

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 6

PART ONE

Introduction	vii
Defoe's Preface	1
<i>A Review of the State of the British Nation</i> (31 March – 29 September 1709)	6

PART TWO

<i>A Review of the State of the British Nation</i> (1 October 1709 – 23 March 1710)	387
Index	753

copyright material

copyright material

## INTRODUCTION

Volume 6 of Defoe's *Review* ran from 31 March 1709 to 23 March 1710. It was the first volume to be published both in London and Edinburgh. For the most part the Edinburgh edition was a reprint of the London text, often adapted in some way for northern readers. But not always. The editions differ wholly when Defoe concentrates on specifically Scottish concerns, such as defending Scotland from criticism by the English, or explaining how to improve Scottish agriculture and trade. On these occasions Defoe writes text for Scottish readers which English readers did not see.<sup>1</sup> On some occasions it is the London edition which reprints text originally published in Edinburgh, not the other way round. (This is discussed below.) Defoe founded the Edinburgh edition partly in response to a request for a publication of their own from Scottish readers who wished to generate the kind of political debate which London had already enjoyed, after censorship, for a dozen years. The desire may be a premonitory flicker of the Scottish Enlightenment.

This dual publication of the *Review* in 1709-10 may have formed part of a larger aim Defoe now cherished to establish himself more permanently in Scotland. When he went north in August 1709 he took along his son Benjamin Norton, who in October joined the second-year class at Edinburgh University and remained in residence there until July 1711. Charles Eaton Burch speculates that Defoe, who in 1710 also gained control of the *Edinburgh Courant* and the *Scots Postman*, and was in 'active partnership' with the Newcastle bookseller and printer Joseph Button (publisher of the *Newcastle Gazette*), was preparing his son to assist him in these ventures and may have 'looked forward to the day when Benjamin would take over these papers and become a power in Scottish journalism'.<sup>2</sup> Maximilian Novak suggests that Defoe aimed to gain 'overall control of the press in Edinburgh'.<sup>3</sup>

From another viewpoint the dual publication of the *Review* in 1709-10 may appear less surprising. Rather it was one more innovation from an author notably resourceful in new ideas, particularly when a problem or opportunity

---

<sup>1</sup> As in the *Review* of 2, 5 April, the 'Miscellanea' section of 27 September, and 25 October 1709 (Edinburgh edition).

<sup>2</sup> Charles Eaton Burch, 'Benjamin Defoe at Edinburgh University', *Philological Quarterly*, 19 (1940), pp. 343-8 (p. 348). For the contract between Defoe and the printer David Fearn over the *Scots Postman* see Paula R. Backscheider, *Daniel Defoe. His Life* (Baltimore and London, 1989), p. 577, note 28. For Benjamin's falling-out with and eventual opposition to his father, see *DNB*.

<sup>3</sup> Maximilian Novak, *Daniel Defoe, Master of Fictions* (Oxford, 2001), p. 375.

presented itself. Defoe first founded the *Review* in 1704 as an unusual combination of serious politics with light entertainment, (the latter in the ‘Advice’ from the ‘Scandalous Club’), at a time when other similar journals of opinion, such as John Tutchin’s *Observer*, were altogether earnest. Defoe in mixing the comic and serious in the same periodical took a hint from Henry Care, who in the 1680s had combined with his *Weekly Pacquet of Advice from Rome* a satirical *Popish Courant*.<sup>1</sup> Some months later he then siphoned off the satire into distinct supplements to prevent the politics from being swamped by frivolity and gossip. In volume 2 (1705) came new and bigger developments. While increasing publication from twice a week to three times a week, he ditched the monthly supplements and founded instead the new independent *Little Review*, a periodical wholly satirical, which appeared twice a week on the days when no main *Review* was available. This meant that he now wrote five *Reviews* each week, three of them serious and two satirical. He terminated the *Little Review* when it too became encroaching and concentrated on the serious *Review* proper, combining it however with a lighter ‘Miscellanea’ column from time to time to vary the tone.

Now in 1709-10 these changes were followed by the new idea of simultaneous publication in Scotland and England. It is hard to name anything in the work of other writers of the time comparable to this initiative. Perhaps in one sense John Dyer’s Tory handwritten *News-Letter* came nearest, for Dyer’s method was to adapt the stories in that sheet to his readers’ regional and political interests, which meant that the contents of the same edition might vary from county to county. Defoe archly comments on this blatant pandering to prejudice by his rival when he writes that Dyer

does not so much write what his Readers should believe, as what they would believe — Not what is Fact, but what will please them — and therefore, when a Friend of mine wrote to him to send him his Letter for a Coffee-House he had set up in a Countrey-Town, he wrote back to that Gentleman to send him Word what sort of People used his House, and he would send them such News as would fit them. (9 February 1710 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 14 February)

Since Dyer’s *News-Letter* also included space in which readers could add their own items of news before passing the periodical on to others, it could claim to be many-authored. But in range and seriousness it does not challenge Defoe’s London and Edinburgh edition of the *Review*, and no other journal comes near.

---

<sup>1</sup> Defoe acknowledges the link in his ‘Introduction’ to the *Supplement* of September 1704 (volume 1, p. 393). Care was an admired Protestant writer of Defoe’s youth.

\*

While writing volume 6 Defoe spent his time for the fourth year in a row partly in England and partly in Scotland, or travelling between the two. Few letters survive from the period 1709-10, as Lord Godolphin, his new patron, did not preserve them, so precise dates for his movements cannot be established. But from hints in the *Review* we know that he left London on his journey north in August 1709.<sup>1</sup> He was in Huntingdonshire about 17 August, and by 22 August had reached Derby. He arrived in Scotland before mid-September.<sup>2</sup> It appears that shortly after this Defoe must have left Edinburgh for another journey further north, for on 13 September (Edinburgh edition; reprinted in London on 17 September) he attributed a missed *Review* deadline – the London edition for Thursday 15 September 1709 had failed to come out – to a friend's delay in posting the copy left with him when Defoe set out.<sup>3</sup> A little later Defoe apologised for summarising German history from memory because he was still 'at the Writing of this in the *North of North Britain*, and remote from the Help of Books or Assistance of others, whose Memory might be better furnish'd than my own' (20 September 1709 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 22 September). Some weeks later, back in Edinburgh, he summarises his journey north in the course of discussing the corn harvest, and in the following number, still on the subject of harvest, describes himself looking through his study window at 'the Fields standing full of the Shocks of Corn, the Quantity great, the Sheaves heavy, the Season kindly, and all Hands busie carrying it home' (15 October 1709 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 18 October). From later comments we know that Defoe remained in Scotland through October and November 1709.<sup>4</sup> His throwaway remark about 'what to us here in *London* will be no News' (13 December, London edition; reprinted in Edinburgh on 15 December) may be a textual device, for he apparently stayed in Scotland until early 1710. He wrote a poem on resignation as a 'little Legacy' for those he left behind when he went south again (28 January 1710, Edinburgh edition; not reprinted in London). Probably the Sacheverell row which blew up in December 1709, and which is discussed below, turned Defoe back to England.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Review*, 13 October 1709 (London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 15 October).

<sup>2</sup> *Review*, 13 September 1709 (London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 20 September).

<sup>3</sup> There was another missed issue on Thursday 29 December 1709; see the preliminary headnote to the *Review*, 31 December 1709 (London edition).

<sup>4</sup> *Review*, 25 October 1709 (Edinburgh edition, not reprinted in London) and 3 November 1709 (London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 12 November).

Paula Backscheider calls the resignation poem with which Defoe closed his stay in Scotland a gloomy piece.<sup>1</sup> Indeed some lines in it do seem wary, if not weary, with Defoe emphasising the untrustworthiness of worldly hope. It would be surprising if a degree of personal anxiety were not behind the writing. Defoe's repeated stays in the north must have deepened his sense of dropping out of view in the world of London power. There were, as usual with Defoe, other worries. By January 1710, after a year, his Edinburgh edition remained problematic. (It would be terminated after thirty five numbers of volume 7.) Benjamin Norton may already have been a trouble to his father. Well might Defoe claim:

*His full Dependance is on GOD,  
He owns and eyes his Pow'r,  
He knows he must Account to Him,  
And waits with joy the Hour.*

*In vain we talk of Happiness  
In any State below;  
There is no Calm on Earth, but what  
Must from this Temper flow.*

(28 January 1710, Edinburgh edition)

Readers have detected a change in tone between *Review* 5 and *Review* 6. Maximilian Novak notes that after the Mad Man's departure from its pages on 18 November 1708 (volume 5) the *Review* became grave, as Defoe himself conceded, and while it remained 'a varied and well-written journal' it seemed to lack charm.<sup>2</sup> It is not that the writing is worse. But while Defoe never abandoned entertainment his subjects become more serious. Contemporaries must especially have felt this when the *Tatler* began to appear on 12 April 1709. Defoe acknowledged himself outdone in polite wit by Addison and Steele, saying on one occasion, 'I do not pretend to be famous for my Concern at pleasing you' but adding that 'If I can serve you, it will do every way as well' (13 October 1709, London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 15 October). But it was not just the challenge of the *Tatler*. The tone of literature in general was also changing. After the *Tatler*, new writers with a sprightlier manner and broader range than Tutchin, Leslie and Ridpath contributed to the *Spectator*, its successor, and left behind the old earnest constitutional discussions. These included Pope, Swift, Budgell, Hughes, Tickell and others. The *Examiner*, for

---

<sup>1</sup> Backscheider says that in December 1708 Defoe had been 'less creative and less committed to anything than at any other time in his life' and infers from the poem that some 'emotional struggle' was draining him (*Daniel Defoe*, p. 263). There is no loss of energy in the writing however.

<sup>2</sup> Novak, *Defoe, Master of Fictions*, pp. 341-3.

which Swift wrote, was answered by Arthur Maynwaring in *The Whig Examiner* (with Addison as a contributor), and Maynwaring with John Oldmixon also produced *The Medley* as a reply to the *Examiner*.<sup>1</sup> While not depreciating the literature of its early years, the polite sparkle of the second decade of the eighteenth century could make even Defoe's work, though in vigour and invention inferior to none, seem unfashionable. It would be John Gay's assessment in 1711.<sup>2</sup> Defoe already saw it in 1709-10.

\*

The sixth volume's dual publication in London and Edinburgh makes for an unusually complicated text while the experiment lasted,<sup>3</sup> of which the following account may be helpful in this place. Defoe's initial idea was to reproduce the London text in an Edinburgh printing. This, as suggested above, was to meet an interest among Scottish readers he had himself helped to develop, who now clubbed together and 'by their own voluntary Subscription encourag'd the Reprinting it at *Edinburgh*'.<sup>4</sup> We get a hint of the agreement in Defoe's later reminder to his Edinburgh readers, when the Scottish edition was in difficulties, that if they now wanted to drop their support it would be fair to honour their original commitment and give agreed notice. Defoe writes that although, '*if the Gentlemen think it is no longer useful to the publick Good*', he is content to terminate the Edinburgh edition, yet

*he Humbly, and with Respect desires to remind the Gentlemen subscribing to it, That the Terms of Subscription were to oblige the Subscribers for two Years, with a certain time of Notice, when they resolve to decline; and it would be but just to give the Author, who lives so Remote, and is at a certain*

---

<sup>1</sup> John Oldmixon summarises this pamphlet warfare in 1709-11 in his *History of England* (1735), pp. 456-7. Of Defoe Oldmixon writes that according to Arthur Maynwaring '*De Foe had great Obligations to the Lord-Treasurer Godolphin, when he began to turn his Reviews against his generous Benefactor; and wrote his Lordship a Letter, that he did it in compliance with the Madness of the Times; and seem'd to fall in with those who clamour'd against his Administration, only that he might get a Hearing in his Favour: Nay, this base Wretch took Money at the same time of the Lord Godolphin, who paid him half a Year's Pension after he wrote against him, and of Mr. R. Harley, who sent him to Scotland as a Spy, when the Treaty of Union was on foot, and kept him in Pay ever after, as a Man whose Conscience was exactly of a Size with his own*' (p. 456). The letter mentioned from Defoe to Godolphin has not survived.

<sup>2</sup> See the Introduction to the *Review*, vol 5, pp. xxvi-xxvii.

<sup>3</sup> He dropped the Edinburgh imprint after thirty five numbers; see A.W. Secord (ed.), *Defoe's Review*, facsimile edition, 22 vols (New York, 1938), Book 14, p. v.

<sup>4</sup> See the *Review*, volume 5, 'Preface' p. 1.

*Charge in the Publication, the Time of warning agreed upon, that as he publishes it without Gain, so he may lay it down without Loss.* (14 March 1710, Edinburgh edition)

From the first Defoe did not simply reissue London material in Edinburgh. On the contrary, the Edinburgh edition assumed a textual integrity of its own. For example, to get the venture under way he wrote four introductory numbers exclusively for Edinburgh readers. Although thereafter he did generally reproduce London material in Edinburgh, it was not always so. Sometimes he reversed roles and reprinted Edinburgh material in London. At others he published material in one edition only. This makes the relationship between the editions sometimes confusing. The following summary attempts to unravel this and help the modern reader not to get lost in the textual complications. In this material I have drawn freely upon the earlier work of Edward G. Fletcher and A.W. Secord.<sup>1</sup>

There was a difference in dates. The great bulk of volume 6, that is to say 125 numbers out of 160, consists of text first published in London and later reproduced in Edinburgh. But there are another 18 numbers which consist of text first published in Edinburgh and later reproduced in London. Of these 18 numbers, 9 appeared during the 'exceedingly complex'<sup>2</sup> period from September to December 1709, when Defoe was in Scotland, and the other 9 in January 1710, when he was either in London or on the road. Adding these 18 'Edinburgh first' numbers to the 125 'London first' numbers gives a total of 143 numbers whose text is common to both editions. On top of that we must include a further 7 numbers which appeared only in London (bringing the London total to 150 numbers) and a further 10 numbers which appeared only in Edinburgh (bringing the Edinburgh total to 153 numbers). The grand total of 160 numbers is made up of the 125 numbers published first in London, the 18 numbers published first in Edinburgh, the 7 numbers published only in London and the 10 numbers published only in Edinburgh.<sup>3</sup>

The London edition ran from 5 April 1709 to 23 March 1710 and the Edinburgh edition from 31 March 1709 to 28 March 1710 (with a nine-day hiatus on 14-23 April 1709). In other words the Edinburgh edition began five days before and ended five days after the London edition. This looks unsyn-

---

<sup>1</sup> E.G. Fletcher, 'The London and Edinburgh Printings of Defoe's *Review*, Volume VI', *Studies in English* Number 14, University of Texas Bulletin, No. 3426: July 8, 1934, pp. 50-58; Secord (ed.), *Defoe's Review*, 14, pp. viii-xxix.

<sup>2</sup> Secord (ed.), *Defoe's Review*, 14, p. ix.

<sup>3</sup> A table of these 160 numbers, with details of the textual relationship between Edinburgh and London in each of them, will be found in the Appendix, pp. xxxii-xxxvi below.

chronised, and Defoe never dovetailed the editions exactly, but after a while had established the predominant pattern. First of all he linked together the four opening Edinburgh numbers as a single introduction to the new venture (31 March and 2, 5 and 7 April 1709) while he brought volume 5 in London to a close. Secord thought the third and fourth of these Edinburgh-only numbers (5 and 7 April 1709) ‘dull and repetitious’,<sup>1</sup> and accuses Defoe of merely marking time, but this may be harsh. In them Defoe describes the abuse he has suffered for writing and appears concerned about more possible attacks in the future, so that the lengthy discussion is understandable.

The first London number (5 April 1709) appeared in Edinburgh on 9 April, that is after the four introductory Edinburgh numbers had been completed. Thereafter the two editions coincided textually sufficiently closely and regularly for a pattern to be established according to which the London copy appeared and then was reissued in Edinburgh a few days afterwards. Thus, for example, the second London number for 7 April appeared in Edinburgh on 12 April. The third London number for 9 April appeared in Edinburgh on 14 April. This arrangement was broken by the nine-day hiatus mentioned earlier (14-23 April), but once this had been got over the editions ran in harness more or less regularly but now with the longer time-lapse – eleven days, increasing to twelve after a while. For further details of the relationship during the remainder of the year between individual *Review* numbers published both in England and in Scotland, along with variants, the reader should turn to the textual footnotes to each number, which draw upon A.W. Secord’s painstaking analysis, and to Secord himself.<sup>2</sup>

As in earlier volumes, Defoe’s text is organised here purely according to calendar sequence. All *Review* numbers are positioned according to their date of first publication irrespective of whether they appeared first in London or Edinburgh. This is a different arrangement from A.W. Secord’s, who grouped the London and Edinburgh publications separately, made London the main text and placed all the Edinburgh numbers he included at the back of the book as an appendix. Secord was being consistent in this, as he had similarly relegated to appendix status the Scandal Club *Supplements* in volume 1 and the *Little Review* numbers in volume 2. The arrangement recognises that the Edinburgh edition, *Supplements* and *Little Review* were not planned by Defoe from the outset of the *Review* but introduced as afterthoughts. But appendicising might suggest the unfortunate impression that what Defoe wrote for Edinburgh is less important than what he wrote for London, either in his view or ours, and influence a reader away from reading his essays in the right order,

---

<sup>1</sup> Secord (ed.), *Defoe’s Review*, 14, p. x.

<sup>2</sup> Secord (ed.), *Defoe’s Review*, 14, pp. ix-xxix.

or reading some of them at all. But the fact is that all the *Review* essays, whether for Edinburgh or for London, whether satirical or serious, are discussions of live issues which unfolded as Defoe wrote and must be regarded as of equal value because there is no evidence that he gave less of himself to the material he wrote for one than for the other. Besides this the connection of essay with essay backwards and forwards sometimes helps to explain them and their contents and this is made less obvious and may be lost if one group is relegated to the back of the book.

The principle followed here then is that of chronology. What Defoe wrote is presented in the order in which he published it (except for the 'Preface' which opens the volume, but was as usual written last).<sup>1</sup> *Review* numbers are presented, referenced and identified in the notes according to the place and date of their first appearance. But two points of procedure still may need explaining. First, occasionally two textually identical numbers, one in London and the other in Edinburgh, appeared on the same day. When that happens this edition reproduces only the London number, and omits the Edinburgh number (beyond noting that it appeared). This is because nothing would be served by reprinting the same essay twice, and, in those circumstances, the London number may be allowed to take priority. (Secord made a similar decision.) This happens with London number 76 and Edinburgh number 76, which were both published on Thursday 29 September 1709; also with numbers 77, 78, 79, 92, 99, 100, 101, 102, 113 and 114. The second point of procedure concerns what might be called the opposite scenario, that is when two textually different numbers appear on the same date in London and Edinburgh. In this case both numbers are printed here in full, again with the London number placed first and the Edinburgh number of the same date immediately following it.

Presenting the material in this way, it has been judged, has the advantage of allowing the reader to read Defoe's work in the order in which it was written and published with the minimum of fuss. But on the other hand intermingling the texts of the two editions might run the risk of confusing the reader since the two editions are, of course, numbered in different sequences, even when the text is the same (and the original numbering has been retained in this edition). Therefore, to minimise confusion, and to ensure that readers may always know where they are in the volume, some extra information has been included in the heading note attached to each number. As in previous volumes, this heading note lists the essay's number and date. But it now also includes the essay's original place of publication, and whether or not it was

---

<sup>1</sup> Defoe wrote this after all the year's numbers had appeared individually but meant it to appear at the front of the collected volume.

republished in the other edition (in which case the number, place of publication and date of the reissue are added). As noted above, if a *Review* number appeared first in London and then without significant textual change in Edinburgh, or vice versa, only the first version is reproduced here; but still the number and date of the reissue are included in the heading note and any textual variations between the editions will be found footnoted in the normal way. Since 143 numbers out of the total of 160 numbers in volume 6 do share the same content, this expanded heading note applies to most of the numbers in the volume. When a *Review* number appeared only in London and not in Edinburgh (which applies to 7 numbers), or vice versa (which applies to 10 numbers), this information is also included in the heading note. These details, it is hoped, will enable a reader to proceed straightforwardly through the essays in the order in which they were written while also remaining aware at any one time which readership, English or Scottish, a given number was written for. The reader may also observe from the footnotes how Defoe may have changed the text when he reissued it.

To illustrate this, take the following summary of the first few numbers in the volume as they now appear. After Defoe's 'Preface' the first number to appear is the Edinburgh-only essay dated 31 March 1709 (numbered '1.' in the Edinburgh sequence). In this number Defoe introduces the new edition to Scottish readers. He explains that, having been abused for his writings in the south, he expects to find similar unkindness in the north, but instead of flattering readers to avoid this he is determined to continue to tell them the truth. This essay predates all other numbers published in volume 6 and is therefore printed here as the first number of the volume. It did not appear in London.

Next comes the second Edinburgh-only essay dated 2 April 1709 (numbered '2.' in the Edinburgh sequence). In this number Defoe continues his introductory remarks to Scottish readers. It predates all the remaining material in the volume and is therefore placed here second. It too did not appear in London.

Third in order comes the first London essay of volume 6 (numbered '1.' in the London sequence). In it Defoe argues that French power needs to be reduced, but not so far as to destabilize Europe. This essay was published on 5 April 1709. The heading note explains that Defoe subsequently reprinted it in Edinburgh on 9 April 1709 (numbered '5.' in the Edinburgh sequence). Since both versions are textually identical, only the London number is reproduced here.

Fourth comes the third Edinburgh-only essay (numbered '3.' in the Edinburgh sequence). In this number Defoe continues his introductory remarks to Edinburgh readers. It was published on the same day and carries the same

date (5 April 1709) as the first London number, and therefore is printed immediately after that number. But note that the texts of the two numbers are different. The text of this Edinburgh number was not reissued in London.

Fifth comes the second London essay published on 7 April 1709 (numbered '2.' in the London sequence). In it Defoe praises Lord Godolphin as the general of the generals. The heading note explains that Defoe subsequently reprinted this essay in Edinburgh on 12 April 1709 (numbered '6.' in the Edinburgh sequence). Since both versions are textually identical, only the London text is reproduced here.

These examples may be enough to show that in placing a particular *Review* in sequence throughout the present volume priority is always given to its date of publication. To find a given number the reader should identify the date when it was first published, check the heading note for any later reissue, and identify textual variants in the latter, if any, in the footnotes.

A final difference between the two editions concerns advertisements. Unless otherwise stated, all advertisements listed here are of the London edition. Edinburgh advertisements, being few, are noted in the textual footnotes. For a fuller account of this aspect the reader is referred to Secord's summary.<sup>1</sup>

\*

Defoe began his Edinburgh venture with high hopes. But problems appeared both in London and in Scotland in the form of personal harassment and attempted sabotage. Political opponents in London initiated a malicious legal persecution so as to embroil Defoe with the law and force closure. He describes hearing in Scotland that his *Review* was to be presented as a public nuisance in an English court (25 October 1709 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 29 October) and anticipates that it might 'die the Death of its Fathers' and 'be silenc't for speaking too naked Truth'.<sup>2</sup> Near the close of the volume came a sabotage attempt on his production and distribution service in Scotland, when '*Threatning and scandalous Letters*' were sent to his Edinburgh printer Mrs Anderson '*to warn her not to print it*' (14 March 1710, Edinburgh edition). Defoe reminded readers in London that copies could always be found for sale at 'Mr. *Nathaniel Cliff*'s, Bookseller in *Cheapside*, near *Mercer*'s-

---

<sup>1</sup> Secord (ed.), *Defoe's Review*, 14, p. xi.

<sup>2</sup> Later he talked of 'the Clamour of the Town against this Paper, upon Account of its being presented at the *Old-Baily* with another Paper, (*of what Kind I know not*) as A NUSANCE' (1 November 1709 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 8 November).

*Chappel*, and at Mrs. *Pike* at the Sign of the *Golden Perrwig* at *Charing Cross*;' (21 March 1710, London edition).

Such harassment bears testimony to the effectiveness of Defoe's writing. And, in fact, the interruptions proved slight. Over the year Defoe established his *Review* on a separate footing in London and Edinburgh, reaching into Northumberland and Westmoreland and adjacent counties and distributing copies in various places in Northern Ireland,<sup>1</sup> so that it could be said that the *Review* approached the status of a national publication. That he sustained this for so long under the logistical difficulty of working at a great distance for long spells, and much time spent on the road, and against the spoiling efforts of opponents, to say nothing of other large literary commitments on his hands (such as the *History of the Union*), extorts admiration for his invention and stamina.

Defoe's 'Preface' to volume 6 concentrates on the Sacheverell controversy because as the volume closed that subject came to overtop other discussions and it was still foremost in Defoe's mind as he looked back over the year. The huge controversy provoked by Sacheverell's sermon at St Paul's on 5 November 1709, subsequently printed and massively distributed, followed by his impeachment, trial and conviction and then his triumphant cavalcade across country, provoked a controversy (not to say a constitutional crisis) to which Defoe paid increasing attention from December 1709. As he says, therefore, his Preface is less about the issues addressed in the volume as a whole than the 'very particular' subject which occupied its closing numbers, and to take it as a representative summary would give a skewed picture of the contents.

Sacheverell we may postpone until later in this introduction. Much of the volume deals with topics already familiar from previous years. They include the progress of the war, the Union, scandals in finance and the latest English xenophobia provoked by the Palatine immigration. All of these topics occupied Defoe in the summer months. Early in the volume he developed a debate which he had once with John Tutchin concerning the balance of power in Europe and the world. Defoe remained in 1709 no less conscious of French power than he had been when beginning the *Review* in 1704, but was especially struck after five years of war by France's ability to return again and again promptly and fully armed to the battlefield following stunning defeats. The French king, he notes on 15 September 1709, had survived the over-

---

<sup>1</sup> 'NOTE, The Counties of *Nortumberland* and *Westmoreland* are also supply'd with this Paper from *Scotland*, together with the Towns of *Belfast*, *Carrickfergus*, and City of *London-Derry* in *Ireland*.' (4 June 1709 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 16 June).

throw of his armies in ‘five dreadful Battles, two of which were enough to have over-whelm’d the *Roman* Empire’.<sup>1</sup> Yet Defoe begins to stress a new angle on affairs. He still condemns Louis XIV’s rage for dominion, which had united the surrounding nations against him. He recognises that they have brought France to the edge of defeat. But he now urges that the nations who fought to defeat France must now preserve France:

Has he not danc’d now these 50 Years in a Circle? — And if he dies the same King of meer abstracted *France*, that at 8 Years old he began to be, ’tis the favourable Circumstance of *Europe*’s divided Interest that he owes it to, not his own Power or Ability to defend himself; were he fighting against a single Monarch, and reduc’d Thursdays low, he must have fallen without Recovery; but as we are confederated Powers, and have respective Interests, we fight for Peace, and not for Conquests; and therein lies the King of *France*’s Safety. (15 September 1709 Edinburgh edition, reprinted in London on 22 September)

Defoe’s love of paradox is visible here, but it is not all paradox. For Defoe, the solution to the problem of international relations was to establish a lasting European balance of power. This he would make a predominant theme in the remaining volumes of the *Review*. Advancing it in April 1709, he envisages the forerunner of a kind of militarised United Nations of the eighteenth century which would hold the hands of tyrants and keep the peace for succeeding generations. Thus when judging that France must be pulled down to manageable size and no longer allowed to bully neighbouring states he still insists on moderation. France, Defoe says, must remain at the end strong enough to act against any other ambitious ruler in the future. In saying this Defoe had the Emperor chiefly in his sights, but even Britain might be meant. On Austria Defoe states that the ‘present Run upon *France*’ should not ‘blindly’ carry the allies into building up the Emperor’s power again in reaction. The best security against a resurgent Austria would be France ‘reduced to its proper Bounds’ (19 April 1709 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 30 April). He applied the same principle to troubled northern Europe where the nations were threatening war:

If then the *Muscovite*, or the *Pole*, should attempt to push their Victory beyond a just Peace — I must declare my self as much a *Swede*, as I am now a *Saxon*. Balance is the Word; the Safety of *Europe* depends on Peace, and all Peace is founded upon Equalities and Proportions. (23 August 1709 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 3 September)

---

<sup>1</sup> Presumably Blenheim (1704), Ramillies (1706), Turin (1706), Oudenard (1708) and Malplaquet (1709).

Again and again when discussing the war Defoe urges the need not for any peace, but for a lasting peace, to which a balance of national interests was the only approach. At the time of writing exorbitant power meant France. But in different circumstances it could mean 'Charles III' of Spain, or any other power which threatened the common good – including England. Exorbitant power, Defoe wrote, 'is the wild Beast we hunt', and wherever he is found 'we must unkenel and dislodge him':

nay if it were to *England* it self, all the rest of *Europe* are engag'd to pursue him, and give him no Rest, no not in *Europe*.

(5 April 1709 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 9 April)

On this subject Alan Downie comments that Defoe's consistent preference was for 'an embryonic League of Nations to preserve peace through the maintenance of a balance of power'.<sup>1</sup> How accurate this assessment is may be illustrated from Defoe's own words. He writes:

Nay, what if I should say, that it is now in the Power of the present Confederacy for ever to prevent any more War in *Europe* — It is in their Power to make themselves Arbiters of all the Differences and Disputes that ever can happen in *Europe*, whether between Kingdom and Kingdom, or between Sovereign and Subjects. A Congress of this Alliance may be made a Court of Appeals for all the injur'd and oppressed, whether they are Princes or People that are or ever shall be in *Europe* to the End of the World. Here the Petty-States and Princes shall be protected against the Terror of their powerful Neighbours, the Great shall no more oppress the Small, or the Mighty devour the Weak; this very Confederacy have at this time, and if they please may preserve to themselves the Power of banishing War out of *Europe* — They are able from henceforward to crush the strongest, and support the weakest. (19 April 1709 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 30 April)

This uncannily predictive suggestion, Defoe comments, 'may pass for a wild Thought of mine,' adding, 'I confess, it is new and undigested'.

Though often charged with coat-turning, he was no less consistent on many other topics, including Jacobitism, Union, the Church of Scotland, credit and finance, immigration and Sacheverell. If Defoe hired his pen to the ministry, and in 1709-10 wrote to support a government view, the opinions expressed also largely chime in with his own commitments. Perhaps one sees the propagandist and independent commentator working in harmony. (It may not have remained so in later years.) Explaining his own position, Defoe

---

<sup>1</sup> J.A. Downie, 'Daniel Defoe's *Review* and Other Political Writings in the Reign of Queen Anne,' M. Litt. Thesis, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1973, p. 197.

claimed not to be tied to a single ministry but to support whatever administration the Queen saw fit to appoint so long as it adhered to the Revolution principles of toleration, parliamentary monarchy and the Protestant succession. Although willing to adapt to those who came in, so long as they adhered to those ideas, and disengage from those who went out, Defoe denied mercenary motivations. When his Tory patron Harley was replaced in 1708 by Godolphin, allied to the Whigs, Defoe transferred to Godolphin with Harley's approval and supported Whig policies. Now in 1709, one year on, contemplating the possibility of a new Tory ministry, he argues that if one comes in it will have to pursue existing policies, which meant that 'The Moment they enter upon the Publick Management, they must commence *WHIGS*' (21 May 1709 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 2 June). Whether Defoe here gave a nudge to men of power, hinted at the price of his support, encouraged the existing ministry, teased the reader or all at once we cannot be sure. His talent for ingenious sophistry certainly livens up the page. He could argue persuasively that black is white.

When Louis XIV rejected the peace preliminaries of 1709 Defoe reiterated that France must be left neither too powerful nor too weak since other ambitious nations might need to be reined in by an alliance of opposing powers. But without back-tracking he shifted emphasis as circumstances changed. When the news first broke of the rejected peace moves he said that Louis XIV must be forced to sign whether he liked it or not and was for negotiating directly with the states of France and by-passing the king (4, 9 June 1709 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 16, 21 June). This was the hard-line Whig view. But then Defoe played up the potential Imperial threat, responding to the changing political situation 'while trying for consistency at the same time'.<sup>1</sup> Soon he was being less emphatic on the subject of forcing France to sign and shifted his attention to trade, credit, manufacture and the national wealth. These were topics close to his heart but they were also, in an uncertain time, safe to talk about. Jacobitism was another standby. In April and May 1709 he spent much time urging Jacobites, whom France could no longer support, to come in from the cold. Defoe wrote what he thought but kept an eye on shifting ministerial policy and wrote with that in mind.

He had always done this. After 1705 as ministers and policies began to change Defoe found his task as political commentator with an unacknowledged ministerial brief growing more complicated. He had maintained independence while writing for the government, and still did so, but the pressure mounted as he strove to keep on doing both and he found himself being

---

<sup>1</sup> Downie, 'Daniel Defoe's *Review*', p. 196. Downie adds that it is 'in itself remarkable' (pp. 200-1) that Defoe achieved consistency in the circumstances.

squeezed between parties. Later in 1710 – which takes us beyond volume 6 – Godolphin would be replaced by Harley and Defoe would re-attach himself to Harley, his former patron – but now a Harley of a decidedly Tory cast. From that point onwards High-Flying principles infiltrated policy, and Defoe’s position became and more ticklish and himself more isolated as he stuck to a non-party brief in an age of deepening party rancour. He had always been attacked by Tories. He was now already under fire from some Whigs. They called him an under-spur leather and a tool of the ministry. Defoe’s response was to tut-tut at the abusive tone, maintain unswervingly that he had never written to dictation, which may have been true, and cast himself dramatically as the prophet dishonoured in his own country for saying unwelcome things. This darkened the old characterisation of himself as plain-speaking ‘Mr Review’ by stressing his despised condition, rejected by all, even those whom he suffered to serve.

Defoe represents the fact of being cursed by Whigs and Tories as evidence of his impartiality and achieves a complex tone of ironically modest defiance. For example, in apologising for preaching at the reader on one occasion he explains, humbly enough, that ‘the Pulpit is none of my Office — It was my Disaster first to be set a-part for, and then to be set a-part from the Honour of that Sacred Employ’ (22 October 1709 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 27 October). But soon his self-deprecation starts to sound tongue-in-cheek:

But suffer a Man loaded with your most contemptible Thoughts,  
and as much as you please scorn’d and reproach’d, to turn upon  
you with Instruction, and attempt to move you in a Thing which it  
is your Interest to regard; perhaps you will not hear, because of the  
Man that speaks. (*ibid.*)

Finally he is plain scornful:

*Dost thou teach US?* Says the proud Haters of this Paper, and its Author;  
*Thou that wert altogether born in Sin,* dost thou teach US? —  
Look you, Gentlemen — Your Contempt I have learn’d to contemn,  
I scorn the Scorn — It has been my Honour to be heard  
and valued by the best King that ever reign’d over you — And I  
can, with a Boasting not contrary to Modesty, write it on my  
Grave, as the true Character of my Life,

*By wise Men courted, and by Fools despis’d.*

He that cannot live above the Scorn of Scoundrels, is not fit to  
live; Dogs will bark, Malice will rage, Slander will revile — and  
they shall; without lessening one Moment of my Tranquility.

*When Envy grins, and Slander barks,*

*And clamouring Monsters rail;*

*They neither can my Passions move,*

*Or on my Smiles prevail.* (*ibid.*)

A twinge of real shame at being pilloried might have lurked in Defoe's presence of modesty. If so it would have been natural. But he cultivates lowliness to ratchet up defiance, telling his readers: 'Think as meanly as you please of the Author, and of this Warning; but REMEMBER, if you contemn it, That it was GIVEN YOU IN TIME' (10 November 1709 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on November 15). In a different connection he had claimed that he was 'a plain Dealer', that he said 'the coarsest things' if they were true and necessary, and that no power or passion had ever deflected him from doing so or ever would (7 April 1709 Edinburgh edition). Picking out Defoe's real speech among these voices is not easy; he is the voices. But behind the humble talk was an assuming personality. He knew and reminded readers of his ability, though sometimes with a playful theatricality. For example, regarding Charles XII of Sweden, once the terror of Europe, now in 1709 a fugitive, Defoe boasts that he alone had rebuked the king for arrogance when Europe lay at his feet and reminds his readers that he had been marked out for retaliation for it by the Swedish envoy on the king's behalf. Charles had at that time had been able, if he felt disrespected, to command princes to send their great men to him bound hand and foot and they had done it, as with Count Zobor and General Patkul. But 'Then it was, Gentlemen, that this Paper spoke Truth with Freedom, and its Author scorn'd to restrain his just Remarks for Fear of the Conqueror's Resentment' (20 September 1709 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 22 September).

This claim is perfectly fair, as is Defoe's moral: 'he that will be known to speak Truth impartially, must do it in the Face of Danger' (*ibid.*). Harassed by a mischievous lawsuit late in the year, Defoe wrote the writer's manifesto:

for Personal Affronts he asks all Men Pardon — But for vindicating the Cause he is embark'd in, *he cannot lay it down*, it is the Cause of TRUTH and LIBERTY; the Nation stands upon it; the Union, the Revolution, the Succession, the QUEEN, the Government, They all stand upon it — And if all the World should abandon him in defending it, he will never abandon its Defence, while he has Life, and a Tongue to speak for it.

(1 November 1709 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 8 November)

Defoe absolves his printer and publisher for what has been objected to and takes all upon himself. At another time, more jokingly, he claimed from his knowledge of current affairs to predict the future, disparaging rivals like the French Prophets, almanac makers, Partridge and others and declaring that he had been right so often in foretelling what would happen that he is surprised not to have been 'recorded for a Conjuror, or sent to *Newgate* for a Witch' (18 March 1710 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 23 March). Not joking, he predicts that an assault on Sweden by the northern powers in the

king's absence would not prosper. When the attack took place a year later, and failed, Defoe reminded his readers of his present words (2 January 1711; volume 7).

Defoe's false-modest boasts and teasing apologies were a way of responding to and deflecting critical attack. He relished provoking debate, though it was usually hostile, often abusive, and sometimes attended with a background threat of physical violence which he dismissed surprisingly easily, apparently seeing it as merely an occupational hazard. He fed off opposition and each year attracted more of it. Although he brushed physical danger aside, it was a serious possibility, and the subject leads us into a side of Defoe's personality not often remarked on. In 1710, in a characteristically unperturbed tone, he announced that he was now considering wearing body armour in his walks abroad, but, he explained, if he did it would only be armour for the back because no High Flyer would dare bring his tattered cause before him face to face:

I think to buy my self a Back-piece of Iron, and go all arm'd behind — As for being arm'd before — I'd never do it for a *High-Flyer* — Not that a *High-Flyer* may have less Courage than another Man — But he is too modest to think his Cause will bear him out — and he will never come in such a Quarrel to any Man's Face.  
(4 February 1710 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 9 February).

Sarcasm like this invited violence. But it seems that Defoe, though physically spare, was pugnacious enough and had something about him which made people think twice before attacking.<sup>1</sup> He relates how

Once I had the Misfortune to come into a Room, where five Gentlemen had been killing me a Quarter of an Hour, *in their Way* — and yet to the Reproach of their villainous Design, as well as their Courage, durst not all together own it to a poor naked single Man, that gave them Opportunity enough, and whom they had too much in their Power. (Preface)

From an extraordinary essay Defoe wrote in a later volume on the commotion of spirits a man suffers the whole night before a duel,<sup>2</sup> one might suppose he had himself fought one and survived, as indeed he claims. But of course he is the master realist on the page. There are no details.

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Fame, a *lying Jade*, would talk me up for I know not what of Courage; and they call me a fighting Fellow' ('Preface', volume 8). Of interest is the historian John Oldmixon's remark that Defoe was 'naturally of a daring dauntless Temper' (*History of England* (London, 1735), p. 235). Oldmixon, a partisan Whig, was no friend of Defoe.

<sup>2</sup> *Review*, 29 November 1712 (volume 9).

Other topics Defoe dealt with in May and June 1709 included a new treason bill going through Parliament which angry Scots were calling an infraction of the Union, stock jobbing and public credit. The treason bill, intended to integrate the Scottish treason law with that of England, arose from the acquittal in Scotland of known Jacobites charged with collaborating with France in the 1708 invasion attempt. Defoe denied that harmonising the two countries' laws broke in upon the Union treaty which had guaranteed Scottish legal independence. On the contrary, he explained, the treaty necessarily allowed for some things to be modified by specifying that others could not be, which if all were unalterable would make no sense. To this ingenious argument he added that the proposed change would benefit Scottish subjects.

In July 1709 he began discussing trade, and linked the broader subject with a new controversy about the thousands of Palatine refugees who were streaming into Britain from their devastated homeland. Should these immigrants be accepted, redirected to the colonies, or sent back home? Defoe had always argued that numbers of people constituted the riches of a society, not just economically but culturally.<sup>1</sup> He now recommended settling the strangers on unimproved land with basic amenities and leaving them to develop on their own, contributing as they did so to the English economy. But he soon found himself defending them from xenophobic incivility at the hands of many English people. Defoe had long before described this rancorous nationalism in *The True-Born Englishman* (1701) as a specifically English vice. He linked it with the traditional English disdain for Scotland and the Scots – the product of an ignorance in which the English, far from trying to remove it, took a perverse glory (14 July 1709 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 26 July).

On a deeper level the plight of the refugees dovetailed in Defoe's mind with other considerations of a historical, economic and moral nature. He argued the obligation of charity. He invoked Britain's role in the war as a reason for supporting those it displaced. In practical terms he pointed out the economic mistake Britain would make by rejecting the benefits brought by skilled immigrants whose increase of consumption would add wealth to the nation. But the refugees' predicament also set Defoe thinking about the fundamentals of society. Working out how to assimilate ten thousand newcomers into English life without upsetting its structure led him to reconsider what community was, how it grew, and under what conditions. This train of

---

<sup>1</sup> See Daniel Statt, *Foreigners and Englishmen. The Controversy over Immigration and Population, 1660-1760* (Newark, DE, 1995). Statt comments that Defoe 'stressed as well the rewards for landed wealth and agricultural productivity of an accession of foreign settlers' (p. 200).

thought he had examined when visiting Scotland in 1706, obtaining a different perspective on England and feeling the sense of the outcast. Eventually it would feed into *Robinson Crusoe*, with its analysis of political existence stripped to its essentials. In this connection his eye may have caught the summary published in the newspapers in July 1709 of the numbers, trades, professions and occupations of the refugees and their families, which reads like the distillation of a whole society into its essentials.<sup>1</sup> Here is part of Boyer's version:

Of these there were Husbandmen and Vinedressers, One thousand eighty three; Schoolmasters, Ten; Herdsmen, Four; Wheelwrights, Thirteen; Smiths, Forty six; Cloth and Linnen-Weavers, Sixty six; Carpenters, Ninety; Bakers, Thirty two; Masons, Forty eight; Coopers and Brewers, Forty eight; Joiners, Twenty; Shoemakers, Forty; Taylors, Fifty eight, Butchers, Fifteen; Millers, Twenty seven; Sadlers, Seven; Stocking-Weavers, Five; Tanners, Seven; Miners, Three; Brickmakers, Six; Potters, Three; Hunters, Five; Turners, Six; Surgeons, Three; Locksmiths, Two; Hatters, Three; Silversmiths, Two; Bricklayers, Four; Glaziers, Two; Cook, One; Student, One; Carvers, Two.

(Boyer, *History*, 8, p. 167)

Defoe urged in the *Review* in June and July that the refugees be settled in England as the best plan for them and for England together. In his mind's eye he saw the new community multiplying and prospering by natural interaction with the environment and with each other, like yeast. The image of development always filled Defoe with ardour, as in the fictional examples of *Crusoe's* expanding estate, Moll's or Roxana's savings, Singleton's gold hoard, or the factual one of his plans for Scotland's economic development submitted to Robert Harley in 1710.<sup>2</sup> To them may be added his sketch of a new forest settlement where the Palatine refugees would transform the trees into a town and the waste land to wealth. But English xenophobia proved unwilling. Having mourned the missed opportunity through July, Defoe then argued unavailingly against sending the Palatines to the West Indies for unsuitable work. When he wrote his last essay on the topic in early September many had already departed for the plantations, or Ireland, or back home, and the dream was over.

Defoe's other topics included the progress of the war, particularly the siege of Tournay, which he discussed at length in July and August. He also kept Scotland before his readers with criticism of the Scottish Episcopal clergy and their Jacobite supporters, in the process extending into volume 6 the 'news'

---

<sup>1</sup> See for example the *London Gazette*, 2-5 July 1709.

<sup>2</sup> See Defoe's enclosure 'Of Improvements in Scotland' in his letter to Robert Harley of 5 September 1710 (*Letters*, ed. Healey, pp. 278-85).

element he had introduced into the *Review* the previous year. This element breaks the ban on news items which Defoe had imposed on himself at the start of the *Review*. But he judged that the way to correct English misconceptions was to publicise the violence perpetrated against Presbyterian ministers by mobs set on by the Jacobite gentry, so that, although for a moment it turned the *Review* into a newspaper, he was still aiming to change minds. Defoe in these accounts reproduces official documents sometimes long enough to fill several *Review* numbers. They make for dogged reading. He admitted that he lost readers by them. Defoe writes:

*As to the REVIEW, Gentlemen, it is grown old and grave, and has left off making you laugh a great while; not because he thinks he cannot tickle your Imagination as formerly; but because he thinks 'tis more for your Service to make you wise, than merry.*

*And therefore he rather applies to serve than divert you — He knows you will call him dull Fellow, and throw by the Paper with some Contempt — But he tells you, if you throw the Review down, some as wise as you will take it up — And when he has talk'd to wise Men, as long as he has already talk'd to F—ls, he'll come back to you again. (21 June 1709 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 2 July)*

Defoe always maintained that English readers should be concerned at these matters because the Union had made the two nations one nation with a common interest. Undoubtedly he had right on his side. But his English readers could not or would not get interested in Scottish politics.

When Defoe tried to silence High-Church complaints that Episcopal Dissenters were persecuted in Scotland whereas in England Dissenters were tolerated, so that not all the inhabitants of Britain enjoyed the same liberty, he challenged even his own skill in subtle distinctions by advancing the argument that toleration could not be offered in Scotland without breaking the terms of the Treaty of Union. He explained this as follows. Although in England religious toleration was the right of all (except Roman Catholics), in Scotland the Presbyterian establishment ratified by Union required the Church to supervise the moral life of the nation, which meant all the nation. The British parliament had no power to change this because Britain itself was a child of Union, and, as Defoe put it, no child could go beyond its father. This rather Augustan concept, bizarre to a modern eye, Defoe regarded as a logical clincher. But the logic proved unavailing. When in 1712 parliament did extend toleration to Scotland Defoe condemned the measure as an attack on the Union. To him this always signalled an attempted restoration of the Stuarts. This did not happen but, in 1712, he was not that far out.

Such are the predominant topics of volume 6. Other significant discussions from time to time were the threat of war in northern Europe, the state of London's theatres, Marlborough's campaign, negotiations for peace, and,

as indicated earlier, in late 1709 and early 1710, the overwhelming case of Sacheverell's trial. When dealing with Charles XII of Sweden, now a fugitive in Turkey, Defoe urged that Sweden must always be protected by the Protestant nations she herself had saved from destruction during the Counter-Reformation. But he remained critical of the Swedish king. Indeed the judgement Defoe here advances on Charles as a type of military hero anticipates Johnson's grave eloquence in *The Vanity of Human Wishes* and not inconceivably influenced it. Defoe, before Johnson, generalises the point from one errant monarch to military hubris. For example he links Charles with Louis XIV in a series of witty and weighty *Review* essays which sum up the French monarch's balance sheet of achievements after sixty-six years spent bullying his weaker neighbours. The bottom line is a resounding zero.

Less broad-minded, indeed slightly depressing, was Defoe's attitude to the art of theatrical representation. This he wanted to see terminated. He recommends an ingenious way to close London's theatres for good by buying up the buildings and paying off the actors with a pension for life on the understanding that they would never again tread the boards in a professional capacity. Defoe calculated that to do this would cost the equivalent of twenty years' salary for the proprietors and other personnel, and – if others would join in – offered to pay his share. He would, he says, 'bring in Subscriptions among my own Acquaintance, and by my little Interest, for at least one Thousand Pounds of the Money' (1 September 1709 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 24 September). In the preceding essay he had apparently been willing to let the theatres stay open if the players would turn their back on immodest language and the town on bawdry and blasphemy. But now he perhaps realised that that would never happen.

As the year 1709 drew to a close a variety of topics came and went in the *Review's* pages. He criticised the Tory journalist, or 'unsufferable Traducer', John Dyer, for belittling the battle of Malplaquet as '*A Victory, AS MARLBRO' CALLS IT; Or, the late great Success, AS IT IS CALLED*' (27 September 1709 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 13 October). He was drawn into a row over alleged scarcity in corn, mentioned earlier. He discussed plague in northern Europe, press freedom, and, through November and December, the cost of war, and toleration in Scotland. But all were swept up in the row provoked by Sacheverell's November sermon in St Paul's. To this *cause célèbre* Defoe gave full though not exclusive attention in the volume's last three months.

Henry Sacheverell (c. 1674-1724) was a Church of England clergyman and Oxford Fellow whose championship of divine right and hatred of Dissent Defoe had criticised in the *Shortest-way with the Dissenters* (1702). Sacheverell then had advised the Church in the notorious phrase to 'hang out the bloody

flag and banner of defiance' against the Dissenting community. Now in his sermon *Perils of False Brethren both in Church and State*, delivered in St Paul's on 5 November 1709, he argued that James II had not been resisted during the Glorious Revolution since he fled without fighting and William and Mary succeeded peacefully. He condemned the Toleration Act (1689) as encouraging Dissenters to cherish their fathers' poisonous principle of regicide. He wanted to close Dissenting schools and ban religious comprehension. In the words of Geoffrey Holmes Sacheverell was fuelled by an 'absorbing, unwavering hatred of Puritans and of all forms of Dissent'.<sup>1</sup>

Sacheverell's *Perils of False Brethren* strongly attacked Godolphin, the Lord Treasurer, as the false brother of the title, and was exceedingly widely distributed by his High Church supporters. These two facts provoked the government to act against him. Holmes estimates that 100,000 published copies of the sermon were circulating before the end of Sacheverell's trial. Many answers further whipped up the frenzy. They included the anonymous *The Peril of Being Zealously Affected, but not Well* (1709),<sup>2</sup> and White Kennett's solidly argued *True Answer*. Less respectful were the *Priest Turn'd Poet: Or, The Best Way of Answering Dr. Sacheverell's Sermon* (1709), which turned Sacheverell's words into burlesque verse, and *The Cherubim with a Flaming Sword that appear'd on the Fifth of November last in the Cathedral of St. Paul* (1709). This last is in the form of a letter to the Lord Mayor of London, Sir Samuel Garrard, who Sacheverell claimed had encouraged him to print his sermon (whereas the Aldermen of London had declined to do so). Garrard denied issuing the invitation when asked by the Commons, losing much reputation in the process.<sup>3</sup> Among Sacheverell's early defenders was William Beck, whose *Vindication* (1709) damned the body of Dissenters as 'potentially as rebellious as ever'.<sup>4</sup>

Defoe at first recommended letting Sacheverell rave until he fired himself out and fell silent. Even on 10 December 1709, when he 'entered the fray'<sup>5</sup> and took Sacheverell's arguments to pieces, he still advised ignoring the man. But on 3 January 1710 Defoe decided to give the subject full treatment, arguing that as the matter had now become a court issue and the Williamite Revolution was effectively on trial it was time to bring about 'the total destruction

---

<sup>1</sup> Geoffrey Holmes, *The Trial of Doctor Sacheverell* (London, 1973), p. 53. In the following summary I draw much on Holmes's account.

<sup>2</sup> Holmes ascribes this 'highly professional, detailed, and at times devastating' piece to George Ridpath (*Trial of Sacheverell*, p. 77). According to John Oldmixon it was 'written by a minister of the Church of England' (*History*, p. 429).

<sup>3</sup> See the *Review* of 17 December 1709 (Edinburgh edition), and notes.

<sup>4</sup> Holmes, *Trial of Sacheverell*, pp. 75, 78.

<sup>5</sup> Holmes, *Trial of Sacheverell*, p. 77.

of the principles of passive obedience, non-resistance and the divine right of hereditary succession through the punishment of the man who had dared to revive those pernicious doctrines, thus establishing once and for all the rights of the people and Parliamentary Limitation'.<sup>1</sup> Looked at from the vantage point of three hundred years later, the whole Sacheverell affair may appear like a last odd fling of the High-Flyers before the Church of England fell into its eighteenth-century sleep, but to Defoe and his contemporaries it appeared differently. He saw Sacheverell as trying to roll back the Revolution, unseat the Queen, bring in the Pretender and re-introduce persecution – all of them appearing to many observers distinct political possibilities at that time. The trial as it proceeded whipped up a hysterical public animosity towards Dissenters which impacted on Defoe personally, and this also colours the tone of his writing in much of the closing section of volume 6.

Defoe's public utterances on Sacheverell, though forceful and hilarious, are models of restraint, but privately he was more bitter when he compared what was happening to Sacheverell with himself imprisoned, pilloried and ruined for *The Shortest-way with the Dissenters* in 1703-4. A letter he wrote on 8 March 1710 to the prosecution manager James Stanhope makes this plain. Learning that Stanhope had been reading past *Review* numbers to learn 'something of the Doctor's character', Defoe wrote to him to call Sacheverell a confessed enemy of the Glorious Revolution he now claimed to support, said he had a hundred times in his cups wished to see William III De-Witted, that is torn in pieces by the mob, names a couple of MPs as witnesses of the truth of what he is saying, and offers to enlarge if need be.<sup>2</sup> The letter is not Defoe's most impressive composition. Paula Backscheider calls it 'petty' and 'smarmy'.<sup>3</sup> But one can see why he wrote it. The contrast between his treatment and Sacheverell's treatment hurt him. Sacheverell had repeated his inflammatory threats many times; Defoe wrote one ironic essay. Sacheverell had an army of backers; Defoe had been abandoned. Sacheverell was fairly tried and mildly sentenced. Defoe was vindictively punished. Even in the *Review* Defoe writes:

You may bear with me, Gentlemen, for being warmer in this Case than in another, *my Part in it has been very hard*: I adore the Wonders of Retaliating Providence that has suffer'd the Wicked thus to fall into their own Snare, and that has from Heaven given a

---

<sup>1</sup> Downie, 'Daniel Defoe's *Review*', p. 208.

<sup>2</sup> George Harris Healey (ed.), *The Letters of Daniel Defoe* (Oxford, 1955), pp. 265-6. See also the *Review* of 9 March 1710 (London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 14 March).

<sup>3</sup> Backscheider, *Daniel Defoe*, p. 266.

Testimony greater than I could ever have hop'd for, to the Justice the Reasonableness, and the Seasonableness of those fatal Observations I made on this very Man's Preaching and his Party's Practice, for which, *and I bless GOD, for standing to the Truth of which*, I suffer'd the Overthrow of my Fortune and Family, and under the Weight of which I remain as a banish'd Man to this Day. (27 December 1709).

But this is notably restrained and dignified in tone, and in public Defoe rose above revenge. He reacted with good humour when Sacheverell tried to prove from the *Review* that the Dissenters planned to ruin the Church of England, answering imperturbably:

Since the *Doctor* has fallen into the Misfortune now upon him, I have industriously forborn falling upon him personally, because from a boxing young *English Boy* I learnt this early Piece of Generosity, *Not to strike my Enemy when he was down*. (9 March 1710 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 14 March)

But now, he goes on,

since the Gentleman is pleas'd to attack me, I can by no Means be so much a Party to the Doctrine of Non-Resistance, as to forbear my own Defence, when I am fallen upon in so unfair a Manner.

Defoe's answer was to reprint all Sacheverell's extracts from the *Review* and invite his readers to judge whether they were seditious or not. Bitter or not, he knew the value of composure in argument. He recriminates only once, when asking the Dissenters who formerly let him down whether to 'throw the *Shortest Way* in your *Faces* upon this Occasion, and make my self a little Amends upon you?' (27 December 1709). It is forgiveable.

The Sacheverell case, among other pressures, put Defoe's life at risk in 1709-10. He describes receiving over a dozen death threats, being waylaid three times, and being advised by friends to bind over his opponents to keep the peace – advice which he ignored. Not all of the threats came from exasperated Sacheverellites. Stock-jobbers also threatened to beat him up for exposing their cheating methods. Defoe writes:

I have been prompted to take Notice here of some Personal Threatnings, which I have receiv'd, some by Letter, and *TWO by Message*, upon the Liberty I take with the Practises of the Stock-jobbers — Indeed I have always thought those Things not worth Notice — Always believing, he that is Bully enough to threaten a Man behind his Back, is too honest to mean what he says. For

*The Cur that barks, is ne're the Cur that bites.*

But my Answer is very short, and I hope just; I am sure, 'tis better natur'd than the Parties it relates to; I take the People, I am talking of, to be made up of three Sorts. The *First* conscious of the Truth, cannot find in their Hearts to BEAT ME for telling it. The *Second*, being Men of Temper, and something better principled,

than Assassination requires, want Gall for it. The *Third* want Courage, and dare not do it — And among the last, I reckon those two in particular, who had the Impudence to promise — but have not thought fit to be as good as their Words. (30 July 1709 London edition, reprinted in Edinburgh on 11 August)

To these menaces, we have seen, Defoe's answer was defiant. He had, he says, 'a Debt to Peace, and in Duty to the present Constitution, *to speak plainly* in these Cases, whatever Risque I run', and he defended the liberty of Britain against 'the reviving Mischiefs of Tyranny' and 'all your Mobbs and Rabbles' ('Preface').

Closing the volume, Defoe returned to earlier topics, including the African trade, debt and bankruptcy. The warmer tone of the writing in the last month is also reminiscent. He invents a licensing office for sin from which he undertakes (for a fee) to grant parsons permission to curse, gentlemen and ladies to be unchaste, and other petitioners to indulge whatever favoured private vice they may prefer. But this entertaining throwback to an earlier style soon disappeared. At the end of the volume Defoe is philosophical about the periodical's future. It has endured for six volumes, he says, of which, 'like a teeming Woman, I have thought every Volume should be the last':

Where it will end now, and when, God only knows, and Time only will discover; *as for me*, I know nothing of it. ('Preface')

Press regulation may have been in Defoe's thoughts as he wrote these words. The subject was already being talked about. He had briefly offered his views on it a couple of times. He would return to it more seriously in future years.

copyright material

Appendix: Correspondence of *Review* Numbers 1709-10

<b>London</b>	<b>Edinburgh</b>	<b>Note</b>
Title-page	Title-page	
Preface	Preface	
	1 Thursday 31 March	E only
	2 Saturday 2 April	E only
	3 Tuesday 5 April	E only
	4 Thursday 7 April	E only
1 Tuesday 5 April	5 Saturday 9 April	
2 Thursday 7 April	6 Tuesday 12 April	
3 Saturday 9 April	7 Thursday 14 April	
4 Tuesday 12 April	8 Saturday 23 April	
5 Thursday 14 April	9 Tuesday 26 April	
6 Saturday 16 April	10 Thursday 28 April	
7 Tuesday 19 April	11 Saturday 30 April	
8 Thursday 21 April	12 Tuesday 3 May	
9 Saturday 23 April	13 Thursday 5 May	
10 Tuesday 26 April	14 Saturday 7 May	
11 Thursday 28 April	15 Tuesday 10 May	
12 Saturday 30 April	16 Thursday 12 May	
13 Tuesday 3 May	17 Saturday 14 May	
14 Thursday 5 May	18 Tuesday 17 May	
15 Saturday 7 May	19 Thursday 19 May	
16 Tuesday 10 May	20 Saturday 21 May	
17 Thursday 12 May	21 Tuesday 24 May	
18 Saturday 14 May	22 Thursday 26 May	
19 Tuesday 17 May	23 Saturday 28 May	
20 Thursday 19 May	24 Tuesday 31 May	
21 Saturday 21 May	25 Thursday 2 June	
22 Tuesday 24 May	26 Saturday 4 June	
23 Thursday 26 May	27 Tuesday 7 June	
24 Saturday 28 May	28 Thursday 9 June	
25 Tuesday 31 May	29 Saturday 11 June	
26 Thursday 2 June	30 Tuesday 14 June	
27 Saturday 4 June	31 Thursday 16 June	
28 Tuesday 7 June	32 Saturday 18 June	
29 Thursday 9 June	33 Tuesday 21 June	
30 Saturday 11 June	34 Thursday 23 June	
31 Tuesday 14 June	35 Saturday 25 June	
32 Thursday 16 June	36 Tuesday 28 June	

<b>London</b>	<b>Edinburgh</b>	<b>Note</b>
33 Saturday 18 June	37 Thursday 30 June	
34 Tuesday 21 June	38 Saturday 2 July	
35 Thursday 23 June	39 Tuesday 5 July	
36 Saturday 25 June	40 Thursday 7 July	
37 Tuesday 28 June	41 Saturday 9 July	
38 Thursday 30 June	42 Tuesday 12 July	
39 Saturday 2 July	43 Thursday 14 July	
40 Tuesday 5 July	44 Saturday 16 July	
41 Thursday 7 July	45 Tuesday 19 July	
42 Saturday 9 July	46 Thursday 21 July	
43 Tuesday 12 July	47 Saturday 23 July	
44 Thursday 14 July	48 Tuesday 26 July	
45 Saturday 16 July	49 Thursday 28 July	
46 Tuesday 19 July	50 Saturday 30 July	
47 Thursday 21 July	51 Tuesday 2 August	
48 Saturday 23 July	52 Thursday 4 August	
49 Tuesday 26 July	53 Saturday 6 August	
50 Thursday 28 July	54 Tuesday 9 August	
51 Saturday 30 July	55 Thursday 11 August	
52 Tuesday 2 August	56 Saturday 13 August	
53 Thursday 4 August	57 Tuesday 16 August	
54 Saturday 6 August	58 Thursday 18 August	
55 Tuesday 9 August	59 Saturday 20 August	
56 Thursday 11 August	60 Tuesday 23 August	
57 Saturday 13 August	61 Thursday 25 August	
58 Tuesday 16 August	62 Saturday 27 August	
59 Thursday 18 August	63 Tuesday 30 August	
60 Saturday 20 August	64 Thursday 1 September	
61 Tuesday 23 August	65 Saturday 3 September	
62 Thursday 25 August	66 Tuesday 6 September	
63 Saturday 27 August	67 Thursday 8 September	
64 Tuesday 30 August	68 Saturday 10 September	
65 Thursday 1 September	74 Saturday 24 September	
66 Saturday 3 September		L only
67 Tuesday 6 September		L only
68 Thursday 8 September		L only
69 Saturday 10 September	75 Tuesday 27 September	
70 Tuesday 13 September	72 Tuesday 20 September	
71 Saturday 17 September	69 Tuesday 13 September	E first

<b>London</b>	<b>Edinburgh</b>	<b>Note</b>
72 Tuesday 20 September	73 Thursday 22 September	
73 Thursday 22 September	70 Thursday 15 September	E first
74 Saturday 24 September	71 Saturday 17 September	E first
75 Tuesday 27 September	82 Thursday 13 October	
76 Thursday 29 September	76 Thursday 29 September	
77 Saturday 1 October	77 Saturday 1 October	
78 Tuesday 4 October	78 Tuesday 4 October	
79 Thursday 6 October	79 Thursday 6 October	
80 Saturday 8 October	81 Tuesday 11 October	
81 Tuesday 11 October	80 Saturday 8 October	E first
82 Thursday 13 October	83 Saturday 15 October	
83 Saturday 15 October	84 Tuesday 18 October	
84 Tuesday 18 October	85 Thursday 20 October	
85 Thursday 20 October	86 Saturday 22 October	
	87 Tuesday 25 October	E only
86 Saturday 22 October	88 Thursday 27 October	
87 Tuesday 25 October	89 Saturday 29 October	
88 Thursday 27 October	90 Tuesday 1 November	
89 Saturday 29 October	91 Thursday 3 November	
90 Tuesday 1 November	93 Tuesday 8 November	
91 Thursday 3 November	95 Saturday 12 November	
92 Saturday 5 November	92 Saturday 5 November	
93 Tuesday 8 November		L only
94 Thursday 10 November	96 Tuesday 15 November	
95 Saturday 12 November	97 Thursday 17 November	
96 Tuesday 15 November	94 Thursday 10 November	E first
97 Thursday 17 November	98 Saturday 19 November	
98 Saturday 19 November		L only
99 Tuesday 22 November	99 Tuesday 22 November	
100 Thursday 24 November	100 Thursday 24 November	
101 Saturday 26 November	101 Saturday 26 November	
102 Tuesday 29 November	103 Thursday 1 December	
103 Thursday 1 December	104 Saturday 3 December	
104 Saturday 3 December	105 Tuesday 6 December	
105 Tuesday 6 December	106 Thursday 8 December	
106 Thursday 8 December	107 Saturday 10 December	
107 Saturday 10 December	108 Tuesday 13 December	
108 Tuesday 13 December	109 Thursday 15 December	
109 Thursday 15 December	102 Tuesday 29 November	E first

<b>London</b>	<b>Edinburgh</b>	<b>Note</b>
110 Saturday 17 December		L only
	110 Saturday 17 December	E only
111 Tuesday 20 December		L only
112 Thursday 22 December	112 Thursday 22 December	
113 Saturday 24 December	113 Saturday 24 December	
114 Tuesday 27 December	114 Tuesday 27 December	
115 Saturday 31 December	119 Saturday 7 January 1710	
116 Tuesday 3 January 1710	115 Thursday 29 December 1709	E first
117 Thursday 5 January 1710	111 Tuesday 20 December 1709	E first
118 Saturday 7 January 1710	116 Saturday 31 December 1709	E first
119 Tuesday 10 January	117 Tuesday 3 January	E first
120 Thursday 12 January	120 Tuesday 10 January	E first
121 Saturday 14 January	121 Thursday 12 January	E first
122 Tuesday 17 January	122 Saturday 14 January	E first
123 Thursday 19 January	118 Thursday 5 January	E first
124 Saturday 21 January	123 Tuesday 17 January	E first
125 Tuesday 24 January	124 Thursday 19 January	E first
126 Thursday 26 January	125 Saturday 21 January	E first
	127 Thursday 26 January	E only
	128 Saturday 28 January	E only
	129 Tuesday 31 January	E only
127 Saturday 28 January	130 Thursday 2 February	
128 Tuesday 31 January	126 Tuesday 24 January	E first
129 Thursday 2 February	132 Tuesday 7 February	
130 Saturday 4 February	133 Thursday 9 February	
	131 Saturday 4 February	E only
131 Tuesday 7 February	134 Saturday 11 February	
132 Thursday 9 February	135 Tuesday 14 February	
133 Saturday 11 February	136 Thursday 16 February	
134 Tuesday 14 February	137 Saturday 18 February	
135 Thursday 16 February	138 Tuesday 21 February	
136 Saturday 18 February	139 Thursday 23 February	
137 Tuesday 21 February	140 Saturday 25 February	
138 Thursday 23 February	141 Tuesday 28 February	
139 Saturday 25 February	142 Thursday 2 March	
140 Tuesday 28 February	143 Saturday 4 March	
141 Thursday 2 March	144 Tuesday 7 March	
142 Saturday 4 March	145 Thursday 9 March	
143 Tuesday 7 March	146 Saturday 11 March	

<b>London</b>	<b>Edinburgh</b>	<b>Note</b>
144 Thursday 9 March	147 Tuesday 14 March	
145 Saturday 11 March	148 Thursday 16 March	
146 Tuesday 14 March	149 Saturday 18 March	
147 Thursday 16 March	150 Tuesday 21 March	
148 Saturday 18 March	151 Thursday 23 March	
149 Tuesday 21 March	152 Saturday 25 March	
150 Thursday 23 March	153 Tuesday 28 March	

copyright material