Subject, yet I have not found any passage in it, that would support a Prosecution."³² This weakness in the government case against the *Craftsman* compelled the ministry to put into circulation about 1,400 copies of each of its three leading journals at every issue, and to print off some 33,000 pamphlets every year. In addition to the cost of these publications, about £20,000 were needed annually for other forms of publicity. Freedom of speech was at last a reality,³³ so that the government's only course lay in a use of such publicity mediums as were at hand for every party or faction.

The *Craftsman* group accomplished more than this; they gave private patronage to the writers that under former reigns would have had sup-

³¹ Letter of P. Yorke, March 26, 1732; *S. P. Dom.*, *George II*, Vol. 26, fol. 58. It is unaddressed, but the endorsement on the outside is in Newcastle's hand.

³² Letter of June 29, 1730: *ibid.*, Vol. 19, fol. 26.

³³ *Craftsman*, No. 265. July 31, 1731. This statement as to the new liberty of the press is not made in ignorance of the *Craftsman* suits, but they were moderate in comparison with those before it appeared. Then death was a common penalty for seditious printing, and such men as Mist and his helper Wolff fled to the continent for safety. The *Craftsman* writers were fortunate by comparison. Probably the worst case against Francklin, the printer, was tried on December 3, 1731. For printing "A Letter from the Hague" he was fined a hundred pounds, served a prison sentence of a year, and signed £1,000 bonds to keep the peace for seven years. The suit did not change the policy of the paper.

port from the nobles of the court. A genuine love for literature led several of these opposition politicians to patronize privately, and so to demonstrate anew the good and evil consequences of such practices.

The career of the poet Thomson illustrates how readily such men as Lyttleton, Dodington, Bolingbroke, and Prince Frederick assisted needy writers. Thomson had looked for patronage immediately upon his arrival in London in 1726. His dedication of "Winter" to Sir Spencer Compton brought in only the usual twenty pounds; similar procedure with "Summer" (1728) brought at the time of publication no response at all from Dodington. In 1728 he failed twice more, for the Countess of Hertford gave nothing for the dedication of "Spring," and Walpole paid no heed to the appeal made as preface to the "Poem Sacred to the Memory of Isaac Newton." The failure of Thomson's early petitions was mitigated by the success of his published works, particularly by a profit of four hundred fifty-four guineas in 1730 from subscription sales of "Autumn." From other sales he had made £1,000 before 1729. These successes are proofs of the new conditions that were making private or party support needless; yet Thomson soon had that assistance as well. From late in 1733 until February 14, 1737, he held a place as secretary of briefs under Lord Talbot's favor, a post yielding three hundred pounds that he lost at the death of his patron. Thereupon he willingly followed Lyttleton's suggestion and joined Prince Frederick's court. The Prince granted him a pension of a hundred pounds, which he received from 1738 until 1748 as return for verses complimentary to the opposition leaders.³⁴

Aside from his hundred pound pension Thomson received fifty pounds annually from Dodington and also quarters in his house.³⁵ Later, in 1744, when Walpole had lost control of affairs, Lyttleton used his power as a Lord of the Treasury to make the poet surveyor-general of the Leeward Islands at three hundred pounds a year. This addition

³⁴ Two of his writings after 1737 deserve special mention because of their political significance. In 1738 the newly-appointed examiner of plays prohibited Thomson's *Edward and Eleanor*. The play was full of lines complimentary to the Prince, and consequently Walpole's agent used his power to protect the administration against this pleader for popular good will. Again, in 1740, when all the opposition writers were attacking the government for laxity in its troubles with Spain, Thomson in collaboration with Mallet produced "The Masque of Alfred," which was devised as an incitement to war. Both were proofs of Thomson's complete willingness to assist his patrons through the use of political material in his writings.

³⁵ Dodington's *Diary*, p. 72. The praises of Dodington in the *Castle of Indolence* repaid the obligation.

raised his income between 1744 and 1747 to a total of four hundred fifty pounds derived directly from political sources.

The favors extended to Thomson were greater than those granted David Mallet, his collaborator in the "Masque of Alfred." He also had worked constantly for patronage, and probably had his friend's assistance. In 1729 Thomson commiserated him because poets were neglected,³⁶ and perhaps his suggestions brought Mallet into favor with Frederick before 1742. In May of that year he was made under-secretary to the Prince at a salary of two hundred pounds,³⁷ and soon after was granted a pension of a hundred pounds. Though his party service was insignificant, he at least aided Thomson in his political playwriting.³⁸

Other poets favoring the opposition party were opposed particularly by the events of 1737 and 1738. Pope then wrote his famous satire, and Johnson, in his *London*, expressed a disgust that later on he regretted having aired so vehemently. Richard Glover won high favor among the opposition with his *Leonidas* (1737), particularly with Lord Cobham, to whom he dedicated the work. One writer says that as a result he was "patronized, in a manner scarcely intelligible to the present reader, by that nobleman, by his party, and indeed by the whole Opposition. . .";³⁹ yet no specific records show what Glover received, except from the Prince and Dodington. Prince Frederick is said to have given him five hundred pounds with the remark that this was done "in order to enable him to return to business and to free him from the necessity of all Court despondencies."⁴⁰ With the gift of money was a fine set of the works of English poets. Dodington's help came in 1761, some years later, when Glover was brought into parliament. Another writer, Henry Brooke, showed his spirit in 1739 by writing a play called *Gustavus Vasa, the Deliverer of His Country*. This was so bitterly abusive of Walpole that

³⁶ Letter of September 20, 1729 (*Phil. Soc.*, IV, 35): ". . . It is high time that the poets, who have been all along bubbles to the world, given them the greatest pleasure, and received little in exchange, began to think of some craft. . ."

³⁷ *Gent. Mag.* XII (1742), 275.

³⁸ Mallet continued political writing until his death in 1765. The last three years of his life Lord Bute supported him through appointment as inspector of the Exchequer books at an annual salary of three hundred pounds.

³⁹ *Memoirs and Correspondence of George, Lord Lyttleton*, etc. I, 99.

⁴⁰ "Parson Etouffe's "Free and Impartial Reflexions on the Character, Life, and Death of Frederick Prince of Wales." *Philob. Soc.*, VIII.

it was prohibited. As usual in such cases,⁴¹ the opposition showed their resentment by subscribing liberally for the printed version, so that Brooke sold a thousand copies. Through keeping up his party writing he finally became a barrack-master in 1745 with the salary of four hundred pounds yearly. Two others, William Warburton and James Ralph, were taken up by the Prince, but their service was apparently not rewarded largely. Warburton's service was much less than Ralph's, who wrote for the *Champion*. For this he seems to have had a pension of two hundred pounds, but that fell far short of his expectations.

The full meaning of the patronage noted in these scattered details, is to be found in some illuminating contemporary comments. Men of the eighteenth century were as quick as we to realize the evils of such dependence as Steele and Addison endured after turning from letters to politics. These two, like their fellow-craftsmen, were formed by events into politicians instead of into men of letters. In comparing the state of letters in England from 1710 to 1714 with that of 1726, Bolingbroke, knowing both periods intimately, wrote: "The celebrated Tatlers and Spectators had no reward except from booksellers and fame. But when those authors made the discovery I have made, and applied their talents better, in writing the Englishman and the Freeholder, one was soon created a knight, and the other became a secretary of state."⁴² James Ralph also explained Addison's prosperity thus. ". . . Everybody," he wrote, "may not . . . recollect, that his party-services contributed more to it than all his laudable efforts to reform our manners and refine our taste."⁴³ Though neither in his comment detracts from the reputation of Steele and Addison as men of letters, both clearly saw the relative importance of their two sources of income. The *Tatler*, the *Spectator*, and the *Guardian* could never have furnished means during their few years of existence to keep Addison and the wasteful Steele. These periodicals simply formed the basis for their real prosperity and

⁴¹ Ralph writes in his *Critical History . . . of Sir Robert Walpole*, (p. 322): "Every one remembers how right his Lordship Shaftesbury's Opinion was, as to the printing of Plays that were refused by the Licensor, and even as to the writing of Plays on Purpose to have them refused, that they might be printed only. Two or three Pieces we have had, under Names of the first Class in the poetical World, which were sold by Subscription at treble the ordinary Price, in order to compensate, with less Hazard, the Profit it was supposed might have accrued from them, had they been represented with success."

⁴² *The Occasional Writer*, No. 1. *Works*, I, 179-80.

⁴³ *The Case of Authors by Profession*, etc., p. 34

contemporary reputation by giving demonstration to the Whig leaders of their fitness for public service.

As early as 1710 Lord Shaftesbury pointed out the trend of literary and political matters, when he wrote: ". . . But supposing it were possible for the hero or statesman to be absolutely unconcerned for his memory, or what came after him, yet for the present merely, and during his own time, it must be of importance to him to stand fair with the men of letters and ingenuity, and to have the character and repute of being favourable to their art. Be the illustrious person ever so high or awful in his station, he must have descriptions made of him in verse and prose, under feigned or real appellations. If he be omitted in sounding ode or lofty epic, he must be sung at least in doggerel and plain ballad. The people will need have his effigies, though they see his person ever so rarely; and if he refuses to sit to the good painter, there are others who, to oblige the public, will take the design in hand. . . ."

"'Tis no small advantage, even in an absolute government, for a ministry to have wit on their side, and engage the men of merit in this kind to be their well-wishers and friends. And in those states where ambitious leaders often contend for the supreme authority, 'tis a considerable advantage to the ill cause of such pretenders when they can obtain a name and interest with the men of letters."⁴⁴ A still earlier comment upon the value of good party writers is in Harley's letter to Godolphin, which has been quoted elsewhere.⁴⁵ The practice recommended in that letter of 1702 was reaffirmed by Shaftesbury; through their acts, Swift and Defoe demonstrated the principle to be correct. Thereafter both Bolingbroke and Swift restated the facts, which may be summarized in the former's assertion that "it is evident that the minister, in every circumstance of life, stands in as much need of us publick writers, as we of him."⁴⁶ It was the pressure of practice that made these doctrines important for literary history. Men then trusted greatly in the political efficiency of competent writers, and as a result offered proper inducements to draw them away from other literary forms towards the political pamphlet and newspaper.

The life records of Swift, Defoe, Addison, and Steele are the final arguments in the case against party writing. All four gave up their impulses towards self-expression and their hopes of enduring fame at

⁴⁴ *Characteristics*, etc., (1900 ed.), I, 147-8.

⁴⁵ See p. 47.

⁴⁶ *Works* (1809 ed.), I, 181-2. For similar comments by Swift see his "Letter to the Writer of the Occasional Paper," or his letters to Pope *passim*.

the prospect of immediate advantage. The times demanded that the professional writer should try to direct public opinion, and he took up the task. This he did in no spirit of altruism, but simply as a means to self-support; his employer, the party agent, was also interested in commercialized journalism for purely selfish reasons. As a result the typical man of letters during the reigns of Anne and the first two Georges was an intensely practical man, with little regard for the finer things of his craft. The only compensation for the resultant loss in imaginative writing came through the release of English literature from the bonds of private patronage. Temporarily political need imposed upon literary genius greater restraints than those laid down by the formulae of neo-classical rules; an economic, not a critical, standard was supreme during the Augustan Age. Meanwhile the circulation of numerous journals was preparing a public that later bought works of genuine literary worth, and so the writers themselves prepared the way for a new freedom. The pressing demands of unstable party rule brought about complete freedom of speech, and released English men of letters from the embarrassing restraints inherent in a condition of dependence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, W. H. D.

English Party Leaders and English Parties from Walpole to Peel. Including a review of the political history of the last one hundred and fifty years. 2 vols. London, 1878.

Addison, Joseph.

The Works of the Right Honourable. Edited with notes by Hurd, Richard. 6 vols. London, 1891.

The Works of the Right Honourable Joseph Addison, Esq. Collected by Tickell, T. 4 vols. London, 1721.

Aikin, Lucy.

The Life of Joseph Addison. 2 vols. London, 1843.

Aitken, George A.

The Life and Works of John Arbuthnot. Oxford, 1892.

The Life of Richard Steele. 2 vols. London, 1889.

Amory, T.

The Life of John Bunce, Containing Various Observations and Reflections. 3 vols. London, 1825.

Andrews, Alex.

The History of British Journalism from the Foundation of the Newspaper Press in England to the Repeal of the Stamp Act in 1855. With sketches of press celebrities. 2 vols. London, 1859.

Anecdotes of Polite Literature. 5 vols. London, 1764.

Arber, Edward. (ed.)

An English Garner: Ingatherings from Our History and Literature. 8 vols. Westminster, 1877-1896.

The Term Catalogues, 1668-1709, A. D.: with a Number for Easter Term, 1711 A. D. A Contemporary Bibliography of English Literature in the Reigns of Charles II, James II, William and Mary, and Anne. Edited from the very rare Quarterly Lists of New Books and Reprints of Divinity, History, Science, Law, Medicine, Music, Trade, Finance, Poetry, Plays, etc.; with maps, engravings, playing cards, etc.; issued by the Booksellers, etc., of London. 3 vols. London, 1903-06.

Argyll, John G. E., Duke of (ed.).

Intimate Society Letters of the Eighteenth Century. 2 vols. London, 1910.

Ballantyne, A.

Lord Carteret: A Political Biography. 1690-1763. London, 1887.

Bateson, T.

The Relations of Defoe and Harley. English Historical Review, April, 1900.

Beljame, A.

Le public et les Hommes De Lettres en Angleterre au dix-huitieme siecle, 1660-1744. (Dryden—Addison—Pope) Paris, 1883.

Beloe, Wm.

Anecdotes of Literature and Scarce Books. 6 vols. London, 1812-14.

Besant, Sir Walter.

London in the Eighteenth Century. London, 1903.

Betterton, T.

The History of the English Stage, from the Restauration to the Present Time. Including the Lives, Characters and Amours of the Most Eminent Actors and Actresses, etc. London, 1741.

Biographia Britannica, or The Lives of the most eminent Persons who have flourished in Great Britain and Ireland, from the earliest Ages, down to the present Times: Collected from the best Authorities, both Printed and Manuscript, and digested in the manner of Mr. Bayle's Historical and Critical Dictionary. 6 vols. London, 1747-63.

Biographia Dramatica, or a Companion to the Playhouse, etc., by David Erskine, Isaac Reed, and Stephen Jones. 3 vols. London, 1812.

Birrell, A. D. C.

Seven Lectures on the Law and History of Copyright in Books. New York, 1899.

Blauvelt, M. T.

The Development of Cabinet Government in England. New York, 1902.

Bolingbroke, Lord Viscount.

The Right Honourable Henry St. John, Letters and Correspondence, public and private of . . . during the time he was Secretary of State to Queen Anne; with state papers, explanatory notes, and a translation of the foreign letters, etc. Edited by Parke, G. 4 vols. London, 1798.

Authentic Memoirs of the Conduct and Adventures of Henry St. John. [Anon. n. d.]

Bookworm, The: An Illustrated Treasury of Old-Time Literature. 7 vols. London, 1888-1894.

Boyer, Ab'l.

The History of Queen Anne. Wherein All the Civil and Military Transactions of that Memorable Reign are faithfully Compiled from the Best Authorities, and Impartially Related. The Whole intermix'd with some Authentic and Remarkable Papers; together with all the Important Debates in Parliament, etc. London, 1735.

The Political State of Great Britain. [Monthly] 38 vols. 1711-29.

Brewster, D.

Aaron Hill: Poet, Dramatist, Projector. New York, 1913.

Brisco, N. A.

The Economic Policy of Robert Walpole. New York, 1907.

British Essayists, The. Edited by Chalmers, A., with Prefaces, Historical and Biographical. 45 vols. London, 1817.

Brosch, M.

Lord Bolingbroke und der Whigs und Tories seiner Zeit. Frankfort, 1883.

Brown, Frank C.

Elkanah Settle: His Life and Works. Chicago, 1910.

Brown, John.

An Estimate of the Manners and Principles of the Times. London, 1757.

Byrom, John.

The Private Journals and Literary Remains of, edited by Parkinson, R. 4 vols. 1854-57.

Calamy, E.

An Historical Account of My Own Life, with Some Reflections on the Times I Have Lived In. (1671-1731) Edited and illustrated with notes, historical and biographical. 2 vols. London, 1829.

- Cambridge History of English Literature, The.* Edited by Ward, A. W. and Waller, A. R. Vol. IX. Cambridge, 1912.
- Cambridge Modern History, The.* Edited by Ward, A. W. and Prothero, G. W. Vol. VI. New York, 1909.
- Catalogue of a Collection of Early English Newspapers and Essayists formed by the Late John Thomas Hope, Esq. Prepared by J. H. Burn. Oxford, 1865.
- Chadwick, Wm.
The Life and Times of Daniel Defoe: with Remarks digressive and discursive. London, 1859.
- Cibber, Colley.
An Apology for the Life of, written by himself. Edited by Lowe, R. W. 2 vols. London, 1889.
- Cibber, Theophilus [and others].
The Lives of the Poets of Great Britain and Scotland. 5 vols. London, 1753.
- Clerk, Sir John.
Memoirs of the Life of, Extracted by Himself from His Own Journals. (1676-1755) Edited . . . by Gray, J. M. London, 1892.
- Cobbett, Wm.
Parliamentary History of England, from the Norman Conquest in 1066 to 1803. 36 vols. London, 1806.
- Collett, C. D.
History of the Taxes on Knowledge, Their Origin and Repeal. 2 vols. London, 1899.
- Collins, J. C.
Jonathan Swift: a Biographical and Critical Study. London, 1893.
- Courthope, W. J.
Addison. (*English Men of Letters Series*) New York, 1894.
A History of English Poetry. Vol. V. London, 1905.
The Life of Alexander Pope. London, 1889. Vol. V of Elwin and Courthope's edition of *Pope's Works*.
- Courtney, W. P.
A Register of National Bibliography, with a selection of the chief bibliographical books and articles printed in other countries. 3 vols. London, 1905-12.
- Coxe, Wm.
Memoirs of the Life and Administration of Sir Robert Walpole, Earl of Orford. With original correspondence and authentic letters never before published. 3 vols. London, 1798.
- Cowper, Wm.
Correspondence of, Edited by Wright, Th. 4 vols. London, 1904.
- Craftsman, The.* 14 vols. London, 1736.
- Craig, W. H.
Life of Lord Chesterfield; An Account of the Ancestry, Personal Character, and Public Services of the Fourth Earl of Chesterfield. London, 1907.
- Craik, Sir Henry.
The Life of Jonathan Swift. 2nd ed. 2 vols. London, 1894.
- Cumberland, Richard.
Memoirs of, written by himself. Containing an account of his life and writings, interspersed with anecdotes and characters of several of the most distinguished persons of his time, with whom he has had intercourse and connection. 2 vols. London, 1807.

- Defoe, Daniel. *Works of*, Edited by Aitken, G. A. 16 vols. London, 1895.
- Dictionary of National Biography, The*. Edited by Stephen, L. and Lee, S. 63 vols. London, 1885-1900.
- D'Israeli, Isaac.
The Calamities and Quarrels of Authors, with some Inquiries respecting their moral and literary Characters, and Memoirs for our Literary History. 2 vols. New York, 1868.
- Dodington, George Bubb (Lord Melcombe).
The Diary of the Late . . . Baron of Melcombe Regis: from March 8, 1749, to February 6, 1761; with an Appendix, containing some curious and interesting papers, which are either referred to, or alluded to, in the diary. Published from his Lordship's original manuscripts. Collected by Wyndham, Henry P. London, 1823.
- Drake, Nathan.
 Essays Biographical, Critical, and Historical, Illustrative of the *Tatler*, *Spectator*, and *Guardian*. 3 vols. London, 1805.
 Essays, Biographical, Critical, and Historical, Illustrative of the *Rambler*, *Adventurer*, and *Idler*, and of the Various Periodical Papers which, in Imitation of the Writings of Steele and Addison, have been published between the Close of the eighth volume of the *Spectator*, and the commencement of the year 1809. 2 vols. London, 1809.
- Dunton, John.
The Life and Errors of John Dunton, Citizen of London, with the Lives and Characters of more than a thousand contemporary divines, and other persons of literary eminence. To which are added, Dunton's conversation in Ireland; Selections from his other genuine works; and a faithful portrait of the author. 2 vols. London, 1818.
- Duppa, R.
An Inquiry concerning the Author of the Letters of Junius, with reference to memoirs by a Celebrated Literary and Political Character, etc. (1742-1757). London, 1814.
- Eighteenth Century Literature: an Oxford Miscellany*. Oxford, 1909.
- Elton, Oliver.
The Augustan Ages. New York, 1899.
- English Poets, The Works of, from Chaucer to Cowper*; including the series edited with prefaces, biographical and critical, by Dr. Samuel Johnson; and the most approved translations. Edited by Chalmers, A. 21 vols. London, 1810.
- Escott, T. H. S.
Masters of English Journalism: a Study of Personal Forces. London, 1911.
- Ewald, A. C.
Sir Robert Walpole: a Political Biography (1676-1745) London, 1878.
- Fielding, Henry.
Works of, Edited by Stephen, Leslie. 10 vols. London, 1882.
Works of, Edited by Saintsbury, George. 12 vols. London, 1893.
- Ford, D. M.
 The Growth of the Freedom of the Press. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, January, 1889.
- Fox Bourne, H. R.
English Newspapers: Chapters in the History of Journalism. 2 vols. London, 1887.

- Fyvie, John.
Wits, Beaux, and Beauties of the Georgian Era. London, 1909.
- Gay, John.
Fables. With a memoir by Austin Dobson. London, 1884.
The Present State of Wit, in a Letter to a Friend in the Country. (In *Arber's English Garner*, Vol. VI).
- Genest, Edward.
 Some Account of the English Stage, from the Restoration in 1660 to 1830. 10 vols. Bath, 1832.
Gentleman's Magazine, The. 1731-1833; New Series, 1834-1851.
Gentleman's Magazine Library, The. Being a Classified Collection of the Chief Contents of the *Gentleman's Magazine* from 1731 to 1868. Edited by Gomme, G. L. 29 vols. in 30. London, 1885-1905.
- Gildon, Chas.
The Complete Art of Poetry. In six parts. 2 vols. London, 1718.
- Godden, G. M.
Henry Fielding. A Memoir, including newly discovered letters and records with illustrations from contemporary prints. London, 1910.
- Gosse, Edmund.
 The Patron in the Eighteenth Century. *Harper's Monthly*, June, 1903.
A History of Eighteenth Century Literature. London, 1889.
Graduati Cantabrigiensis. 1659-1823. Cambridge, 1823.
- Graham, H. G.
Scottish Men of Letters in the Eighteenth Century. London, 1901.
- Grant, James.
The Newspaper Press: its Origin, Progress and Present Position. 2 vols. London, 1871.
- Hamilton, Walter.
The Poets Laureate of England, being a History of the Office of Poet Laureate, biographical notices of its holders, and a collection of the satires, epigrams, and lampoons directed against them. London, 1879.
- Haney, J. L.
Early Reviews of the English Poets. Philadelphia, 1904.
- Hansche, M. B.
The Formative Period of English Familiar Letter Writers and their Relation to the Essay. Philadelphia, 1902.
- Hardwicke, Philip Yorke, First Earl of.
The Life of Lord Chancellor Hardwicke; with selections from his correspondence, diaries, speeches, and judgments. Edited by Harris, George. 3 vols. London, 1847.
 Second Earl of. *Miscellaneous State Papers from 1501 to 1726.* 2 vols. London, 1778.
- Hearne, Th.
Remarks and Collections of, Edited by Doble, C. E. 7 vols. Oxford, 1885-1900.
- Hervey, John, Lord.
Observations on the Writings of the Craftsman. London, 1730.
Memoirs of the Reign of George the Second, from his Accession to the Death of Queen Caroline. 3 vols. London, 1884.

Hettner, Hermann.

Geschichte der englischen Literatur von der Wiederherstellung der Konigthums bis in die zweite Hälfte des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts. 1660-1770. Braunschweig, 1893-94.

Historical Manuscripts Commission, The, Publications of, 1877-1914 *passim*.

Historical Register, The, foreign and domestic. London, 1714-1732; 1734-35.

House of Commons, The. Journals of, XXIV (June 1741-Sept. 1745). London, 1803.

The History and Proceedings of, from the Restoration of King Charles II to the Present Day. 14 vols. London, 1742-44.

House of Lords, The. The History and Proceedings of, from the Restoration in 1660 to the Present Time. 8 vols. London, 1743-44.

Johnson, Samuel.

Lives of the English Poets, with Critical Observations on their Works. Edited by Hill, George B. 3 vols. Oxford, 1905.

King, Wm.

Political and Literary Anecdotes of his own Times. 2nd ed. London, 1819.

Knight, Charles.

Shadows of the Old Booksellers. London, 1865.

Leadam, I. S.

The Political History of England from the Accession of Anne to the Death of George II. (1702-1760) Edited by Hunt, Wm. and Poole, R. L. London, 1909.

Lecky, Wm. E. H.

History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe. New York, 1866.

A History of England in the Eighteenth Century. 8 vols. New York, 1888-91.

Lee, Wm.

Daniel Defoe: his Life, and Recently Discovered Writings, extending from 1716 to 1729. 3 vols. London, 1869.

Periodical Publications during the Twenty Years 1712 to 1732. *Notes and Queries*, Third Series, IX, 53-54, 72-75, 92-95; X, 134 ff.

The Library. A Quarterly Review of Bibliography and Library Lore. New Series, I. London, 1900.

Lochner, Ludwig.

Pope's literarische Beziehungen zu seiner Zeitgenossen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der englischen Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts. Leipzig, 1910.

Lucas, R.

George II and His Ministers. London, 1910.

Luttrell, Narcissus.

A Brief Historical Account of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714. 6 vols. London, 1857.

Lyttleton, George, Lord.

Memoirs and Correspondence of, from 1734 to 1773. Compiled and edited by Phillimore, Sir Robert. 2 vols. London, 1845.

Macaulay, G. C.

James Thomson (*English Men of Letters Series.*) London, 1908.

Macaulay, Thomas Babington.

Works of, Edited by his sister, Lady Trevelyan. 5 vols. New York, 1889.

Macknight, T.

Life of Bolingbroke. London, 1863.

Marchmont Papers, The. A Selection from the Papers of the Earls of Marchmont Illustrative of Events from 1685 to 1750. In the possession of the Right Honorable Sir George Henry Rose. 3 vols. London, 1831.

Marston, E.

Sketches of Booksellers of the Time of Dr. Samuel Johnson. New York, 1902.

Masson, David.

Essays Biographical and Critical: chiefly on the English Poets. Cambridge, 1856.

Matthews, Brander.

The Economic Interpretation of Literary History. In *Gateways to Literature*, and other essays. New York, 1912.

Memoirs of the Society of Grub Street. January 8, 1730-August 24, 1732. 2 vols. London, 1737.

Meye, Rudolph.

Die politische Stellung Jonathan Swifts. Leipzig, 1903.

Minto, Wm.

Daniel Defoe. New York, 1879.

The Literature of the Georgian Era. New York, 1895.

Montagu, Charles, Earl of Halifax.

Poetical Works, with His Lordship's Life including the History of his Times. London, 1716.

Montagu, Lady Mary Wortley.

The Letters and Works of, Edited by her Great-grandson, Lord Wharnccliffe. 2 vols. London, 1837.

Morel, Leon.

James Thomson: sa vie et ses oeuvres. Paris, 1895.

Morley, John.

Walpole. London, 1889.

Nichols, John.

Biographical and Literary Anecdotes of William Bowyer, Printer, F. S. A. and of many of his learned friends, containing an incidental view of the progress and advancement of literature in this kingdom from the beginning of the present Century to the end of the year 1777. London, 1782.

Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century comprising Biographical Memoirs of William Bowyer, Printer, and many of his learned friends. An incidental view of the progress and advancement of literature in this kingdom during the last century; and biographical anecdotes of a considerable number of eminent writers and ingenious artists; with a very copious index. 9 vols. London, 1812-15.

Illustrations of the *Literary History of the Eighteenth Century*, consisting of Authentic Memoirs and Original Letters of Eminent Persons and intended as a sequel to the *Literary Anecdotes*. 8 vols. (vols. VII and VIII by J. B. Nichols.) London, 1817-58.

Nicholson, Watson.

The Struggle for a Free Stage in London. Boston, 1906.

North, Roger.

The Autobiography of the Honorable Roger North. Edited by Jessop, Augustus. London, 1887.

North, John.

The Lives of the Right Hon. Francis North, Baron Guilford; the Hon. Dudley North; and the Hon. and Rev. Dr. John North; together with the Autobiography of the author. Edited by Jessop, Augustus. 3 vols. London, 1890.

Oldmixon, John.

The Life and Posthumous Works of Arthur Mainwaring. London, 1715.

History of England during the reigns of William and Mary, Anne, and George I. London, 1735.

Memoirs of the Press, historical and political, for thirty years past, from 1710 to 1740. . . . Dedicated to her Grace the Duchess of Marlborough, as it happens to explain some passages in her Grace's late admirable treatise. London, 1742.

Oliphant, Margaret O. W.

Historical Characters of the Reign of Queen Anne. New York, 1894.

Papers: a new and impartial collection of interesting letters from the public. 2 vols. Collected by J. Almon, London, 1767.

Parkes, Samuel.

An Account of the Periodical Literary Journals which were published in Great Britain and Ireland, from the year 1681 to the commencement of the *Monthly Review*, in the year 1749. Quart. *Journal of Sc., Lit., and Arts*, XIII. London, 1822.

Parliamentary Debates in England, A Collection of, from the year MDCLVIII to the present time. Printed in the year MDCCXLI. [London]

Parnell, Arthur.

The Honourable Dean Swift and the Memoirs of Captain Carleton. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, January, 1891.

Paston, George. [Emily Morse Symonds].

Lady Mary Wortley Montagu and Her Times. London, 1907.

Mr. Pope: His Life and Times. 2 vols. London, 1909.

Side-Lights on the Georgian Period. London, 1902.

Paterson, J.

The Liberty of the Press, Speech, and Public Worship. Being Commentaries on the liberty of the subject and the laws of England. London, 1880.

Paul, Herbert.

Queen Anne. Paris, 1906.

Paul, H. G.

John Dennis: His Life and Criticism. New York, 1911.

Pearce, C. E.

Polly Peachum: being the Story of Lavinia Fenton (Duchess of Bolton), and *The Beggar's Opera*. New York, 1913.

Perry, T. S.

English Literature in the Eighteenth Century. London, 1883.

Pope, A.

Works of, Edited by Elwin, Wm. and Courthope, W. J. 10 vols. London, 1871-89.

Letters of, to Atterbury when in the Tower of London. Edited by Nichols, John, for the Camden Society. London, 1859.

Piozzi (Thrale), Mrs.

Autobiography, Letters, and Literary Remains of. Edited with notes and an introductory account of her life and writings, by Hayward, A. 2 vols. London, 1861.

Present State of the Republic of Letters, The. Vol. I, January 1728. [London]

Prince, J. H.

The Life, Adventures, Pedestrian Excursions, and Singular Opinions of J. H. Prince, Bookseller. London, 1807.

Prior, M.

Poems on Several Occasions. Edited by Waller, A. R. Cambridge 1905.

Ralph, James.

The Case of Authors by Profession or Trade, stated: with regard to Booksellers, the Stage, and the Public. London, 1762.

Of the Use and Abuse of Parliaments; in two historical discourses. London, 1744.

Richardson, Samuel.

The Correspondence and Biography of, Author of Pamela, Clarissa, and Sir Charles Grandison, selected from the original manuscripts, bequeathed by him to his family, to which are prefixed a Biographical Account of that author and Observations on his writings. Edited and written by Barbauld, Anna L. 6 vols. London, 1804.

Riker, T. W.

Henry Fox, First Lord Holland. A Study of the Career of an Eighteenth Century Politician. 2 vols. Oxford, 1911.

Roberts, Wm.

The Earlier History of English Bookselling. London, 1891.

Robertson, C. G.

England under the Hanoverians. London, 1911.

Roscoe, E. S.

Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, Prime Minister 1710-1714. A Study of Politics and Letters in the Age of Anne. London, 1902.

Rosebery, Lord.

Chatham: His Early Life and Connections. London, 1910.

Rundle, Thos.

Letters of the Late Thomas Rundle with Memoirs. Edited by Dallaway, Jas. London, 1789.

Ruville, Albert von.

William Pitt, Earl of Chatham. Translated by H. J. Chaytor assisted by Mary Morrison, with an introduction by Professor Hugh E. Egerton. 3 vols. New York, 1907.

Ryan, P. F.

Queen Anne and Her Court. 2 vols. London, 1908.

Saussure, C. de.

Letters of. *A Foreign View of England in the Reigns of George I and George II.* Translated and edited by Van Muyden, Madame. London, 1902.

Savage, Richard.

The Works of, son of the Earl Rivers, with an account of the Life and Writings of the Author by Johnson, Samuel. 2 vols. London, 1775.

- Savile, George, First Marquis of Halifax.
The Complete Works of. Edited with an introduction by Raleigh, Sir Walter. Oxford, 1912.
- Shaftesbury, Anthony, Earl of.
Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times, etc. Edited, with an introduction and notes, by Robertson, John M. 2 vols. New York, 1900.
The Life, Unpublished Letters, and Philosophical Regimen of. Edited by Rand, Benjamin. New York, 1900.
- Sichel, Walter.
Bolingbroke and His Times. 2 vols. New York, 1901-02.
- Spence, Joseph.
Anecdotes, Observations, and Characters of Books and Men. Collected from the Conversation of Mr. Pope and Other Eminent Persons of his Time. London, 1820.
- Stanhope, Philip Henry, Fifth Earl of.
History of England: Comprising the Reign of Queen Anne until the Peace of Utrecht (1701-13). 2 vols. London, 1872.
History of England from the Peace of Utrecht to the Peace of Versailles (1713-1783). 7 vols. London, 1858.
- Stephen, Leslie.
History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century. [2nd ed.] 2 vols. London, 1881.
Alexander Pope. (*English Men of Letters Series*) London, 1880.
- Straus, Ralph.
Robert Dodsley: Poet, Publisher, and Playwright. London, 1910.
- Suffolk, Henrietta Howard, Countess of.
Letters to and from Henrietta, Countess of Suffolk, and her second husband, the Hon. George Berkeley, from 1712 to 1767. Edited by Croker, J. W. 2 vols. London, 1824.
- Swan, N. L.
Reflections of Contemporary Literature in the Gentleman's Magazine, 1731-1741. MS thesis, University of Chicago Library, 1908.
- Swift, Jonathan.
The Correspondence of . . . D.D., with an introduction by the very Rev. J. H. Bernard, D.D., Dean of St. Patrick's. 6 vols., London, 1910-14.
Journal to Stella. Edited by Aitken, George A. London, 1901.
Works of, etc. Edited by Scott, Sir Walter. 19 vols. Second edition. London, 1883.
Unpublished Letters of. Edited by Hill, George B. London, 1899.
The Intelligencer [with Sheridan, Th.] 2nd ed. London, 1730.
- Sydney, W. C.
England and the English in the Eighteenth Century. 2 vols. London, 1892.
- Temperley, H. W. V.
The Inner and Outer Cabinet and the Privy Council. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, October, 1912.

Thackeray, Francis.

A History of the Right Honorable William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, containing his speeches in Parliament; a considerable portion of his correspondence when Secretary of State upon French, Spanish, and American affairs; never before published, with an account of the principal events and persons of his time connected with his life, sentiments, and administration. 2 vols. London, 1827.

Thomas, W.

Le Poete Edward Young (1683-1765): Étude sur sa vie et ses oeuvres. Paris, 1901.

Thomson, C. L.

Samuel Richardson: A Biographical and Critical Study. London, 1900.

Timperley, C. H.

A Dictionary of Printers and Printing, with the Progress of Literature Ancient and Modern. London, 1839.

Encyclopedia of Literature and Typographical Anecdote; being a Chronological Digest of the most interesting facts illustrative of the History of Literature and Printing from the earliest Period to the present time. . . . Second edition, to which are added, A Continuation to the Present Time, Comprising recent Biographies, chiefly of Booksellers, and a Practical Manual of Printing. London, 1742.

Torrens, W. M.

History of Cabinets, from the Union with Scotland to the Acquisition of Canada and Bengal. 2 vols. London, 1894.

Turner, E. R.

Sources for the History of the English Cabinet in the Eighteenth Century. *Report of the Amer. Hist. Assoc. for 1911.* Vol. 1.

The Development of the Cabinet, 1688-1760. *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, October, 1913.

Walpole, Horace.

The Letters of Horace Walpole, Fourth Earl of Orford. Chronologically arranged and edited with notes and indices by Toynbee, Mrs. Paget. 16 vols. Oxford, 1903-10.

Walsh, Wm.

Handy Book of Literary Curiosities. Philadelphia, 1893.

Warner, Sir George F.

An Unpublished Political Paper by Daniel Defoe. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, January, 1907.

Warton, Joseph.

An Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope. 2 vols. London, 1806.

Wentworth Papers, The, 1705-1739: selected from the Private and Family Correspondence of Thomas Wentworth, Lord Raby, created in 1711 Earl of Strafford. With a memoir and notes by Cartwright, James J. London, 1883.

Williams, J. B.

A History of English Journalism to the Foundation of the Gazette. London, 1908.

Wilson, Walter.

Memoirs of the Life and Times of Daniel Defoe: Containing a Review of his Writings, and his Opinions upon a variety of Matters, Civil and Ecclesiastical. 3 vols. London, 1830.

Windham, Wm.

The Windham Papers (1750-1810), etc. Edited by the Earl of Rosebery. 2 vols. London, 1913.

INDEX

- Addison, Joseph, 5, 15-30, 39, 40, 74, 82, 113, 132, 133; ability as office holder, 15; attacks Defoe, 23-4; before 1710, 10; *The Campaign*, 10, 11, 16, 22; compared with Steele, 92; compared with Swift, 46; defence of Garth, 16; as an essayist, 15, 61, 79; his opinion of the *Examiner*, 70; the *Freeholder*, 86, 111, 132; under George I, 89, 111; income of, 92; as keeper of the records, increased payment to, 91; the Kit-Kat Club, 10; *The Late Tryal and Conviction of Count Tariff*, 23; letter to Delafaye, 91; the *Old Whig*, 88; as patron, 12, 18, 92, 93 ff; the Peerage Bill, 88; plea to, 92, 94; *Poem to His Majesty*, 16; political importance of, 15 ff.; Pope and, 19 ff.; A. Philips and, 18; praise of Tickell, 18; *The Present State of the War*, 16; quarrel with Steele, 86; Secretary to the Regency, 89; state appointments of, 89-91; Steele and, 75; summary of his work to 1714, 24-5; turn to politics of, 17; as typical of his age, 15; as Whig literary advisor, 36; why politically successful, 132.
- Advisors, party, Addison and Swift as, 17.
- Allusions, political, reasons for, 1.
- Amburst, Nicholas, 126-28.
- Anglesey, Earl of (John Annesley), 54, 107.
- Anglo-Dutch alliance, plan for, 71.
- Anne, Queen, 47, 81, 93, 102, *passim*; coronation of, 1; favor to Dennis, 11; death of, 23, 82; Oxford's deception of 28; pension to Steele, 74; party histories during reign of, 28; opinion of Prior, 69 n.; on seditious printing, 12; Speke's appeal to, 101; typical writer of her reign, characterized, 134.
- Anonymous publication, penalty for, 77.
- Appeal to Honour and Justice, An*, 59.
- Applebee's *Journal*, 109, 112 and n.
- Arbuthnot, John, 11, 20, 67.
- Arnall, William, 120, 122.
- Atlantis Major*, 55.
- Atterbury, Dr. Francis, 11 n., 67, 115.
- Audonn*, 130.
- Barber, John, 42.
- Barrymore, James, Earl of, 26.
- Bateson, T., reference to, 50 n.
- Bathurst, Lord (Allen Bathurst), 127.
- Beef-Steak Club, 35.
- The Beggar's Opera*, 123 and n.
- Bell, John, 50.
- Berkeley, George, 74.
- Birch, Dr. Thomas, quoted, 122.
- Blackmore, Sir Richard, 80 n.
- Blenheim*, 11.
- Blount, Edward, 23.
- Bolingbroke, Henry St. John, 1st viscount, 20, 31 ff., 41, 104, 121 ff., 130, 133; attacks Walpole, 125; and *Cato*, 25 and n.; the *Craftsman*, 126 ff.; the *Examiner*, 31, 35, 65; as news director, 65; the *Occasional Writer*, 127; out of power, 81; Parnell and, 42; his political club, 34 ff.; and the press abroad, 33 ff.; quarrel with Oxford, 82; *The Shepherd's Week*, dedication of, 123; situation of, 1714, 82; Swift and, 32; Trapp and, 68.
- Bolton, Duke of (Charles Poulett), 93.
- Books, piracy of, 3; subscription editions of, 3-5.
- Booksellers, country, 2; syndicate of, 2.
- Book trade, 14; after 1695, 2-5; hindrances to, 7; security of, in 1705, 2.
- Booth, Barton, 25 and n., 83.
- Bothmer, Count H. C. von, 101.
- Boulter, Dr., Archbishop of Armagh, 97.
- Boyer, Abel, 41 and n., 67 n.; on Defoe, 52 n.; the *Post boy*, 41; quoted, 13.
- Brett, Colonel Henry, 18.
- Bribes, offered by Whigs, 106.
- Britain, The*, 71.
- Britannia Triumphans*, 11.

- British Apollo, The*, 6; prosperity of, 62.
British Journal, The, 120, 121.
British Mercury, The, 78.
Briton, The, 115, 120.
 Bromley, William, 28.
 Brooke, Henry, 131.
 Brown, Dr., 12.
 Buckley, Samuel, 34, 107, 108, 116.
 Budgell, Eustace, 17, 89, 93, 114 n.
 Burke, Edmund, 4 n.
 Burnet, Gilbert, 97, 100.
 Burnet, Thomas, 100.
 Button, Daniel, 17, 25.
 Cabinet, development of, under George I, 81.
 Cadogan, William, 83.
Campaign, The, 10, 11, 16, 22.
 Carey, Henry, 18.
Carmen Saeculare, 69.
 Caroline, Queen, as Princess of Wales, 85, 121, 122.
 Caryll, John, letter of Pope to, 19, 23.
Case of Authors, The, etc., 128.
Case of Schism, The, etc., 106.
Catalogues, Term, 2 n.
 Catholic papers, 110, 116.
 Catholics, proclamation against, 101.
Cato, political intent in, 24-5; Pope's prologue to, 22 n.
Cato's Letters, 113.
 Cave, Edward, 110, 128.
Champion, The, 127, 128, 132.
 Charterhouse, mastership of, Steele's plea for, 84.
 Chatterton, Thomas, patronage of, 4 n.
 Chesterfield, Earl of (Philip Dormer Stanhope), 99, 126; *Common Sense*, 127.
Chit-Chat, 86.
 Cibber, Colley, 83, 88, 122; laureate, 98; *Non-Juror*, 98; state appointments to, 98; *Ximena*, 88.
 Cibber, Theophilus, 121.
City Intelligencer, The, 6.
 Clarendon, 3rd Earl of (Edward Hyde), 44.
 Clayton, Mrs., 85.
 Club, political, general purposes of a, 34-5; members of Bolingbroke's, 35 n.
 Cobham, Viscount (Richard Temple), 127.
 Coffee-houses, London: Button's, 17, 25; as news centers, 1; Will's 19.
Collection of Scandal, A, 53.
 Collier, William, 83.
Common Sense, 127.
 Compton, Hon. Spencer, 124, 130.
 Concanen, Matthew, 120.
Conduct of the Allies, The, 38.
 Congreve, William, 39; Swift and, 44; state appointments of, 96.
Conscious Lovers, The, dedication of, 88.
 Copyright, law of, 1709, 3.
Corn-Cutter's Journal, The, 120.
Country Parson's Address to the Lord Keeper, 12.
 Courthope, W. J., 22 n.; quoted, 19.
 Cowper, William, Lord Chancellor, 98.
 Coxe, William, 121.
 Crabbe, George, 4 n.
Craftsman, The, 93, 119, 120, 123, 125 ff.; political value of, 128; why successful, 129; writers for, 127.
 Craggs, James, the younger, 107 n.
Crisis, The, 38, 53.
 Criticism, literary, effect of politics on, 17, 132 ff.
 Curl, Edmund, 108; as Whig spy, 107.
Daily Courant, The, 6, 34, 63, 113, 120, 121.
Daily Gazetteer, The, 120.
Daily Post, The, 113.
 Dalton, Isaac, 106.
 Dart, John, 4 ff.
 Davis, Robert, 50.
Dawley Farm, The, 126 n.
 Debates, parliamentary, reporting of, 128.
 Declaration of 1688, The, 101.
 Defoe, Daniel, 47 ff., 112, 133; as advisor of Oxford, 48, 52; aliases of, 56n.; *An Appeal to Honour and Justice*, 57, 59; attacks the *Flying Post*, 53-4, 73n.; attacked by Addison, 23-24; compared with Swift, 9, 46, 60;

- defence of self, 60; effect of party writing on, 8, 47, 80; *The Family Instructor*, 110; under George I, 104, 113; under Godolphin, 51; government payments to, summarized, 55-58; influence of, before 1715, 59; intrigues of, 1718, 108; Oxford's interest in, 47 ff.; pamphlets published by, 56; pleas of, 50, 51 and n., 59, 67; political ideals of, 60; protected by Oxford, 52; release from Newgate, 48; return to Tories, 1710, 52; return to Whigs, 1715, 54, 107; the *Review*, 5, 8, 71n., *passim*; satires against, 109; on secret service, 48, 49n.; secret service journeys, 49 ff.; *The Shortest Way with Dissenters*, 12; state payments to, 49 ff.; Steele's expulsion, 27 and n., 53 ff.; on trade, 60, 64; treachery of, 55; *True-Born Englishman*, 8, 110; under suspicion, 52; work in 1718, 107.
- Delafaye, Charles, 107, 108, 116; Addison's letter to, 91.
- Delpeuch, Elias, 110.
- Dennis, John, 10-11.
- Diaper, William, 42.
- Director, The*, 112 and n.
- Distribution of news-journals, method of, 106, 107 and n.
- Dodington, George Bubb, 127, 130, 131; Young and, 124.
- Doggett, Thomas, 83.
- Don Quixote*, 95.
- Dormer's News Letter*, 108.
- Dorset, Duke of, Young and, 124.
- Drake, Dr. James, 12, 13.
- Drury Lane Theater, 87, 98.
- Dunciad, The*, 121.
- Dunton, John, 100 and n., 101; quoted, 102.
- Dyer's News-Letter*, 12, 108.
- Economic demand, effect of. on literature, 134.
- Economic reasons for party writing, 133.
- Edward and Eleonora*, 130n.
- Electioneering, methods of, in 1722, 118.
- England, A Compleat History of*, 2.
- English Advice to the Freeholders of England*, 104, 106.
- Englishman, The*, 25, 53, 74-6, 132; Second Series, 85, 111.
- Entertainer, The*, 112.
- Escott, T. H. S., reference to, 37n.
- Essay, periodical, effect of politics on, 80, 132 ff.; influence of, upon reading public, 6, 79.
- Eusden, Laurence, 103.
- Evening Post, The*, 6.
- Examiner, The*, 16, 29, 37, 38, 43, 67n., 69, 71, 73, 77; Addison on, 24; attacks on, 70; Bolingbroke and, 35; foundation of, 31, 65 and n.; under George I, 111; on journals, 63; on party histories, 28; payment of writers for, 66; quarrel with the *Guardian*, 74; on Steele, 26; Steele's comment on, 76; Swift's income from, asserted, 101; tone of, 65; writers for, 67.
- Excise Bill, *The*, 126.
- Fantio, a Jew, threats against, 105.
- Female Tatler, The*, 6.
- Fenton, Elijah, 35.
- Fiddes, Richard, 39, 42.
- Fielding, Henry, 127, 128.
- Finch, Lord (Daniel Finch), 27.
- Flying Post, The*, 5, 6, 29, 53-4, 63, 73, 78, 99, 104, 108, 115, 120; Defoe's issues of, 107.
- Flying Post and Medley, The*, 54.
- Fog's Weekly Journal*, 112n., 127 and n.
- Ford, Charles, as gazetteer, 43.
- Francklin, Richard, 129n.
- Free Briton, The*, 29.
- Freedom of the press, See Press.
- Freedom of speech, See Speech.
- Freeholder, The*, 86, 111, 132; on the *Examiner*, 70.
- Freeholder's Journal, The*, quoted, 114.
- Freethinker, The*, 111; writers for, 97.
- Freind, Robert, 67.
- Garth, Samuel, 16, 72, 102.
- Gawen, Thomas, 110.
- Gay, John, 20, 43, 121-27; *The Beggar's Opera*, 123 and n.
- Gazetteer, 43, 74; defined, 43n.

- General History of Trade, A*, 71.
General Postscript, The, 6.
General Remark, The, 6.
Gentleman's Magazine, The, 121, 128.
 George I, 81, 107, 114; favors to Colley Cibber, 98; favors to Steele, 83, 87, 89; interest in letters, 29; persecution of writers under, 116; plea to, from Addison, 90; poems to, 82; power of press under, 117; promise of, to writers, 101; satires on, 1719, 110.
 George II, 122, 125, 128; as Prince, 95, 101.
 Gildon, Charles, 7, 94.
 Glover, Richard, 127, 131.
 Godolphin, Sidney. Lord, 13, 133; and Defoe, 8, 47, 50, 51.
 Gordon, Thomas, 113, 114n., 117.
 Griffith, Richard, 125.
Grub Street Journal, The, 126.
Guardian, The, 19, 53, 74, 76, 132.
Gustavus Vasa, 131.
 Halifax, Lord (Charles Montagu), 11, 16, 89-90; Addison and, 10, 89-90; Congreve and, 44, 96; Pope and, 23; Swift's appeal to, 9.
 Hampton Court, Steele's players at, 87.
 Hanover Club, *The*, 97.
Hanover Post, The, 85.
 Harley, Robert, See Oxford, Earl of.
 Harrison, William, 41, 42n., 59.
 Harvey, Mr., prosecution of, 105.
 Hedges, Sir Charles, 90.
 Henley, John, 72, 120.
 Henry VIII, 28.
Hermit, The, 80 and n.
 Hertford, Countess of, 130.
 Hervey, Lord (John Hervey), 123.
 "High Fliers," 116.
High German Doctor, The, 112 and n.
Hind and the Panther, The, etc., 68.
 Histories, party, 18, 27; defined, 28.
Honest True Briton, The, 115 and n., 120.
 Hornby, Charles, 106.
 Horneck, Phillip, 112.
 Howe, John, 10.
 Howell, Mr., arrest of, 106.
Hudibras Redivivus, 13.
 Hughes, John, 80n., 98; Addison and, 25; Steele and, 74-5.
 Hurt, William, 54, 104.
 Hutcheson, Archibald, 113.
Hymn to the Pillory, 106.
Hyp-Doctor, The, 120, 126n.
Iliad, The, Pope's translation, 23, 94n.; Tickell's, 94.
 Imaginative writing, reason for the lack of, 134.
 Immorality, proclamation against, 12.
Independent Whig, The, 113.
 Jacobites: papers of, 106, 112; power in 1715, 91; rebellion of, 1715, 105; writers against, 1715, 93.
 Jervas, Charles, 23.
 Johnson, Samuel, 111, 128 and n., 131.
Journal to Stella, The, quoted, 36, 39, 42.
 Journals, See News journals.
Judas discover'd, etc., 55n.
 Kennett, Bishop, 38, 72.
 King, William, 11, 67.
King George's Farewell, etc., 105.
 Kit-Kat Club, *The*, 10, 16, 35.
 Lansdowne, Lord (George Granville), 11, 20.
Lay Monastery, The, 80n.
Lay Monk, The, 80 and n.
 Lee, William, 55 and n., 61, 107.
Legion's Humble Address to the Lords, 12.
Leonidas, 131.
 Leslie, Mr., 12.
 L'Estrange, Roger, 106.
Letter to the Earl of Oxford, A, 88.
Letter to Secretary Harley, A, 13.
Letter to the West Country Clothier, A, 29.
 Lewis, Erasmus, 45.
 Lewis, Thomas, 112.
 Libel, proclamation against seditious, 104.
 Licensing Act, *The*, reference to, 2, 3, 5.
 Lintot, publishing house of, 2.
 Literary periodicals, effect of politics on, 80.
London, 131.
London Gazette, The, 6, and n., 28, 32, 62 and n., 63.
London Journal, The, 113 and n., 114 and n., 120, 121.

- Lover, The*, 76.
- Luttrell, Narcissus, 12, 48.
- Lyttleton, George, 130.
- Macclesfield, 1st earl of, 85, 107.
- Mainwaring, Arthur, 72, 73 and n.; on the *Examiner*, 32; on Prior, 69; on Swift, 37.
- Mallet, David, 127, 131 and n.
- Manley, Mrs. Mary de la Riviere, 43, 65 and n., 66, 67 and n.
- Manley, Roger, 121.
- Manners*, 126.
- Mar, Duke of (John Erskine), 106.
- Marlborough, Duke of (John Churchill), 10, 13, 31.
- Masham, Samuel, Lord, 66.
- Matthews, John, 110.
- Mawson, Robert, 105.
- Medley, The*, 32, 63, 72 and n., 73, 78; on the *Examiner*, 70; pay of writers for, 102; quoted 32.
- Meetings, political, first, 118.
- Memoirs of Count Tariff, The*, etc., 24.
- Mercator, The*, 24, 52, 64 and n., 71.
- Mercurius Politicus*, 108.
- Minister, a, his need of writers, 133.
- Mist, Nathaniel, 108, 123, 129n.; his *Journal*, 29, 106, 108-10, 112n., 127.
- Mitchell, Joseph, 123.
- Moderator, The*, 112 and n.
- Molesworth, Robert, Lord, 113.
- Monument, The*, 10.
- Morley, Henry, quoted, 6n.
- Morley, John, 97.
- Muses Mercury, The*, 14n.
- Nast, Thomas, 106.
- Negus, Samuel, 116-17.
- New Atalantis, The*, 43, 65.
- Newcastle, Duke of (Thomas Pelham Hollis), 87 ff., 98, 102, 129.
- News hawkers, arrest of, 105, 106, 110; proclamation against, 1718, 106.
- News journals, circulation of, 1709, 6; circulation of, 1710, 6; against George I, 112; cost of, under George II, 129; increased number of, after 1695, 2, 5; distribution of, 1, 106, 107 and n., 110, 115, 119; hindrances to, trade, 7; London, in 1709 and in 1712, 79; Non-juror papers, 116; number of, in 1709, 5-6; in 1711, 61; 1712-15, 61; 1723, 114, 116-17; profits from, 1709, 63; prosecution of, 10, 12-13, 115, 129; state purchase of, 114 and n.; subsidized, 5, 119.
- Newton, Sir Isaac, 130.
- Non-Juror, The*, 98.
- Non-juror papers, 116.
- Norfolk Stevard, The*, 126n.
- Nottingham, Earl of (Daniel Finch), 10.
- Observer, The*, 6, 10, 63, 77.
- Occasional Writer, The*, 127.
- Ocean*, 124.
- Ode, An*, 106.
- Odell, Thomas, 99, 100.
- Oldisworth, William, 67, 68n., 111.
- Oldnixon, John, 72, 73, 100, 102; state appointments of, 102; income from the *Medley*, 102; quoted, 69, 72.
- Old Whig, The*, 88.
- Oldys, William, quoted, 99.
- On the Death of Mr. Addison*, 94.
- Ormonde, Duke of (James Butler), 45, 91.
- Orrery, Earl of (Charles Boyle), 34, 93, 127.
- Osborne, Thomas, 114n.
- Oxford, Earl of (Robert Harley), 20, 47 ff., 50, 81, 104, *passim*; advised by Defoe, 48; aid to Defoe, 48; Mrs. Manley and, 66; on the Peerage Bill, 88; position of in 1710, 30; return to power, 1710, 30 ff., 52; praised, 43; as promoter of party journalism, 31, 47, 59, 80; quarrel with Bolingbroke, 82; spares Congreve, 44; Steele and, 40, 53, 74.
- Pamphlets, distribution of, 106, 107; Steele's and Swift's, 38.
- Parker, Thomas, See Macclesfield.
- Parnell, Thomas, 12, 42.
- Parties, political, growth of, 1; their need of writers, 8, 133.
- Party journals, rise of, 14.
- Party politics, effect of, upon literary criticism, 17.

- Party writers, why needed, 8, 133-34; payment of, under Oxford, 66 ff.; payment of, under George I, 103; payment of, under Walpole's advice, 117, 119-20; treatment of, under George I, 103.
- Party writing, effect of, on Defoe, 47; general effect of, on writers, 79-80; value of, to Addison, 132; value of, to Steele, 132.
- Party writings, distribution of, 106, 107n., 110, 115, 119.
- Pasquin*, 115.
- Patronage: freeing of writers from, 134; literary, contemporary comment on, 132 ff.; literary, of the *Craftsman* group, 129 ff.; political, 17 ff., 118, *passim*; political, effect of, by 1710, 14, 79; political, contemporary comment on, 132 ff.; private, decline of, 2-6, 14, 59, 100.
- Paul, H. G., reference to, 11 and n.
- Pearce, Dr. 97.
- Peerage Bill, *The*, 88, 92.
- Pembroke, Earl of (Thomas Herbert), 11.
- Pensions, state, to writers, 107, 114; to Addison, 16; effect of, in 1723, 116; under George II, 124; to Mallet, 131; to Thomson, 130.
- Periodical essay, See Essay.
- Persecution of writers, 1710-14, 32 ff.; 1714-21, 104.
- Peterborough, Earl of (Charles Mor-daunt), 43, 45.
- Philips, Mr., a printer, arrest of, 116.
- Philips, Ambrose, 18, 39, 82, 97n., 111; appointments of, 97; the *Free-thinker*, 97, 111.
- Philips, John, 11.
- Pilkington, Matthew, 42.
- Pillory, use of, as political punishment, 33.
- Pirating of books, 2.
- Pitt, William (Earl of Chatham), 119.
- Plain Dealer, The*, 71 and n., 112 and n.
- Plays, prohibited, printing of, 132 and n.
- Plebian, The*, 88.
- Poem on the Battle of Ramillies, A*, 11.
- Poem to His Majesty, A*, 16.
- Political journals: in 1712, 63; effect of, upon literary taste, 80.
- Political meetings, first, 118.
- Politics, effect of, on writers, 1, 9, 11; effect of, on literary journals, 7.
- Pope, Alexander, 19 ff., 25, 74, 93, 99, 121, 122, 126 and n., 127, 131; Addison's influence with, 19 ff.; chief desires of, 21; dedication of his *Iliad*, 94n.; Dennis and, 11n.; under George II, 126; the *Grub Street Journal*, 126; Halifax and, 23; the *Hyp-Doctor* on, 126n.; opinion of, on Queen Anne's reign, 23; party interest of, 126; position of, in 1712, 19-20; Prologue to *Cato*, 22n.; Swift and, 20 ff., 122n.; Warton on, 21-22; *Windsor Forest*, 20 ff.
- Portland, Duchess of, 125.
- Post Boy, The*, 71 n.
- Postboy, The*, 6, 41, 63, 72 n., 76 n.
- Postboy Junior, The*, 6.
- Postman, The*, 6, 63, 78.
- Post-office, the, misuse of, 27, 118-19.
- Present State of the War, The*, etc., 16.
- Press; control of, in 1718, 107; under George I, 81; freedom of, growth in, 5, 128, 129 and n.; freedom of, and prohibited plays, 132 and n.; restriction of, 1702 proclamation for, 12.
- Pretender, the old (James Edward), 27, 38, 111, 115.
- Printers, arrest of, 33, 104, 106, 116, 129 n.; boycott by, of government spy, 117; fear of, in 1716, 105.
- Prosecution of news journals, 10, 12-13; decrease of, 129; failure of, 115; Harley's reason for, asserted, 13.
- Protestant Post-Boy, The*, 55, 63, 78.
- Public Spirit of the Whigs, The*, 38.
- Publishers, London, increased number of, 2, 5.
- Prior, Matthew, 10 and n., 67, 68 ff., 105 n.
- Private patronage, See Patronage.
- Projector, The*, 112.

- Pulteney, Sir William (Earl of Bath), 121, 126.
- Pulteney, David, 126.
- Queensberry, 3rd Duke of (Charles Douglas), 127.
- Raikes, Robert, 110.
- Ralph, James, 127, 128; quoted, 103, 132.
- Rambler, The*, 111.
- Reader, The*, 75 and n., 76.
- Reading public, the, effect on, of party journals, 134; during Queen Anne's reign, 79.
- Read's Weekly Journal*, 112, 120.
- Redmayne, Mr., a printer, 116.
- Rehearsal Revived, The*, 6.
- Reprisal, The*, 112 and n.
- Resigners Vindicated*, 100.
- Review, The*, 5, 6, 49, 52, 63, 71 and n.; foundation of, 8, 47, 64; under Godolphin, 51; importance of, 8; report on, 1708, 51; tone of, 65.
- Revolution of 1688, the effect of, upon parties, 1.
- Rewards, government, for information, 33 n., 104.
- Ridpath, George, 5, 29, 33 n., 54, 73, 77, 82, 99.
- Robethon, Jean de, 94.
- Robin's Last Shift* 105.
- Roper, Abel, 72 n., 76 n.
- Rowe, Nicholas, 39, 42, 82, 87, 95-6, 102; his dedications, 95 n.; made laureate, 95; state appointments of, 95-6; *Tamerlane*, 95.
- Royal Gratitude*, etc., 102.
- Royal Progress, The*, 93.
- Rules, critical, and economic demand, compared, 134.
- Sacheverell, Dr. Henry, 9, 11, 30, 68.
- St. James Journal, The*, 114.
- St. John, Henry, See Bolingbroke.
- Sales profits, of the *London Gazette* and *British Apollo*, 62-3; of the *Spectator* and *Tatler*, 132, of Thomson's poems, 130.
- Savage, Richard, 124.
- Scotland, Defoe's journeys in, 49 ff.
- Scots Atlantis, The*, 55.
- Scourge, The*, 112, 114.
- Scriblerus Club, 37.
- Secret Committee of 1742, 119 ff.
- Secret service, Defoe's recommendations for, 48; expenditure for, 1704, 48.
- Secret service money: how distributed, 84, 119.
- Settle, Elkanah, 5 n.
- Sewell, George, 100.
- Shaftesbury, Third Earl of (Anthony Ashley Cooper), 133.
- Shift shifted, The*, 105, 108.
- Short History of the Parliament, The*, 29.
- Shortest Way with Dissenters, The*, 12.
- Smith, Edmund, 12, 18, 28.
- Some Advice to the October Club*, etc., 38.
- Somers, Lord (John Somers), 11, 16.
- Somerset, Duke of (Charles Seymour), 96.
- Somerset, Duchess of, 45.
- South Sea schemes, 52, 112, 113.
- Spectator, The*, 6, and n., 7, 9, 22, 61, 76, 80 and n., 94, 111, 132; dates of discontinuance, 73; nonpartisan tone of, 25, 41 n.; political tone of, 74; and the reading public, 6 and n., 79; why dropped, 17, 80; writers for, 18.
- Speculatist, The*, 121.
- Speech, freedom of: increased, 1, 117, 129; influence of the *Craftsman*, 128.
- Speke, Hugh, 100, 101.
- Spies, government, rewards to, 106; work of, 33, 51, 104, 106, 116.
- Spinster, The*, 112.
- Splendid Shilling, The*, 11.
- Spring*, 130.
- Stamp Act of 1712: effect of, 78; political intent of, 33; terms of, 33, 76-7.
- Stanhope, James, 27, 81, 104, 111.
- Stanley, John, 110.
- Stationers Company, the, duties of, 2.
- Steele, Sir Richard, 39, 72, 111, 113, 132, 133; Addison's power over, 25; appeals of, 85; Whig appointments of, 83, 86; comments on, in *Chit-Chal*, 86; compared with Addison, 92; complaint against, 87; *The Conscious Lovers*, 88; *The Crisis*, 38; *The Englishman*, 25, 53, 74-6, 85, 111,

- 132; as an essayist, 15, 61, 79; favors from George I, 83, 87, 88; as gazetteer, 74; the *Hanover Post*, 85; *The Importance of Dunkirk Considered*, 38 n.; income of, 62, 82 n., 85, 87; *A Letter to the Earl of Oxford*, etc., 88; the *Lover*, 75 and n.; in parliament, 26, 53 ff., 74, 75, 84; the Peerage Bill, 88; the *Plebian*, 88; as a politician, 26; position of, after 1714, 82 and n.; quarrel with Addison, 86; the *Reader*, 76; resignation from state appointments, 74; the *Scavenger*, 76 n.; secret payments to, 1715, 84; summary of his party work, 76; the *Taller*, 5, 6, 7, 41, 61, 62, 79, 132; theatrical difficulties, 87 ff.; under Tory patronage, 40; *Town Talk*, 86; his turn to politics, 74; as typical of his age, 15; Walpole's aid to, 27, 28, 88, 89.
- Stephens, Henry, 97.
- Sterling, James, 121.
- Stubbs, George, 97.
- Subscription editions, 2-5.
- Subsidies, government, to Defoe, 57-59; effect of, on writers, 14, 110; to news journals, 71, 119.
- Suffolk, Duchess of (Henrietta Howard), 121-123, 126.
- Summer*, 130.
- Sunderland, Earl of (Charles Spencer), 30, 51, 81, 90, 93, 99; Defoe and, 108; the *London Gazette*, 62.
- Sunderland, John, 106.
- Supplement, The*, 6.
- Swift, Jonathan, Dean of St. Patrick's, 30 ff., 52, 127, 133; Addison and, 39, 140; after 1726, 121 ff.; appeal to Oxford, 37, 67; appeal to Walpole, 122; appointment to St. Patrick's, 45; attacks on, 41 and n.; before 1710, 8 ff.; compared with Addison, 46; compared with Defoe, 9, 46, 60; *The Conduct of the Allies*, 38; Congreve and, 39, 44, 96; *Discourse of the Contests and Dissensions*, etc., 8; as editor, 67; effect of politics upon, 9; *The Examiner*, 38, 65, 67 and n.; under George II, 126; Harrison and, 41, 59; *The Importance of the Guardian Considered*, 38 n.; income under Oxford, asserted, 101; in Ireland, 9; Bishop Kennett on, 38-9; Mrs. Manley and, 43; as news director, 17, 18, 36, 39, 42, 65; motives of, 37 and n.; Oxford and, 30 ff., 36, 37, 38, 45; as patron, 41-44, 92; A. Phillips and, 39; Pope and, 20 and n., 122 n.; the *Post-boy*, 72 n.; *Public Spirit of the Whigs*, 38; Rowe and, 95; Sacheverell's sermon, effect of, on Swift, 9; Scriblerus Club, 37; situation of, 1710, 36; *Some Advice to the October Club*, 38; *Some Remarks*, etc., 38 n.; Stamp Act of 1712, 77; Steele and, 39, on Steele, 74; summary of his Tory services, 45; *Tale of a Tub*, 9; Walpole and, 122-23.
- Syndicate publication, 2-4.
- Talbot, Lord (Charles Talbot), 130.
- Tale of a Tub, A*, 9.
- Tamurlane*, 95.
- Taste, literary, during Queen Anne's reign, 6; effect on, of politics, 132 ff.
- Tate, Nahum, 95.
- Taller, The*, 5, 6, 9, 41, 61, 62, 132; popularity of, 7 and n., 79; Harrison's, 41, 80 n.
- Thomas, J. M., reference to, 77 n.
- Thomson, James, 127, 130 ff.; dedications of his poems, 130; *Edward and Eleanor*, 130 n.; *Masque of Alfred*, 130 n., 131; pension to, 130; profits from sales, 130.
- Thuanus*, 111 n.
- Tickell, Thomas, 22 n., 74, 82, 93; his *Iliad*, 94; party poems of, 94 and n.; *On the Death of Mr. Addison*, 94; Oxford, 18; *Poem on the Prospect of Peace*, 18; *Royal Progress*, 93.
- Tilson, George, 51.
- Toland, John, 101.
- Tonson, publishing house of, 2.
- Tonson, Jacob, appeal to, 102; bribe to, 111 n.

- Tooke, Mr., 107.
- Tory party: before 1708, 9; Bolingbroke's power in, 31; in 1714, 82; journals of, 1710-14, 64-72; journals of, under George I, 108, 112; party history, 27; Prior and, 69; prosecution of its leaders, 1715, 105; suspects Oxford, 1710, 30; Steele a dependent, 40; Swift and, 30 ff., 45; Walpole's attack upon, 1713, 28; writers for, 1710-14, 67 ff.
- Tory Tatler, The*, 71 and n.
- Townshend, Viscount (Charles), 81, 86, 104, 107, 108.
- Trapp, Joseph, 67, 68 and n.
- Treasury payments, delay in, 42 n., 57, 59; method of, 84, 119; to Oldisworth, 67.
- Treaty of Utrecht, *The*, 64 n., 82, 115.
- Trenchard, John, 113, 114 n., 117.
- True Born Englishman, The*, 8.
- True Briton, The*, 115.
- Truth found out, The*, etc., 106.
- Tutchin, John, 10, 77.
- Vanbrugh, Sir John, state appointments of, 98 and n.
- Vernon, Sir Richard, 26.
- Victor, Benjamin, 125.
- Vogues, literary, economic reason for, 1, 134.
- Vox Populi*, etc., 110.
- Wales, Frederick, Prince of, 101, 121, 124, 125, 126, 130, 131.
- Walpole, Robert, Earl of Orford, 73, 81, 107, 111, 113; Addison and, 29; aid to Steele, 27, 88, 89; Dennis and, 11 n.; Dunton's petition to, 102; Excise Bill, 126; interest in journalism before 1714, 28-29; journals of, 114 ff.; on the Peerage Bill, 88; power of, in 1714, 27; purchase of journals, 114; satirized, 105, 109, 127; Savage and, 124; Secret Committee and, 119 ff.; Thomson and, 130; work under George I, 104, 117; work under George II, 118; treatment of writers, 118, 121; the *True Briton* against, 115; Vanbrugh and, 98 n.; Young and, 124.
- Walthoe, John, 84, 120.
- Warburton, William, 132.
- Ward, Edward, 13 and n.
- Warner, Sir George, 48 n.
- Warton, Joseph, quoted, 21-22.
- Weekly Journal, The*, 113; quoted, 99.
- Weekly Packet, The*, quoted, 99.
- Weekly Register, The*, 120.
- Welsted, Leonard, 84, 98.
- West, Richard, 97.
- Westmonasterium*, etc., 5.
- Weston, Thomas, 106.
- Wharton, Duke of (Philip Wharton), 115; Young and, 124.
- Wharton, Lord (Thomas Wharton), 89, 90, 91, 98, 99.
- Whately, Stephen, 73, 101; letter of, to Walpole, 28-9; Whig works of, 29.
- Whig Examiner, The*, 16, 17, 72; contributors to, 72.
- Whig party: Addison's pension from, 16; Addison's power in, 15 ff.; bribes offered by, 1716, 106; condition of, in 1708, 9; in 1714, 82; defeat of, at Steele's trial, 53; journals of, 1710-14, 72-81; journals of, under George II, 129; patronage of writers, under George I, 81 ff., 103; under George II, 120; party history of, 18; prosecutions of, 1715, 105; spies of, under George I, 106-7; treatment of Swift, 9; pension of, to writers, 1718, 107.
- Whisperer, The*, 6.
- Whitehall Evening Post, The*, 109, 110, 113.
- Whitehead, Paul, 126.
- Wilkins, W. 120.
- Wilks, Robert, 83.
- William III, 1, 68, 95, 100, 129; Addison and, 16; Dennis and, 10.
- Williams, Sir Charles Hanbury, 123.
- Willies, John, 110.
- Windsor Forest*, 20-22.
- Winter*, 130.
- Wolff, Mr., a printer, 129 n.
- Writers, party, Bolingbroke and, 32; buying off of, 1718, 107; general effect of politics upon, 11; need for, in 1702, 47; pensions to, 1718, 107;

- treatment of, by Whigs, 103; treatment of, by Walpole, 118, 121; value of, to a minister, 133; value of, to parties, 80; under Walpole, comments on, 121; Whig payments to, 112.
- Wye, William, 110.
- Wyndham, Sir William, 66, 126.
- Ximena*, 88.
- Yalden, Thomas, 11.
- York, Archbishop of, 45.
- Yorke, Philip (1st Earl of Hardwicke), 129.
- Young, Edward, 82, 124, 127; letter of, quoted, 125.






HECKMAN
BINDERY INC.



JUL 89



MANCHESTER.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 934 688 8