

**'Anglia Libera': commonwealth politics in the early years of George I**  
by  
**Justin Champion**

Despite some magisterial work on the history of political thought and culture in the eighteenth century, it is still unclear whether the contours and varieties of 'whiggism' have been definitively identified and classified. One commonplace assertion that still dominates the topography of political discourses in the period is that 'republican' components to 'true whig' ideology dribbled away into the sand of political respectability and proto-liberalism. As J.G.A. Pocock famously asserted, after 1689, republicanism became a language rather than a programme. More recently the arguments of Worden and Skinner, in their different ways, have claimed that the broader trajectory of political thinking, and especially 'Whig' political theory, was directly away from radical republican languages, towards a more anodyne and conservative language of virtue and rights. This interpretation is ripe for revision. It fits uneasily with the other dominant account of the period advanced in the work of J.C.D. Clark, which emphasises the fundamentally theological and aristocratic idioms of political culture in the eighteenth century.<sup>1</sup> It is possible to suggest that the political culture of some elements of the 'Whig' élite (especially after the accession of the Hanoverians in 1714) was both republican and aristocratic, and even driven by if not theological, then at least religious ambitions. By examining some of the political writings produced between 1714 and 1722, it is possible to tease out some unfamiliar elements as a platform for re-thinking the traditional account.

After 1714, the ambitions of the joint ministry of Sunderland and Stanhope, publicised by men like John Toland, Thomas Gordon and John Trenchard, were to secure an 'anglia libera'. Traditionally, the historiography of the period 1689-1720s has been driven by an account of parliamentary party politics. As this account has shown, the 'substance of conflict' was determined by the consequences of revolution. The status of 1689, the security of the Protestant succession, and the relationship between the established Church and toleration were the key issues. Although not commonly discussed in these terms *au fond*

these were debates about 'free government', tyranny and individual liberty that potentially had republican implications. After 1714, these republican dimensions became, briefly, much more explicit under the ministry of Stanhope and Sunderland. The persistence of this aristocratic republican discourse can be established by considering the various public polemics over the status of the established Church and the controversial proposed reforms of the House of Lords in 1719.

## I

Between 1717 and 1721 a fierce battle was fought within the Whig régime. After the so-called schism of 1717 when Walpole and Townshend left the ministry there was an increasingly bitter contest between the leading politicians, made worse by the fracture of relations between George and his son. During these last years of the 1710s there was a profound and sustained attempt to establish the fundamentals of republican ideology against the backcloth of harassment from an apostate Whig opposition. The discursive ambitions and dimensions of this conflict have rarely been examined in their own terms, but a study of the central issues and the vocabulary of contention between the ministry and those in opposition establishes the persistence of commonwealth discourses concerned with the war against priestcraft and establishing the security of the constitution against corruption. The enormous success of Toland's *State Anatomy of Great Britain* (1717), which set the agenda for a programme of commonwealth reforms, suggests that there was a significant audience outside of the Court and Parliament for printed arguments. Toland's pamphlet, which ran to at least nine editions, was widely regarded as being the result of commonwealth confederacy within the ministry. Defoe dismissed the work as being as 'heterodox in politics' as its author was in religion. The work proposed fundamental reforms in Church, constitution, universities and law. Defending a limited Protestant monarchy and a 'free constitution', Toland defined a schema of reform based upon a general toleration that involved, for example, the radical measure of the repeal of the Test Act. Projecting George I as a model of Cicero's 'Prince in Idea', Toland articulated republican ambitions of combating superstition and political tyranny on the bedrock of existing political institutions.<sup>2</sup>

Further evidence that the ministry was committed to both achieving reforms through the agency of parliamentary means, but also intent on persuading people 'without doors', can be illustrated most effectively in the government sponsorship of newspapers like *The Freethinker* edited by Ambrose Philips, antagonist of Pope and pastoral poet.<sup>3</sup> As Thomas Burnet commented 'the government have sett the author up to it, and know that we are assisting to him'.<sup>4</sup> Philips was secretary of the Hanover Club, an adjunct to the Whig Kit Kat Club, which met from 1711 at Charing Cross and was dedicated to giving Tories and Jacobites 'all the opposition they could give in their several stations'. Including MPs like James Craggs and Sir Richard Steele, and men like Paul Methuen, the club had true Whig credentials: many of the politicians held significant position in the post 1714 ministry.<sup>5</sup> Thomas Burnett admitted that 'though I am not the author, yet I am one of a club that reviews everyone before they go to the press'.<sup>6</sup> Running from March 1718 into the next year, and frequently republished as a collection in the early 1720s, Philips collaborated with Hugh Boulter, Richard West and Gilbert Burnet. Boulter, associated with Sunderland, was Chaplain to George I in 1719 and became Archbishop of Armagh in the mid-1720s. Richard West became Irish Lord Chancellor. Zachary Pierce, another contributor, was Bishop of Rochester.<sup>7</sup> The collective authors are remarkable, not least, for their intimacy with the Whig supremacy of the 1720s.<sup>8</sup>

The motto of *The Freethinker*, citing Horace rather than Kant, was 'Sapere Aude'.<sup>1</sup> Acknowledging that the title of the journal would be controversial and probably '(without any ceremony) make it be thrown aside with indignation by several well-meaning Persons', the editors hoped that it would also be 'received with Alacrity by some sanguine philosophers'. The point of naming it the 'freethinker' was to save the word from association with libertines and bigots. The nation was unthinking: 'Scarce anyone dares at present think his soul is his own, or, in other words, entrust himself with his own thoughts; much less take the liberty to speak them; and he must be a bold man indeed, who shall venture so far as to publish them in print'. Commonplace arguments about liberty of conscience were developed into a full-

blown defence of freedom of enquiry: 'to think freely is not to think at random: it is not to think like a fool or a madman: but like a philosopher: it is not to think without the checks of reason and judgement; but without the incumberances of prejudice and passion.'

Freethinking was the 'foundation of all human liberty: remove the one and the other cannot stand'. As the source of knowledge, the parent of the arts and sciences, freethinking supported virtue, good manners, 'order and government' and true religion. Great Britain was a 'land of philosophers' where reason stood as a bulwark against 'slavery, ignorance, superstition, idleness and poverty'. In Britain a man was 'not obliged to divest himself in any degree of his reason, before he can be a good subject'.<sup>9</sup>

Addressed to all sorts and all parties, 'from the Groom porters to Jonathans in Change Alley', the journal even engaged with a female audience 'so as in the end to set them upon the level with my own sex, in our boasted superiority of reason': after all, Elizabeth I was a freethinker.<sup>10</sup> Discoursing about sensitive issues such as the crucifixion of Christ (which was compared with that of Socrates and Cato) the journal sponsored an anticlerical and almost irreligious attitude towards Christian doctrine and institutions. There was a clear republican intent to the paper: a 'free people' needed to use their reason to combat passion and interest, as well as error and delusion. Truth, like the 'bursting of a bomb in a crowd' alarmed modern statesmen and courtiers whose understandings 'are enslaved, and perpetually employed in journey work under their passions'.<sup>11</sup> Amongst a miscellany of discussion about air-pumps, duelling and Lucretius, there was a persistent assertion that 'every Briton not only may, but has a right to, Think aloud'. To encourage all to be rational was a fundamental maxim of free government and would 'dispose the people to vertue'. Antiquity showed that though the tyranny of 'authority' had often 'usurpt and arbitrary power' it had also often been deposed.<sup>12</sup> The collapse of the 'Protestant' language of liberty of conscience into a republican language of freethinking was achieved most effectively in the discussion of the relative merits of the atheist and the superstitious. The 'Protestant principle' was clearly defined as 'a right of thinking and judging for my self.' Since judgement was determined by reason 'without

---

<sup>1</sup> Horace *Epistles* 1, 2.

prejudice', both enthusiasts and atheists were compromised. However, using the distinctions, advanced by Shaftesbury, between the libertine and virtuous atheist, *The Freethinker* argued that the 'religious atheist' who 'delights in goodness, and in everything, that is reasonable and beautiful. He loves mankind; he is social and publick spirited.' Although there was a tendency amongst such men to muddle religion and superstition, they were to be valued over the deranged enthusiast or popishly superstitious.<sup>13</sup> Fanatics, non-jurors and the high-church, especially those who believed in the 'Chimerical notions of a Royal, Rectilineal Priesthood, independent of the state', should be severely disciplined by the state for their threat to public peace.<sup>14</sup>

The articulation of such ideas, from a government-sponsored journal, gives an indication of the centrality of republican conceptions of virtue and liberty to public discourses in the period. 'True religion' was a plain and simple matter that resembled 'good manners'. Such manners were to be distinguished from the 'unmanly politeness' of the courts of arbitrary princes: 'free states' should reject such politeness 'as the very laws of tyranny'. The civic virtue of ancient Greece was corroded by degeneration into mere 'politeness': all gentlemen were advised to 'mend their manners, by becoming less polite'. Drawing a specific parallel between the decline of virtue in the Roman republic and 'modern customs', Philips commented that 'a degenerate polite Roman' would have been at home in eighteenth-century London.<sup>15</sup> One of the main areas for reform was, then, that of the Church. Citing Cicero's *De Natura Deorum* against the dangers of 'superstition', the journal indicted the 'cunning and artful part of mankind' who exploited the natural tendency of humans to fear the unknown. Such priests 'imposed on the world all the wildest inconsistencies, which the brain of man could invent' with the objective of terrifying 'men into every compliance'. Since the frailties of humankind were vice and 'a strong propensity of mind towards everything, that is mysterious, dark and incomprehensible,' so the priests established their tyrannous empire.<sup>16</sup> War against such corruption was the purpose of the ministry. Philips was not alone in this public campaign.

Perhaps the most effective, and certainly the most humorous, writer on behalf of the government was the young Thomas Gordon, associate of John Trenchard and Robert Molesworth.<sup>17</sup> He is a particularly interesting example to explore because of the trajectory of his commitments between 1718 and the early 1720s. In the early years, as will be seen below, Gordon published a series of very popular pamphlets projecting the anti-clerical platform of the ministry. By 1720-21 disenchantment, especially over the handling of the South Sea Bubble, led Gordon into direct collaboration with Trenchard in the production of the oppositional *Cato's Letters* between 1720 and 1723. An example of the early pro-ministry polemic is the *Modest Apology for Parson Alberoni* (1719), a work that achieved many editions. Here Gordon produced a savage satire against the 'indelible character' of priesthood. Portraying churchmen as greedy and devious manipulators of Scripture, ambitious only to increase the value of their livings, they were more the 'Lord's receiver general' than the 'Ambassadors' of God. Parodying clerical arguments about divine right in church and state, Gordon dismissed their sanctity and insisted that reading scripture easily exposed their lies.<sup>18</sup> In the second part of the work, *An Apology for the Danger of the Church* (1719), Gordon let slip his intentions in the sub-title 'that the church is, and ought to be always in Danger; and that it would be dangerous for her to be out of danger'. This was explicitly calculated to upset mainstream Anglicans. Countering the attempt to set up 'the parsons as the idols of the universe', Gordon (again by parody and satire) trounced the clericalist claims of the Church. There was no unbroken apostolic succession from 'Jerusalem to Lambeth'. He produced a mock catalogue of books: *The Art of Holy Foaming*, *The Holy Monopoly*, *Church Arithmetic* (that 'three is one'), *The unreasonableness of understanding Scripture*, and *The Tribe of Issachar; or an argument to prove that the laity have a right to no liberty, but that of being slaves to the Clergy*. Such clergy only believed in two holy days: January 30<sup>th</sup> and May 29<sup>th</sup>. As Gordon added in a postscript, the purpose of his tract was to provide readers with material to ridicule arrogant clergymen, as he wrote 'when the Parsons cock their beavers, and give themselves airs, the country folks cut them down with a text out of Parson Alberoni.'<sup>19</sup>

In two further works, *Priestianity: or a view of the disparity between the Apostles and the modern inferior clergy* (1720) and *The Character of an Independent Whig* (1720), Gordon made the connection between the attack upon the Church and the preservation of liberty even more explicit. The thrust of the first pamphlet focused on the role the clergy had in corrupting the beliefs of their parishioners by insinuating themselves into the homes of the gentry. As Gordon explained, 'when a shepherd will intrust a wolf with the care of his flock, then I shall consent that a priest may be a superintendent of my family.' Fortunately, Gordon exclaimed, 'the British spirit begins to reassume its reason; that is shakes off the Biggotry of Priestcraft, and daily disesteems the delusion of juggling impostors.' Just as Toland, Shaftesbury and Molesworth had asserted, Gordon too posed the rhetorical question: 'Is not the liberty of the mind preferable to the liberty of the body?' The sacrifice of reason to the 'arbitrary' will of the Churchmen was a tragedy, since 'every man living has a right to think freely, and reason ought to direct him.' Gordon's remedy was to propose a strict scrutiny of the morals, principles and characters of Churchmen. Since they were 'servants' of the laity, they ought to be forced to display their testimonies and certificates of good conduct like any other servant seeking employment.<sup>20</sup> In the second work, Gordon reinforced the connection between the attack on the church and the defence of liberty; as he claimed 'Reason and liberty are the two greatest gifts and blessing which man has given us, and yet where ever a priestly authority prevails, they must either fly or suffer.' Churchmen, in the tradition of Archbishop Laud, had laid a plot against 'conscience and constitution'. It was clear that 'abject slavery' was 'and always has been, the certain consequence of power in the priests.' The antidote was to be found in the 'unlimited Toleration of all dissenters, whatsoever': it was simply 'tyrannical' to punish religious difference, for 'in matters of conscience, he who does his best does well, though he is mistaken.' All Protestants ought to be equally employed by the state: provided a 'man loves liberty and his country, what is it to the commonwealth whether he sings his prayers or says them?' The high churchman made a 'prey of our property, and slaves of our persons.' Trouncing their influence in the parish and the universities by accommodating and rewarding dissenters would be a secure route to preserving liberty.<sup>21</sup> It

should be underscored that this public polemic had political ambitions of preparing the ground for the dis-establishment of the church.

An insight into Gordon's commitment to toleration as the premise of civil liberties can be seen in his manuscript work on 'The tryal of Lord Cobham', a study of the persecution and death of the Lollard Sir John Oldcastle who was executed in 1417. Oldcastle was subjected to persecution for exposing the superstitions of the clergy as 'a senseless repetition of what any impostor frames and a stupid acquiescence in unintelligible sounds.' Oldcastle, a man who used his reason in matters of religion, was contrasted with the 'stupid and ghostly fear' induced by the priests. 'Bold, honest and wise', Oldcastle suffered illegitimate and corrupt persecution. This example was held up to establish the general principles that 'clerical power' was the most 'compleat and tyrannical of all others'. By claiming to control 'our eternal fate' the priest became the 'tyrant of our soul, body and fortune'.<sup>22</sup> The example of Oldcastle's fate had an obvious resonance with the contemporary context of the ongoing battle against the persecuting church. In the fifty-three issues of the *Independent Whig* between January 1720 and June 1721, a sustained polemic against clerical imposture was directed towards an audience, presumably, preparing a platform for the coming general election. Supporting the reforms advanced by Bishop Hoadly the journal defined the legitimate nature of the church as 'the spiritual supremacy of the Crown; the right of the laity to judge for themselves; the forming of all ecclesiastical polity by the legislature; and consequently that of creating clergyman by the civil power'. Issue by issue, the paper deconstructed the contemporary commonplace understanding of the power and authority of Churchmen. Blending Lockean and Hobbist nominalism with the sociological analyses of Toland, Shaftesbury and others, Gordon exposed how the tyranny of popery established its unjust power by 'worshipping words'. The Clergy were hegemonic, 'every event of life contributes to their interests; they christen; they educate; they marry; they church; they bury; they perswade; they frighten; they govern; and scarce anything is done without them'.<sup>23</sup> In the course of the eighteen months of issues, the journal anatomised the 'priestcraft' of contemporary ecclesiastical establishments and propagated a powerful defence of a

republican civic theology. Religion was designed as a moral basis of social happiness, virtue and action rather than doctrine were the determinants of its value. In essays such as 'A general idea of priestcraft' or 'no priests instituted by the Christian religion' a fundamentally anticlerical and political reading of contemporary clerical culture was broadcast to a popular audience.

## II

Between 1717 and 1721 there was, then, a profound, persistent and radical assault upon the ecclesiastical establishment, sponsored and written by men close to the national government. The political attempts to repeal the statutes regulating occasional conformity, dissenting education and the sacramental test were seriously supported by a powerful print campaign. The multiple editions of these works, and the fact that many of the tracts were published by the same publisher — James Roberts, who had connections to the Whig printers the Baldwins and the Darbys — suggests that there was a certain amount of co-ordination in the deliberate attempt to reach as wide an audience as possible. As the various studies of the complex political relationships that bedevilled the stability of the ministries after 1716 have indicated, the question of accommodating the demands of Dissent for a more tolerant settlement of their civil status, with the aspirations of moderate Whig churchmen to preserve the legal authority of the national establishment, was most contentious and divisive.<sup>24</sup> Given this schism about aims and objectives amongst the Whig régime, from 1717 it became a key political imperative of Stanhope and Sunderland to render their dominance of the mechanics of government more secure, not only against the threat of Tory resurgence, but more importantly against the machinations of 'defected' Whigs like Robert Walpole. Having secured the support of George I, the critical political imperative was ensuring that the ministry could control the other political institutions, most notably the Commons and the Lords. The Septennial Act that extended the life of the Parliament to the early 1720s rendered the former more amenable to ministerial influence. The attempt to effect the same sort of management over the House of Lords, a venue where opposition was more readily established around

figures like Cowper and others, was the ambitious piece of legislation known as the Peerage Bill, introduced with the support of the King, into the House of Lords in 1719.<sup>25</sup>

As Toland had intimated in *State Anatomy*, the Whigs had been appalled by Harley's creation of new (probably Jacobite) peers to pass the peace of Utrecht through the Lords in Anne's reign: it was 'the deadliest blow which was ever struck at the vitals of Parliament'.

This creation was regarded as an unconstitutional use of the royal prerogative that, in essence, compromised the balance of the constitution. Given the difficulties between George I and the Prince of Wales, and the intimacy between oppositional politicians and the Prince, the perceived dangers of a new ministry securing their power by mass creations were imminent.

The answer was introduced into the Lords on 28 February 1719 by the Duke of Somerset and the Duke of Argyll: the number of English peers 'should not be enlarged beyond six above the present number, which upon the failure of male issue might be supplied by new creations', the sixteen elective peers of Scotland were to be replaced by twenty five hereditary lords 'whose number, upon failure of heirs male, should be supplied by some other Scotch peers.'<sup>26</sup>

The number of peers, as a consequence, would have been fixed at 209.<sup>27</sup> As a number of historians have noted, the bill sparked off one of the bitterest and most intense pamphlet wars of the century, but until recently it has received scant attention.<sup>28</sup> There were many dimensions to the debates about the bill: the ambition of securing a political majority in the Lords, attempts at resolving the question of the status of Scottish peers, as well as remedying the perceived decline in the status of the aristocracy, were all fundamental issues under consideration. After a complicated series of Parliamentary manoeuvres the Bill was rejected (after a ten hour debate) in the Commons by 269 to 177 votes on 8 December 1719.<sup>29</sup>

Between March and December a 'paper war' raged that involved dozens of publications in a variety of formats (from weekly journals, to lengthy tracts and shorter polemics). Despite some recent attention, most notably from Clyve Jones and Colin Brooks, the controversy has not received much historiographical attention. It has not been placed within a context of a persisting commonwealth tradition.

The debates focused intensely upon constitutional issues. George I had in early March made his position clear in a message to the Lords that indicated he was willing to waive his prerogatives to enable the passage of the Bill.<sup>30</sup> It appeared that the objective of the bill was to limit the prerogative of the monarchy and refurbish the political 'independence' of the aristocracy. It was then a republican measure in the tradition of the Act of Settlement, bringing regulations and balance to the constitution. By exploring the language of the various pamphlet exchanges it is clear that these constitutional issues were discussed in a republican vocabulary. As the author of *The Limitation of the Peerage, the security of the liberties of the people of England* (1720) put it, the question deserved the 'utmost attention of a free nation'. George I's release of prerogative was calculated to benefit the 'ease and safety of his people' by removing an instrument that had been used to 'enslave the nation' in the previous reign.<sup>31</sup> Those who opposed the 'self-denying bill' were malcontents like Jacobites and Tories, or self-interested wealthy men who sought peerages without virtuous merit. One of the points of the reform was to re-invigorate a virtuous aristocracy: gaining a peerage would become a reward for merit rather than money, it would 'render the honour more coveted; and it will set up a glorious emulation for their country's service, when the honour of being a peer will be the ultimate reward for great and glorious actions'. Although no reflection was intended against the 'transcendent goodness' of the present king, 'so long as an unlimited power remains in the crown of creating peers, the house of Lords can be nothing but a tool in the hands of the Crown to direct as it pleases'. The 'act of limitation may be a bar in the way of an ill Prince, but can never hurt a good one'.<sup>32</sup> As a private man the author acknowledged that the bill would compromise his prospects, 'but in my publick capacity, and as a well wisher to my country, divesting myself of all sinister ends, or partial views, but acting the true Patriot, I must declare myself for the passing of the bill'. The republican dimension of the analysis of the merits of the bill went further than its role in protecting an aristocracy of virtue, since the measure would also preserve the balance of power in the House of Commons, and maintain 'the equal balance of power in the three estates'. Using the Harringtonian account of power following 'property', limiting the amount of peers in the Lords would also contain the amount

of power they cultivated, retaining the balance in the Commons, 'the true and proper Guardians of the people'. The bill was then an exercise in republican adjustment of the constitution: the 'unprejudiced' man could do nothing but support it as a means 'for preserving to posterity the liberty of their country.'<sup>33</sup>

Republican vocabulary permeated the literary exchanges. In *The Constitution explain'd, in relation to the independency of the House of Lords* (1719) the issue was reduced to that of the 'balance' between interests in the pursuit of the public good. The consequence of reducing the crown's prerogative might have been to subject the nation 'to the worst of oligarchies'. On the contrary: removing the ability to create peers would re-establish 'an equal right to vote freely, and independently' to each part of the constitution without 'being accountable to, or controulable by each other'. The illegitimate exercise of such regal prerogative had corrupted the constitution in the past: the parallel of James II modelling corporation charters to his own agenda was clearly drawn, and 'might not Strafford by this method have saved his head?' Historical precedent as a 'balance' between the two powerful extremes of King and Commons established the importance of a free and independent Lords. This balance was critical in preserving the freedom of the constitution, 'since if that is broken, and either of them gets uppermost, they are no longer a state, but slaves to the prevailing power. The nobility were historically, as part of the 'Gothick' constitution, the defenders of British liberties; degeneration from this freedom had been caused by the turbulence of the people and sponsored by corrupt priests. As the author explained, 'the multitude never arriv'd to that pitch of madness, as to believe Tyranny to be jure divino, till these last ages, in which they have been absolutely govern'd by their priests.' Liberty was on a 'precipice', only those who subscribed to absolute monarchy could support the continuation of 'this overruling power in the crown.' A free nobility was the premise for the security of property and liberty: the bill 'will fix the Constitution in its due balance of power, [and] prevent the fluctuations which have so much disturb'd the publick peace'.<sup>34</sup> Contrary to the assertions of those who claimed the bill was purely a matter of self interest (to 'perpetuate Whiggism')<sup>35</sup> in securing the preservation of the current ministry, the advocates of the legislation saw it as

restoring and empowering aristocratic virtue.<sup>36</sup> 'Independency' in all parts of the constitution was critical to 'preserve us from the tyranny of all ministers.' Limiting the number of peers was also regarded as a means of preserving the independence of the House of Commons too, since it would reduced the amount of influence aristocrats wielded over the lower House. The alternative was that the lower House would become 'full of their creatures, not the representatives of the Commons of Great Britain'.<sup>37</sup>

The most successful attack upon the bill was Robert Walpole's *The Thoughts of a Member of the Lower House* (1719) which, claiming the rights of a free-born Englishman, dismissed the bill as compromising the King's prerogatives and the peoples' liberty in order to establish 'the worst sort of oligarchy'. Walpole's assessment was that 'if this prerogative is taken away, the house of Lords will be a fixed independent body, not to be called to an account like a ministry, nor to be dissolved or changed like a house of Commons.' The result of creating such a power in the Lords would be a return to a state of vassalage: since the Lords retained control over the 'power of legislation' because of their status as the court of final appeal, they would become 'the lords and masters of mankind'. The creation of peers was an act of prerogative employed as a 'trust for the publick good'; the remedy for abuse was punishment, not an alteration in the constitution. Removing the Crown's authority over the distribution of honours would compromise the process of political rewards for virtuous actions and introduce a dependence of the commons directly on the Crown. For Walpole, the fact that the Lords were united across the political parties in support of the bill indicated that a plot was afoot: 'such phenomenas and uncommon appearances, like comets or eclipses, are apt to fright ignorant people.'<sup>38</sup> One reply to this tract, *Remarks on a Pamphlet entitled The Thoughts of a Member* (1719), was surprised that a Whig could dismiss the bill as a threat to the constitution; as he exclaimed, 'It is new indeed, and very extraordinary, to find Whigs opposing a restraint to Royal authority.' Presenting the bill as a remedy against corruption, very much like the anti-place and pension bills for the commons, it would provide an antidote 'against the poison of Tyranny'. The bill would reinforce the freedom and independency of the government, indeed 'every part of the constitution shall have the free exercise of their

proper function, without let or hinderance.' The nobility had always been a force for the preservation of liberty: as the author noted 'Who were greater adversaries to the Tyrants that arose out of the patrician order, than the Senators of Rome.'<sup>39</sup> This language of a 'free nobility' was redolent of the way in which Toland had described the political virtues of Newcastle and Somerset in his dedications to them in the republican editions and texts of the early 1700s. His close association with Molesworth, a strong supporter of the Peerage bill, indicates a continuity of this aristocratic form of republican politics.<sup>40</sup>

The battle for public opinion took its most popular form in the series of exchanges in March and April 1719 between the serial publications of Steele, Addison and Molesworth: *The Plebeian*, *The Old Whig* and *The Patrician*.<sup>41</sup> Steele's *Plebeian* set the scene by dismissing the 'shutting up the door of the house of Lords' as creating the 'worst sorts of slavery'. Such an aristocracy was contrary to the principles of Whiggism: 'the milk such noble are nursed up with, is hatred and contempt for every human creature but those of their imaginary dignity.' The bill was a plot to 'set up some noble above the Crown and the Commons both.' The suggestion that the nobility would behave like the *ephors* of Sparta was risible and dangerous. As Steel pointed out, although the *ephors* originally executed a purely judicial role their power 'grew immense' and 'at last they took upon them to dethrone, or imprison, or execute, their Kings themselves.' When King Theopompus of Sparta relinquished his royal dignity it 'ended in the ruin of the commonwealth' and 'republica in tyrannidem conversa est.' Presumably calculating to irritate one of his combatants, Steele cited at length Molesworth's *Account of Denmark* to illustrate the point 'that too great a power in the hands of the nobility has brought on the ruin of many free states.'<sup>42</sup> Addison responded by re-asserting that no part of the constitution should be dependent on another: the bill cut off a branch of the prerogative 'which is pernicious to the publick'. George I had exercised his true dignity by the self-denying measure to preserve the 'liberty of his people'. Restrictions on the creation of peers would remove the dangers of bribery from the conduct of politics. More significantly, the expedient would safeguard the balance of property and power in favour of the Commons. A careful calculation of the relative wealth and consequent

power of a limited peerage and that of the Commons supported this assertion.<sup>43</sup> For successive issues the two authors contradicted the rival analyses of wealth and property between the institutions. Regardless of the figures, Steele's repeated fear was that the bill would 'change this free state into the worst of all tyrannys, that of an Aristocracy.'

The significance of the controversy is to be found both in the language and intention of the measure. That committed republicans such as Molesworth could support the 'shutting up' of the Lords as a instrument for preserving liberty establishes both the continuity of practical concerns with the nature of the constitution and the distinctively aristocratic quality of their commitments. The fury of the debate, conducted both within and without the doors of Parliament, also illustrates the fissures within Whig ideology. Although the defeat of the measure can be seen as evidence of the essentially conservative allegiance of the mainstream of the party to the established protocols of government, it also shows that there was a powerful minority of leading men who applied the principles of a republican tradition to the practical issues of political authority. The commonplace historiographical account has assessed the later 1710s as a complex and messy period (perhaps somewhat akin to the 1690s) resolved by the ascendancy of Walpole in the 1720s. The success, and longevity, of Walpole's management of parliamentary and ecclesiastical government forged by an alliance between the interests of property and the established church, has long obscured the radical ambitions of the ministry of the late 1710s. Walpole built his dominance out of the wreckage of republican aspirations. The defeat of the Peerage bill signalled the ministerial retrenchment of the achievement of any extravagant objectives, such as that of repeal of the Test Act, in favour of the logic of political survival.

### III

The manoeuvres for political ascendance between 1719 and 1721 were further complicated by the eruption of the crisis over the consequences of political involvement in the collapse of the financial speculation in the South Sea Company in late 1720. That the alliance of interests supporting the Sunderland-Stanhope ministry, forged in the connection between republican political theory and the attack upon priestcraft, was fragile once these common

pursuits were marginalised can be explored by examining the anti-ministerial arguments of the period. The nature of this language was resolutely republican: here was power struggle with pronounced ideological dimensions. As has been discussed above, the detachment of the Molesworth interest from the ministry resulted in the re-articulation of key republican works, calculated to cultivate a platform for the parliamentary elections of 1722. The most successful polemical campaign was executed (again) by the dual penmanship of Thomas Gordon and John Trenchard with the occasional assistance of Molesworth and Anthony Collins under the title of *Cato's Letters* and published in the *London Journal*. The sustained polemic of *Cato's Letters* systematically anatomised the corruption of the ministry and the court by the application of republican analyses of passion and private interest. Gordon was also responsible for the publication of a series of tracts exposing the betrayal of republican principles by the leading ministers. In his important *Three Political Letters to a noble Lord concerning liberty and the constitution* (1721) Gordon, citing the canonical republican texts of Sallust and Livy, complained that political corruption was threatening the 'noble Gothick Constitution'. In Spain, France, and Denmark 'the name of liberty is no more heard ... and slavery is taught to be an inheritance by divine right.' Invoking the 'Act of Settlement', Gordon insisted that 'we have a spirit of Virtue and Liberty reigning among us; we have a good and gracious prince, and a noble constitution guarded by excellent laws.' To reinforce the point, the Act of Settlement was transcribed with comments after each clause establishing the continuing application of the law: 'yet in force'. With the revival of 'antient English virtue' after 1689, governments had turned their purpose to the 'publick good'. 'Perfect liberty' and balance between prerogative and legislative power had established rule for the common good. When such government turned into 'unjust domination', it could only be reformed by a 'free people'. Discoursing on Livy's account of the decay of virtue under the Decemvirs, Gordon noted that (citing Machiavelli) that the people acted tumultuously to defend their freedom. Mankind was not made for the 'tyranny and lawless rule of one': *aequa libertas* meant that 'we have *enough* of prerogative, and not *too much* liberty.' Invoking the 'wisdom, virtue and liberty of the *Bill of Rights*' Gordon instructed his audience

to 'often read this sacred depositum of our rights, and bring up to our imagination, those noble patriots that established them.' Indeed, he converted the arguments of the Bill of Rights into a liturgical form: 'this Bill of Rights, thou shalt teach diligently unto thy children.' The warning implicit in the tract was that corrupt men like Walpole ('like the Fabii in Rome') could expect a vigorous opposition, both popular and political.<sup>44</sup>

The emphasis upon the importance of the *Act of Settlement* as a severe constitutional limitation on the monarchy was a continuation of the commonwealth understanding invoked by Toland's *Anglia libera* in 1701. The constant parallelism between the Roman Republic and Britain was more than literary rhetoric but further evidence of the living republican imagination.<sup>45</sup> These themes were revisited in the *Supplement* to the letters. Re-iterating the importance of 'limitations' upon even a good prince, Gordon insisted that it was 'absolutely necessary if men will preserve their liberties' that such measures were take with the most 'virtuous king'. Augustus was followed by Tiberius: 'his moderation was their ruin'. Citing the supporting evidence of Tacitus, amongst other sources, Gordon acknowledged that although William III and George were good princes, that upon such just men could be the source of political corruption: their generous actions might become acts of prerogative in less virtuous hands. Regardless of the 'wisdom, goodness and moderation' of the present monarchy, future kings might turn bad. Particular caution ought to be paid to the matter of religion since the 'Church and the state are interwoven'. The *Act of Settlement* had established acute limitations against intolerance, court corruption and prerogative, consequently 'Tis our good fortune to live in Republica Platonis, and not in a Faece Romuli.' There was a continuity of purpose to outlaw 'craftsmen in Politicks' and 'reform the people from Dan unto Bersheba'.<sup>46</sup>

Perhaps the most successful of Gordon's polemical tracts, which was steeped in republican language, was *The Conspirators; or the Case of Catiline* (1721) which achieved ten editions in London and two in Dublin between 1721 and 1722. Dedicated to the Earl of Sunderland, the work intended to expose the parallels between contemporary corruption and that of Rome. As Gordon pondered, 'our circumstances may be like those of old Rome when

the plot of Catiline was set on foot'. Sunderland was encouraged to be 'like a second Cato, [and] persecute corruption where-ever you find it'. Constantly citing classical Roman sources and the commentaries of Machiavelli, Gordon delivered an incisive republican analysis of the nature of conspiracy. Whether directed against the Prince or the commonwealth, conspiracies were 'perpetrated by some fraud: when it is against their wealth; or by terror, when it is against their liberties'. Luxury, ambition and 'incurable discontents' were the motors of corruption. Using Sallust's account of the Catiline conspiracy, Gordon traced the 'fall from virtue' and the subversion of the constitution. Corruption was born in religion: impiety towards the Gods, 'methods of stupefaction' and 'luxury and indolence' were the things that 'best prepare the minds of men for slavery, and reconcile them to meanness and servitude'.<sup>47</sup> Gordon's method was to make a specific parallel between the Roman conspirators and contemporary politicians: so the chief instrument of corruption was M.Hortensius, 'a base senator of no great family or fortune; but the little patrimony, which descended to him from his ancestors, he had wasted by promoting factions in the commonwealth, which he repair'd again by publick offices.' Weaving the account of Sallust into a contemporary narrative of the 'conspiracy' behind the South Sea Bubble, Gordon encouraged the audience to imagine Britain as the republic under threat. That it was an effective political strategy can be seen in the manuscript additions to various copies of the tract where the contemporary identity of the Roman figures has been established: Hortensius is noted as 'Walpole'.<sup>48</sup> There is some evidence to suggest that the keys to these parallels were circulated orally or distributed in print form, which would have help readers to establish the connections.<sup>49</sup> In the early 1720s the public readers of such works were quite comfortable with using a republican imagination to understand contemporary political affairs.

The second part of the *Conspirators* made even more of the parallels with ancient Rome. Unlike those who wrote under the persecution and tyranny of Tiberius, Gordon had no fears of collecting the 'flowers' of history to teach contemporaries. Although he acknowledged he was writing about the virtue of republics in times of kingly government, with George in place he expected no persecution. Gordon premised his discussion on an

engagement with the paradoxical maxim of Machiavelli, 'that the disagreement of the people and the senate of Rome made the Commonwealth both free and mighty.' Although Rome had been plagued by sedition, the combination of 'virtue, good fortune and military discipline' had created order. Popular tumults had been prompted by the 'encroachments' by the 'great ones' against liberty: consequently (as Machiavelli had pointed out) Rome was not 'a disorderly commonwealth; for good example proceed from good education, good education from good laws, and good laws from these very tumults.' At the time of Catiline, both the Senate and the tribunes had been corrupted by gold: this 'villainous harmony' corroded virtue. The evidence of such Roman examples suggested that such corruption in the eighteenth century should also be rooted out by tumult. To reinforce the point, Gordon extracted the elegiac verses of Solon on corruption in Athens (from Demosthenes) and the speech of Cicero against Catiline.<sup>50</sup> The language of Cato and the Catilines was not simply a device restricted to criticising the ministry and its conduct over the Bubble, but was an idiom for understanding contemporary political structures and conduct.

In *The Censor Censur'd: or Cato turn'd Catiline* (1722) the assault of Gordon and Trenchard was rebutted by an attempted inversion of the charge of conspiracy. It was the 'old Whigs', formerly dismissed as 'republicans, rebels and traitors', who were 'embroiling and perplexing affairs' just as they had in the reign of William III. Just like Camillus, who was 'driven from the City by the noise and rage of a faction, who accus'd him of bribery', ministers were falsely charged by pretended Whigs, men 'who would rather venture the wreck of the ship, than not have a hand at the helm.' Such men by taking texts 'out of Tacitus, Sallust, and their commentators; out of Machiavel, Sidney, Harrington, Locke and other modern authors' made a simple model of 'popular sentiments of tyranny and liberty'. These histories of corruption and courtiers provided an easy rhetoric for the popular press: 'whenever he meets with a Sejanus, a Gaveston, a Villiers, he need only write under the picture, Earl of Sunderland, Earl Stanhope; and the vulgar as naturally cry out, How like it is?' Such writers were simply rehearsing the arguments of the 1690s, in some case re-printing the 'pamphlets written by the disaffected and murmerers' on such issues as the

Standing Army. The drawing of historical comparisons was foolish and seditious: after all, 'what are the Romans and Lacedaemonians to us?'<sup>51</sup>

In the run up to the general election of 1722 (which proved to be one of the most hotly contested of the eighteenth century) there was an enormous amount of polemical literature that focused upon the dangers of corruption to the process of representation. In *A Compleat History of the late Septennial Parliament* (1722) the author deployed the standard republican critique of bribery: such electors 'by selling themselves, they must expect nothing less than slavery, and than to be abject slaves.' Recommending *Cato's Letters* and *Shaftesbury's Letters* (a work produced by Toland for the electoral campaign of Robert Molesworth), the advice was to avoid voting for court pensioners, those who supported the Septennial Acts or men implicated in the Bubble. 'A general corruption [had] spread its baleful Qualities throughout the whole body': the commons, instead of acting as servants to the public, had become the 'greatest invaders' of liberty and property. Indeed, underscoring the theme that it was a 'free nobility' that preserved the constitution, it was only the 'patriots' of the upper house that 'have exerted themselves for the publick welfare'. Although some peers had behaved themselves like Cicero 'we have not now a Roman Age, or a Roman people'. The commons had degenerated from the ancient constitution and become like the Rump Parliament. Documenting the successive infringements upon the constitution and liberties, the author called for a radical reform of electoral procedure and practise: all electors and prospective candidates should at the least take an oath against bribery.<sup>52</sup> Other tracts described the prospective MPs as 'Guardians of the People's properties and immunities'.<sup>53</sup>

Many works were addressed directly to the electorate and offered not only an attack upon the corruption of the current ministry, but also the means for a remedy. *The Art of Parliamenteering* (1722) exposed the secret history of electoral bribery and its pernicious consequences: bribery made slaves. In *A Guide to the Electors of Great Britain* (1722) having published the lists of MPs voting performances on key issues (the Triennial Act, the repeal of Occasional Conformity, and the Peerage Bill) the choice was reduced to that between 'the prerogative of the Crown, or ... the privileges of the people'.<sup>54</sup> A recurrent

theme was that 'you cannot be enslaved, but with chains of your own making'. Law was established to make freedom, but corruption might reduce that law to an instrument of slavery: the election was an opportunity 'to be free'.<sup>55</sup> The same invocation, 'use your freedom, and be neither soothed nor bribed about that which in our constitution is the great bulwark of your liberties' was repeatedly made.<sup>56</sup> John Trenchard, in *Seasonable Advice to the Electors of Great Britain* (1722), spoke out in defence of 'the glorious cause of LIBERTY' against the plunderers of the Bubble and those priest-ridden ministers who aimed to impose upon conscience. In particular, the electors should shun the men who had the support of the Church in favour of those that supported 'trade and commerce' and 'an happy union among all Protestants, whilst rebellion, Bigotry, Persecution and Priestcraft shall lie grovelling beneath our feet.' Tories and Highchurchmen could only be in favour of 'popery and slavery ... fit only to be subjects to Nebuchadnezzar, when (bereav'd of humane sense) he herded with the wild asses of the desert.'<sup>57</sup> Such advice could be replicated in many other pamphlets.

The repeated use of Catoic language, the indictment of conspiracy, and the fundamental concern with the corruption of the constitution by bribery and electoral malpractice was not a marginal or remote discourse but vitally related to the immediate matters of politics. Republican languages of virtue, liberty and regulation construed against tyranny, slavery and passion were not simply recapitulated in the various republications of men like Molesworth, Toland, Trenchard and Gordon, but were a central constituent in the vibrant and vigorous print culture of journals and polemical pamphlets. The printers James Roberts and John Peele seem to have been responsible for the vast majority of this 'republican' literature. The evidence of the multiple printings and editions of many of the works suggests, both that there was an audience that approved of the contents of the tracts, and that this audience was considerable. Certainly the success of the journals *The Freethinker*, *The Independent Whig* and *Cato's Letters* suggests that the republican polemic against corruption and tyranny was a functional one. The fact that from 1720 the ministry, increasingly under the management of Walpole, undertook a policy of regulating the press or

'buying' the services of the authors, could be seen as evidence for the effectiveness of both the medium and the message. These writings, distributed in a wide circulation in London and the provinces, were constructed from the traditions of both classical and seventeenth century republicanism: Cicero, Sallust, Tacitus, and Lucan were used alongside Harrington, Sidney, Milton and Machiavelli. To suggest that the republican tradition was neither vibrant nor popular seems wilfully mistaken. This articulation of a defence of free government, liberty and virtue, was not simply a politics of nostalgia, nor a language designed to advance a cultural politics of polite manners. Men like Molesworth and Toland wrote to achieve political power: the dual concerns of a limited and regulated monarchy, combined essentially with an entire freedom of religion were critical and fundamental matters of political debate. By the mid-1720s the overwhelming majority of the men who associated around men like Sunderland, Stanhope and even Molesworth in this agenda were dead. Politically, Walpole's skills in the arts of parliamentary management ensured that the radical republican ambitions of full liberty (civic and religious) were defeated in the name of ensuring political stability.

---

 NOTES

<sup>1</sup> J.G.A. Pocock 'The varieties of Whiggism from Exclusion to Reform: a history of ideology and discourse' in *Virtue, Commerce and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985): 215-310; A.B. Worden 'The Revolution and the English republican tradition' in J.I. Israel (ed.) *The Anglo-Dutch Moment. Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its world impact* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991): 241-77; Q. Skinner, *Liberty before Liberalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). See J.C.D. Clark *English Society 1660-1832. Religion, ideology, politics during the ancien régime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

<sup>2</sup> For a more detailed account of this republican moment see J.A.I. Champion, *Republican Learning. John Toland and the crisis of Christian culture, 1696-1722* (Manchester: PUBLISHER, 2003).

<sup>3</sup> See C. B. Realey 'The London Journal and its authors, 1720-1723' *Humanistic Studies of the University of Kansas* 5, Number 3 (1936): 1-38 has useful material on the context of newspapers and politics in the period. For a survey of the idea of freethinking see P. Miller '“Freethinking” and “Freedom of Thought” in Eighteenth-Century Britain', *Historical Journal*, 36 (1993): 599-617.

<sup>4</sup> See M. Harris, *London Newspapers in the age of Walpole* (London: Associated University Presses, 1987): 101.

<sup>5</sup> Personal communication from David Hayton.

<sup>6</sup> Harris, *London Newspapers*: 101.

<sup>7</sup> See *DNB*.

<sup>8</sup> For further discussion of the journal literature, see A. C. Thompson, 'Popery, politics and private judgement in early Hanoverian Britain', *Historical Journal*, 45 (2002): 333-356.

<sup>9</sup> *The Freethinker*, Number 1, 24 March 1718 (Collected edition, London, 1722): 3, 4, 5-6, 7.

<sup>10</sup> *The Freethinker*, Number 2 and 3: 10, 14.

<sup>11</sup> *The Freethinker*, Number 10 and 12: 64-65, 66, 77, 80.

<sup>12</sup> *The Freethinker*, Number 16: 107, 110-11; No. 17: 114.

<sup>13</sup> *The Freethinker*, Number 22: 151-53.

<sup>14</sup> *The Freethinker*, Number 30, 31: 231-32.

<sup>15</sup> *The Freethinker*, Number 24: 171-73; No. 25: 174, 178-79.

<sup>16</sup> *The Freethinker*, Number 34: 240, 245-46, 249.

- 
- <sup>17</sup> See M.P. McMahon, *The Radical Whigs, John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon* (PLACE: PUBLISHER, 1990).
- <sup>18</sup> Thomas Gordon, *A modest apology for Cardinal Alberoni* (1719): 6-7, 14-15, 16, 19, 21-22.
- <sup>19</sup> Thomas Gordon, *An Apology for the Danger of the Church* (1719): 3, 4, 6, 27, 32.
- <sup>20</sup> Thomas Gordon, *Priestianity: or a view of the disparity between the Apostles and the modern inferior clergy* (1720): iv, xiii, xiv, 4, 6-8, 9, 19.
- <sup>21</sup> Thomas Gordon, *The Character of an Independent Whig* (1720): 3, 6-7, 8-9, 11-12, 27.
- <sup>22</sup> Thomas Gordon, 'The tryal of Lord Cobham', BL Add Mss 21,153 folios 5-6, 7, 7v, 18, 21v.
- <sup>23</sup> Thomas Gordon, *The Independent Whig* (London, 1721): v, vi, xii, 8, 78.
- <sup>24</sup> See the excellent summary by C. Brooks, 'The debate on the Peerage Bill, 1719' in *Bicameralism. Tweekamerstel vroeger en nu* (eds) H.W. Blom, W.P. Blockmans, H. de Schepper (s-Gravenhage: PUBLISHER, 1992): 261-77.
- <sup>25</sup> See C. Jones, 'William, First Earl Cowper, Country Whiggery and the leadership of opposition in the House of Lords, 1720-23' in R.W. Davis (ed.), *Lords of Parliament. Studies 1714-1914* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995): 29-43; *idem*, 'The new opposition in the House of Lords, 1720-1723' *Historical Journal*, 36 (1993): 309-329. D. Lemmings 'Lord Chancellor Cowper and the Whigs, 1714-16' *Parliamentary History*, 9 (1990): 163-74.
- <sup>26</sup> See B. Williams, *Stanhope* (PLACE: PUBLISHER, 1934): 405.
- <sup>27</sup> The best work detailing the context to the bill is C. Jones '“Venice preserv’d; or a plot discovered”': the political and social context of the Peerage Bill of 1719' in C. Jones (ed.), *A Pillar of the Constitution: the House of Lords in British Politics, 1640-1784* (London: PUBLISHER, 1989): 79-112.
- <sup>28</sup> See A. Foord, *His Majesty's Opposition* (Oxford: PUBLISHER, 1964) p.93.
- <sup>29</sup> Jones, 'Venice Preserved': 103.
- <sup>30</sup> Jones, 'Venice Preserved': 111-12.
- <sup>31</sup> J. Roberts and A. Dodd, *The Limitation of the Peerage* (1720): 3.
- <sup>32</sup> *The Limitation of the Peerage*: 6, 8, 8-9, 15.
- <sup>33</sup> *The Limitation of the Peerage*: 17, 18, 20-21, 28.
- <sup>34</sup> *The Constitution Explain'd* (1719): 5-6, 8, 14, 17, 19, 21-22, 23, 30, 31-32, 34-35, 71.
- <sup>35</sup> See *Further Reasons against the Peerage Bill* (1719): 17.

- 
- <sup>36</sup> The case for self interest is most pithily put in *Some Reflections upon a pamphlet called the Old Whig* (1719): 7-8.
- <sup>37</sup> See *A supplement to the paper writ in defence of the Peerage Bill* (1719): 29, 30; *Six Questions, Stated and Answered* (1719): 9.
- <sup>38</sup> *The Thoughts of a member of the Lower House* (1719): 5, 7, 10, 12, 13, 18-19, 20.
- <sup>39</sup> *Remarks on a pamphlet entitled The Thoughts of a Member of the Lower House* (1719): 6, 14, 19, 21-22, 34.
- <sup>40</sup> For further discussion of this, see Champion, *Republican Learning*, Part 2, *passim*.
- <sup>41</sup> R. Steele, *The Town Talk, the Fishpond* (London, 1789); collected edition of *The Plebeian, The Old Whig*.
- <sup>42</sup> Steele, *The Town Talk, the Fishpond: The Plebeian* Number 1, 14 March 1719: 242, 243, 249, 251, 252-54.
- <sup>43</sup> *The Town Talk, the Fishpond: The Old Whig* Number 1, 19 March 1719: 258, 263-64, 265-69.
- <sup>44</sup> Thomas Gordon, *Three Political Letters to a noble Lord* (1721): 3, 4, 5, 7-8, 21, 22-23, 24, 26-29, 31-32, 36.
- <sup>45</sup> See David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999) for an account of this imagination in the 1650s.
- <sup>46</sup> Thomas Gordon, *A supplement to three political letters to a noble Lord* (1721): 2, 3, 6-7, 8-9, 12, 14, 16, 30-31, 32, 36-37.
- <sup>47</sup> Thomas Gordon, *The Conspirators; or the case of Catiline* (1721: 9<sup>th</sup> edition): iv, vi, ix-x, xiii, 1, 3, 5, 8-9, 10-12, 22.
- <sup>48</sup> See Thomas Gordon, *The Conspirators* [BL Call-Mark 518.e.21(2)]: 10-11, 25, 28.
- <sup>49</sup> See Realey, 'The London Journal': 7.
- <sup>50</sup> Thomas Gordon, *The Conspirators. Part II* (1721: 3<sup>rd</sup> edition) [BL 578.c.21(3)]: 1-2, 6, 9, 10, 11-12, 34-35, 36, 54-55.
- <sup>51</sup> *The Censor Censur'd; or Cato turn'd Catiline* (1722): 3, 4, 4-5, 7, 10-11, 17, 23-24, 25.
- <sup>52</sup> *A Compleat History of the late Septennial Parliament* (1722): v, vii, viii, 10, 12, 13, 16, 32-33, 36-62, 68.
- <sup>53</sup> See *The benefit and advantages gain'd by the late Septennial Parliament set in a clear light* (1722): 3.

---

<sup>54</sup> *A Guide to the Electors of Great Britain* (1722).

<sup>55</sup> *A Letter of Advice to the Freeholders of Great Britain* (1722): 9, 10, 14, 38.

<sup>56</sup> *Advice and Considerations for the Electors of Great Britain* (1722): 4.

<sup>57</sup> John Trenchard, *Seasonable Advice to the Electors of Great Britain* (1721): 5, 9, 8-11, 12-13, 14, 17.