To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by David Matchen entitled "Prophet, Preacher, Mountebank: Defoe and His Methods of Persuasion in the Review." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in English.

Percy G. Adams, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

PROPHET, PREACHER, MOUNTEBANK: DEFOE AND HIS METHODS OF PERSUASION IN THE REVIEW

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Philosophy

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

David Matchen

June 1976

1286712

Copyright by David Matchen 1976
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Defoe's principal purpose in the Review is to persuade Whig readers to support the moderate governmental policies of Robert Harley and Lord Godolphin. Of course Mr. Review assures his readers that he writes for no party or private interest and that his discussions of the issues will always be clear, objective, honest, and rational. One discovers, however, that such is hardly ever Defoe's method.

Actually, Defoe wishes to discourage rational examination of and response to his arguments. Therefore, one often finds him trying to develop a moral setting so that the politico-religious issues of the day may be interpreted typologically or in terms of emblems. The struggles between the Confederates and Louis XIV or between High Church and Low Church, Whig and Tory or Whig and Jacobite become epic clashes between good and evil forces.

In order to facilitate his Puritan interpretation of temporal reality, Mr. Review frequently notes his similarity to Nathan, Jonah, Nehemiah, Jeremiah, and Christ. He becomes a preacher and ascends the pulpit to deliver political sermons to the elect (Whigs) and sinners (Tories, Highflyers, and Jacobites) alike. Biblical allusions and quotations abound in his sermons and his style is highly oratorical. Anaphora, alliteration, compar, complexio, conversio, interrogatio, rogatio, and quaestium are his favor rhetorical devices. These sermons depend upon sound and rhythm instead of reason for their appeal.

The arguments themselves are equally deceptive. Frequently one finds Defoe using invalid premises or drawing illogical conclusions while maintaining that he is being objective and rational. He is also inclined to present ironic arguments or provide opponents who offer arguments damaging to their own position. In short, Defoe often very effectively misleads his audience.

In the Review we learn not only about Daniel Defoe as a propagandist but also about his ability as a stylist, his creativity, his ingenuity, and his acute understanding of the hopes, fears, and prejudices of his audience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	DEFOE AS PROPHET-PREACHER: THE DEVELOPMENT OF MORAL SETTING IN THE REVIEW	11
III.	THE PERSUASIVE STYLE: RHETORIC AND ORATORY IN THE REVIEW .	77
IV.	THE SLEIGHT-OF-HAND ACT: DEFOE'S METHOD OF ARGUMENT IN THE REVIEW	144
V.	CONCLUSION	221
BIBLIOGRAPHY		230
APPENDIX		235
VITA		238

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Review is Daniel Defoe's most substantial and varied nonfiction work; it has hardly received any critical attention, except for occasional historical references and as a source for biographical material.[1] From various biographies, from Payne's Mr. Review, and from the scant critical commentaries in Sutherland's short Daniel Defoe: A Critical Study and Marjorie Nicolson's "Introduction" to Payne's The Best of the Review,[2] we learn a number of facts about its longevity, its style, its features, its conception, its circulation, its audience; and from Payne's Mr. Review we can learn what Defoe had to say about himself or about any of his major topics in the Review's more than twelve hundred issues. We discover, for example that Defoe began the Review

---

[1]The only close analysis of any kind occurs in Stephen Horton Dill, "An Analysis of Some Aspects of Defoe's Prose Style," Diss. University of Arkansas, 1965, passim. Dill chooses one-thousand-word passages from several of Defoe's works and draws comparisons and conclusions by counting such items as the number and types of nouns, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs; the types of phrases; the types of sentence structure; and the instances of parallelism and by examining the "prose rhythm" in the various passages. The passage taken from the Review is the essay for April 17, 1708 (V, 34-35). Dill seems to have chosen it because it appears approximately midway in the Review. All references to the Review are to Defoe's Review, 9 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938) and are hereafter cited parenthetically.

[2]William Lytton Payne, Mr. Review: Daniel Defoe as Author of the "Review" (Morningside Heights, N.Y.: King's Crown Press, 1947), passim.; James Sutherland (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971), pp. 73ff; and Marjorie Nicolson, "Introduction," in The Best of the "Review": An Anthology, ed. William Lytton Payne (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951), pp. ix-xxi.

on February 19, 1704, probably as a means of repaying Robert Harley, then the Speaker of the House of Commons, for his assistance in extricating Defoe from prison. Defoe, of course, was in prison until November, 1703—and at the mercy of Nottingham, the High-Church Secretary of State—because of his scathing, ironic attack on the High Church in The Shortest Way with the Dissenters. We learn that, although Robert Harley probably never told him what to write, Defoe staunchly supported the government despite several violent changes in its political character. The critics and biographers often go on to explain that Defoe's support of a moderate Tory government, then of a basically Whig ministry, and finally of a strongly Tory ministry was not hypocritical on Defoe's part; he was a moderate Whig himself and such political maneuvering, especially when labels were, at best, ambiguous, was not unusual for the time. Generally, we are to assume, Defoe saw himself as serving the good of the country. As for his audience, commentators usually surmise that they were middle-class Whigs, Dissenters, merchants, shopkeepers or really a vague combination of these ambiguous overlapping groups. And, although its actual circulation at any given time can only be guessed, one must assume that the Review's influence was great, despite a probable low number of copies sold per issue.[3] The Review, it

---

[3]There is some confusion about estimations of the Review's actual circulation. James R. Sutherland in "The Circulation of Newspapers and Literary Periodicals 1700-1730," The Library, 4th ser., 15 (1934), 110-124, suggests that the early circulation of the Review may have been about 400 copies per number. His estimate is based upon a proposal, made to the ministry sometime in the summer of 1704, for taxing periodicals. The author of the proposal puts the circulation of the

is agreed, made the rounds in coffee houses, on street corners, and even in the provinces and Scotland. Students of Defoe believe that, except for bright spots such as the entertaining "Mercure Scandale (which, all agree, had its origin in John Dunton's Athenian Mercury) and The Little Review, the face of Mr. Review is usually solemn as he considers the war, politics, trade and economics and makes numerous side excursions into particularly engaging issues of the day. Almost all agree that the Review style is plain, clear, and appropriately without rhetorical flourish and that truth, honesty and direct speaking are usually uppermost in Defoe's mind. In short, for most of these writers, since they are often biographers, the Review is of interest because it sheds light on Defoe's life, on his beliefs, and on the climate of the times from 1704 through 1713.[4] As a piece of literature it is generally

---

Review at 400. Later Henry L. Snyder in "The Circulation of Newspapers in the Reign of Queen Anne," The Library, 5th ser., 23 (1968), 207-235, notes that, according to records of periodical taxation in the last year of the Review, its circulation was 425-500 copies per number. Snyder may be in error, however, because the stamp tax was one half penny for a half-sheet, a penny for a whole sheet; and the records show that the printer purchased about 500 half-penny stamps for each number of the Review. But the Review was not printed on a half-sheet; with the advent of the tax the Review was printed on the front and back of a quarto sheet. Thus if 500 half-penny stamps were procured for the Review and used only for the Review, perhaps as many as 1000 copies were printed. Also Sutherland in the earlier article notes that printers were commonly successful in evading buying stamps for their papers so that the numbers of stamps sold might well be much less than the actual number of papers sold.

[4]For representative biographical approaches to the Review see Walter Wilson, Memoirs of the Life and Times of Daniel De Foe: Containing a Review of His Writings and His Opinion upon a Variety of Important Matters, Civil and Ecclesiastical, vol. 2 (London: Hurst, Chance, and Co., 1830; rpt. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1973), pp. 196-201, 206ff; Paul Dottin, The Life and Strange and Surprising Adventures of

considered unremarkable, except for its Mercure Scandale, which many see as a vulgar predecessor of the lively Tatler and Spectator. It remains, however, that, despite the facts, the assumptions and the conclusions, readers of these general evaluations learn very little about the Review.

Too often these brief, general references to Defoe's most substantial work depend too much on what Defoe said about himself and about his purposes in the Review. He always claimed to be independent of any party interest or the interest of any single person. His design, as he so often expressed it, was to provide truth and an objective examination of the facts in a clear, unvarnished prose that anyone could understand. He would, he asserted, never stoop to Billingsgate or attack the person of any man. He would always be fair, he implied, and would even admit his own mistakes. The readers could, he clearly intimated, always trust him and believe everything he said. One wonders, of course, if Defoe or any other propagandist could have been expected to

---

Daniel Defoe, trans. Louise Ragan (New York: The Macaulay Company, 1929) pp. 121-24; Thomas Wright, The Life of Daniel Defoe (London: C. G. Francombe & Sons, Ltd., 1931), pp. 98ff; James Sutherland, Defoe (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1938), pp. 195-320; and John Robert Moore, Daniel Defoe: Citizen of the Modern World (Chicago: Press, 1958), pp. 147ff. Most of the facts about the Review noted in the text can be found in these sources. Wilson's treatment is of interest because he provides an "abstract" of the first volume of the Review; but Wilson obviously had not seen all of it. Sutherland's discussion is the most thorough. Bibliographical data can be found in Arthur Wellesley Secord's "Introduction" in Defoe's "Review" (I, xv-liii). The most detailed discussions of the content and techniques occur in James Sutherland's Daniel Defoe: A Critical Study, pp. 73ff; William Lytton Payne's Mr. Review; and Marjorie Nicolson's "Introduction" to Payne's The Best of the "Review," pp. ix-xxi. John F. Ross in Swift and Defoe (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1941), pp. 56, 61-62, though he is primarily concerned with what Defoe says of the Examiner in the Review, discusses the function, style and audience of the Review.

say, "I am secretly on the payroll of Robert Harley, the Queen, and several other important people, and I plan, with all my resources, to present you with such a slanted picture of the truth and to argue so effectively that you will be persuaded always to support the government, even though you believe the ministers to be Tories." Defoe's hiding of his intentions—as he obviously tried to do—does not necessarily make him a hypocrite: he would have been ineffective had his readers been absolutely sure of his backing and of his primary design; and that he hid his motives does not mean that he did not believe what he wrote. One gets a distinct impression from reading the Review that he was sincere most of the time but, also, that sincerity had little to do with the effectiveness of his argument.

The Review is such a long-lived periodical with such variety of content, tone, style, method, and motive that no generalization about any of these qualities can absolutely hold. Those critics who note the prevalent plainness in Defoe's prose style will find it in the Review and, as Payne notes, Mr. Review frequently proclaims his own ideal of clear, simple, unadorned prose.[5] But, as others readily admit, Defoe cannot be said to write one particular style, to employ one single technique, and it is this quality of Defoe's prose--to fit the method to

---

[5]Payne, Mr. Review, pp. 20-36.

the subject and the audience--that allows us to examine his rhetoric of persuasion in the Review.[6]

The function of the Review is not so much to inform as to persuade, and for persuasion Defoe cannot rely on the simple, unadorned prose that he frequently pretends is his own style.[7] He must use a more metaphorical, a more complex, rhetorical style. Still, the rhetoric must be of a certain kind: it cannot be rhetoric designed to impress the audience with the author's learning because neither the author nor his assumed audience are scholars; it cannot be rhetoric devised to parade witty conceits or elaborate structures of figures of sound because such would neither fit the temporal subjects in the Review nor appeal to the taste of a materialistic audience. But it can effectively employ a rhetoric familiar to the audience, a rhetoric they are likely to hear on Sunday morning or on any street corner of the city, a rhetoric designed

---

[6]See Sutherland, Daniel Defoe: A Critical Study, p. 82; James Sutherland, "The Relation of Defoe's Fiction to his Nonfictional Writings," in Imagined Worlds: Essays on Some English Novels and Novelists in Honor of John Butt, eds. Maynard Mack and Ian Gregor (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1968), p. 39; Bonamy Dobreé, "Some Aspects of Defoe's Prose," in Pope and His Contemporaries: Essays Presented to George Sherburn, eds. James L. Clifford and Louis A. Landa (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949), p. 177, 180-81; E. Anthony James, Daniel Defoe's Many Voices: A Rhetorical Study of Prose Style and Literary Method (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1972), pp. 14-15, 25.

[7]In just one of many expressions in the Review of this supposed philosophy, Defoe attacks rhetoric as something he never uses: "My Logick is speaking plain Truth in an explicit manner, Ars Loquendi, is to me nothing else; . . . all that is more than this is Juggling with Words, Sophistry, and Froth, and worth no Man's Notice . . ." (VIII, 438).

to appeal not to the intellect but to the imaginations and the emotions, passions, and prejudices of his chosen audience.[8]

His audience probably was composed of Dissenters and Low Churchmen, most of whom certainly must have been freemen like Defoe himself and inclined to vote for Whigs.[9] From the many articles on trade, money, manufacturing, debtors, public credit, etc., one may assume that they were perhaps mostly merchants and tradesmen. Thus the most common subjects handled by the Review—the war, High-Church persecution, occasional conformity, the Jacobite threat, the succession, the High-flying clergy, the iniquity at Oxford, the immigration of Palatinate refugees—could be highly emotional issues. In such cases it was Defoe's purpose to stir conviction and passion among his readers when they could be expected to rally behind or against a certain cause or, when they must be brought to the moderate position, apply arguments and rhetoric

---

[8]James has noted (pp. 15, 25) a similarity between some of Defoe's pamphlets and Puritan sermons, particularly Baxter's. It is James' contention that Defoe's pamphlets often roughly follow the pattern of a puritan sermon with an emotional, rhetorical application at the end. See also Maximillian E. Novak and Herbert J. Davis, The Uses of Irony: Papers on Defoe and Swift Read at a Clark Library Seminar, April 2, 1966 (Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1966), p. 13, in which Novak notes that, despite Defoe's advocacy of plain style in the Review he also remarked that "a good style must 'touch the Reader, surprise his Fancy, and fire his Imagination.'"

[9]Novak (p. 15) says that Defoe's Review audience was wider than is usually assumed because of its coffee-house popularity. Sutherland in Daniel Defoe: A Critical Study, p. 73, defines the Review's audience as "predominantly middle-class, consisting perhaps mainly of tradesmen, but including readers from a wider range of the population, both Anglican and nonconformist." Defoe identifies his audience as "Tradesmen, Artificers and Manufacturers . . . Corporation-Men" (V, 577).

to weaken conviction and raise clouds and mists of doubt so that the readers might accept the ministry's position rather than hold to their own.

In short, Defoe set about to deceive his audience. On the surface, he always pretended honesty, sincerity, and plainness because, he always said, his aim was never anything but truth and objectivity.[10] But we shall see that, with unquestionable premeditation, he employed three basic methods—separately or in combination—to control and persuade his audience.

First of all, the reader will find Defoe, especially when he deals with such subjects as the war, the Jacobite problem, the Highflyers, the morality of the clergy, the need for public thanksgiving and prayer, the danger of Dr. Sacheverell, or any of the dozens of emotional political or politico-religious issues of the day, consciously trying to develop a moral attitude in the audience toward these issues—that is, he works very hard to make the particular issue appear to be a primal struggle between good and evil on an epic scale. In order to achieve his end, he clearly sets himself up as a preacher in a pulpit; the Review literally becomes his sermon. As a result he can make reality two dimensional, as in an emblem or a Biblical account. There is no ambiguity; the reality is absolute. Such a view of the world would be quite acceptable to Dissenters and Low-Churchmen alike.

---

[10] See, for example, I, 341; V, 74; V, 139; VIII, 149; VIII, 589; [IX], 51.

Also, the reader will discover, Defoe works diligently to create the fiction of himself as preacher addressing an audience seated before him or, in some cases, perhaps standing about him. From this position he presents orations that depend for their force much more on sound and rhythm than on content. Again and again he loads the sermons with anaphora, alliteration, balance, parallelism and dozens of other devices of repetition of sound and rhythm. Such essays or sermons might have proven very effective when read aloud on street corners, and they certainly must have reminded his more religious readers of some of the eloquent preachers of the middle and late seventeenth century. This style supports the whole notion of the moral conflict and serves to heighten emotional rather than intellectual response.

Finally, the reader will see that Defoe is often not honest in his arguments either. Certainly there are many cases, especially when he is discussing such matters as the importance of trade or the prospects of an allied offensive, when Defoe offers a strictly logical argument, but in the conflict between Whigs and Tories, between High Church and Dissenters, between revolutionary principles and Jacobitism, or between tyranny and freedom the reader may expect something other than disinterested arguments. Reason demands a cool approach by the orator and rational response by the audience, but too much is at stake during Anne's reign and the people are not disinterested enough for rational argument. As a result Defoe's loaded premises, his invalid conclusions, and his clearly ironic arguments become part of the same calculated deceit as his contrived moral setting and his pulpit oratory.

At last we must decide that for Defoe, as well as for many of his more knowledgeable readers, Mr. Review's whole stance as an unbiased, reasonable seeker of truth was ironic and that the more he expressed these aims the more ironic they became.[11] In the nine years of the Review the reader can find abundant examples of that clear, unassuming style and approach, so popularly thought to be the style of the Review, but when it becomes important to persuade and engender conviction, we always see Mr. Review stepping into the pulpit and appealing to the irrational part of the audience's collective mind.

---

[11]It should be mentioned at the beginning that Defoe and Mr. Review are not necessarily one and the same. Mr. Review usually seems to be Defoe, but when he steps into the pulpit or encounters the mad man in Volume V or takes purposely ironic positions or enters the fray with Mr. Rehearsal or Mr. Examiner or stands before the Scandalous Club he is clearly a persona, not Daniel Defoe. There is not, however, a great difference between Defoe and Mr. Review. In discussing the Review, therefore, unless it is important to make a distinction between Defoe and Mr. Review, I shall not do so.

CHAPTER II

DEFOE AS PROPHET-PREACHER: THE DEVELOPMENT OF MORAL SETTING IN THE REVIEW

In the Review Defoe gives constant lip service to truth, logical argument, and the plain style because, he suggests, people's eyes must be opened; they must not be confused by ambiguities. Yet in the process of persuading his audience—chiefly Dissenters, Presbyterians and Low-Church Anglicans—his most familiar appeal is not to reason and clear thinking but to emotion. Naturally some topics do not readily lend themselves to an emotional appeal; or, when a topic such as the Union is under review over a period of months, Defoe tries various methods of carrying his point. Nevertheless, for most religious and political issues, he methodically sets about devising an emotional basis for arguing.

The emotional groundwork in the Review is designed to touch the Puritan concept of reality, certainly still strong among the highly moralistic Scottish Presbyterians and apparently still extant in the Dissenters and Low-Church Anglicans who prefer a simpler form of worship than the ceremonious High-Church service. The religious ancestors of Defoe and his audience were strongly inclined to see Biblical prophecy and Godly providence fulfilled in their lives. Their world was enmeshed with the spiritual and with a history set in motion and maintained by the Will of God; the end of that divine Will was to found a new Jerusalem

on earth and the Puritans felt that they were the new Jewish nation determined by God to set it up. Believing with William Bradford that they could build a "city on a hill," some of them sought the New Jerusalem in the wilderness of North America; others remained behind to fight a civil war to fulfill the prophecy in England. Because they were chosen people fulfilling destiny, God often showed his concern for or displeasure with them by directly controlling the outcome of certain human events; they believed strongly in God's providence in their lives and, as Perry Miller sardonically describes the New England branch, spent much of their time fasting or giving thanks in order to influence God to help them. They could not, then, understand life as simple day-to-day existence in a temporal world; they were an important part of a grand design and they tended to see life as a great moral drama acted out by the forces of Good (God and themselves) and Evil (Satan and anything that smacked of popery). The conflict was a spiritual warfare, symbolized by the war in heaven and the fall of Satan and made reality in the struggle against the savages in the wilderness and against the Royalists in the English Civil War.[1]

---

[1]My generalizations about Puritan concepts are based on discussions in Thomas Davis, "The Traditions of Puritan Typology," in Typology and Early American Literature, ed. Sacvan Bercovitch (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1972), p. 40; Christopher Hill, Society and Puritanism in Prerevolutionary England (New York: Schocken Books, 1964), pp. 20-29; Perry Miller, The New England Mind: From Colony to Province (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953), pp. 19-26; Herbert Wallace Schneider, The Puritan Mind (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1958), p. 11 [reprt. of 1930 ed.]; and Michael Walzer, The Revolution of the Saints: A Study in the Origins of Radical Politics (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965), pp. 118, 150, 159-60.

It is perhaps because of this heritage, this concept of reality that sometimes borders on the medieval psychomachia and that depends heavily upon typology and belief in God's providence, that Defoe seeks to turn what is primarily a political and personal struggle for power during Queen Anne's reign into a primal struggle between Good and Evil, God and Satan.[2] Certainly there are religious issues: Is the Presbyterian Church to remain independent of the English Church after the Union? Are the Episcopal churches to be tolerated in Scotland? Are the Dissenters to continue to be tolerated in England? Is occasional conformity to continue? Is the Church actually in danger and from whom? Will papacy return with the Pretender? Is there, indeed, too much popery and immorality in the Church of England already? But because the religious issues are so closely tied, perhaps inseparably, to various political parties and factions, they become part of the political turmoil. Defoe's turning the political issues into moral ones is not an unusual device among writers of either side at the time. But for Defoe the device becomes something more than a means to condemn or rail at an opposing writer or party, because Defoe develops it elaborately and consistently so that the idea of the struggle becomes part of the fabric and actually part of the argument of the Review. One gets a distinct

---

[2]M. M. Knappen in Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), pp. 114-115, 173, 202-204, notes the earlier Puritan use of typology for political purposes during the Marian exile and during Elizabeth's reign, especially during the vestiarian controversy.

impression that Defoe is trying very hard to create for his generation the moral drama of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Briefly, Defoe's basic moral assumptions are that Louis XIV, a Catholic tyrant who rules according to divine right, has thereby reduced his own people to utter slavery and is now trying to enslave the rest of Europe. He is driven by pride, that cardinal sin and the sin of Satan, his master. As such he becomes the ultimate symbol of evil in the Review. Louis supports James, the Pretender, whose purpose is to overthrow the Revolution of 1688 by returning Britain to jure divino to destroy the protestant religion, to set up the Catholic Church, and to subject Britain to the power of France. Thus James and Louis are utterly connected and, with Louis, he emerges as symbol of Satan. As a result, the War of the Spanish Succession becomes less a war to maintain the balance of power (although that remains an important point in the Review) than a religious war--a war of Protestants (though the Emperor is Catholic) against the Papacy. Those who work for the Pretender within Britain are, thus, not only traitors to their country but also agents of Satan who are trying to destroy God's Church. Finally, the struggle is also between tyranny and oppression on one hand and liberty on the other. Into this scheme may fall many of the Review's topics not directly related to the politico-religious struggle.[3]

---

[3]After the Emperor's death in 1711, Defoe returns to the theme of balance of power in order to support the Ministry's peace effort. Should Charles, now Holy Roman Emperor, win Spain too, Defoe argues, the imbalance of power would be greater than if the Spanish crown were given to Philip.

In order to create this moral framework, Defoe must endure events with more than particular temporal significance, because, as such, they have meaning only as facts, as pieces of historical data. He wants his audience to interpret reality and draw from it abstraction; he wants them to see a kind of allegory being worked out so that the present is really only a shadow of the past and takes on the abstract interpretations drawn from that past.

To encourage people to accept this approach to the present, Defoe Defoe makes himself a combination preacher-prophet. He often refers to what he does in the Review as preaching and sometimes speaks in terms of his "text" or his "application."[4] He also frequently interweaves Biblical quotations into the essay. For example, when he ends Volume I he explains that he is going to broaden the scope of the Review so that it will deal with more than the affairs of France but that he does not intend to outline the present plan, for "I have many things to say, but ye cannot bear them now" (I, 337). When he speaks of disharmony in government, he remembers that in Paradise Lost Adam and Eve brought disharmony to

---

[4]See, for example, IV, 503; V, 317; VI, 222; VI, 245-46; VI, 341; VII, 493. That Defoe is a preacher is a fairly common idea. James Sutherland in Defoe, p. 110, says that the Review "was . . . to be Defoe's pulpit, a pulpit from which this unorthodox nonconformist could preach political sermons, and exhort his fellow countrymen to do this or that as the circumstances arose." E. Anthony James, pp. 16-18, argues that Defoe has structured his pamphlet sermons after the "plain-style" sermon. There seems to be little evidence of this in individual Reviews. Richard I. Cook in "'Mr. Examiner' and 'Mr. Review'; The Tory Apologetics of Swift and Defoe," HLQ, 29 (1965/66), 154, also refers to Defoe as "a lay preacher risen at a meeting to cajole his friends into righteousness.

the world when they sinned. Then, to strengthen the point he concludes with the text, "Only of Pride (or Sin) cometh Contention" (II, 474). Speaking of the rioters against the Union in Scotland who perhaps believe they are doing God's work he notes that "the wrath of Man cannot work the Righteousness of GOD" (III, 638-9). Later, when he rebukes the British people for not offering prayers to God for the sake of the war, he reminds them that Joshua prayed as well as fought (IV, 251). Sometimes he also slips into a Biblical, coordinate style, as he does when he speaks of the reward awaiting tyrannical princes: "At last the time of Retribution seems to come, and the Injur'd Princes round them begin to lay hold of him on every side, and pull their Plumes from him, and he is in a fair way to be left naked and weakened to the power of those he had oppress'd" (IV, 304). Finally, he often puts on a very excited pulpit style with repetition, strings of rhetorical questions, and lists of synonyms when any one of the terms would have served the purpose. One such passage, having to do with immorality in the military, provides a taste of Defoe's seventeenth-century Puritan oratory, along with the faint scent of brimstone:

> If we were to look into our Armies and Camps, but especially into our Fleet, I must own to you, it is a Wonder to me, Heaven should suffer Winds to flow for them, or Ships to swim under them, or Shot to fly for them; that he is not mov'd by the horrid Oaths, Cursings, Ravings, and Blasphemings on Board our Ships, to discharge Nature from obeying her Course with them, that their Damnings and Madness do not stagnate the Sea, and raise Convulsions in the very Elements; that every Breath of Wind is not a Tempest, and that the Waves do not fly back in a Fright, and leave them splitting on the Bottom; to hear poor ignorant, blinded, intollerable Monsters insulting the Power that made them, and tho' within Inches of Death every Moment, dare GOD almighty to damn them at every Word.
> (IV, 479)

As preacher Defoe tries to give a religious tone to subjects that almost never have anything to do with the soul's salvation. As what may broadly be called the "prophet," he tries to enhance his image as seer and as a special workman for God. Involved in this pose is the idea that such men supply warnings of impending disaster but that the people who should harken to the warning generally disregard it. Such men as these are destined to suffer persecution from those they would save.

As a moral, righteous man doing God's work, Defoe is often set upon by evil-doers whose purpose it is to upset or ruin his efforts. Such appears to be the case when some High-flying gentlemen accuse him of being a hypocrite in his discussion of the Union of England and Scotland, a subject to which Defoe devoted almost the whole of Volume III of the Review; at times although he called for an end to party strife as a hindrance to the Union, he continued to attack Tories and Highflyers. By doing so, his accusers claim, he has served to stir up animosity among parties rather than soothe it. Defoe is shocked: he had tried to change the subject from Tories and Highflyers, he says; but each time he began on trade he was provoked to return to these incendiaries. Since the charges of disruption are made by the very people who are scheming to cause disruption, Defoe cannot help noting a parallel to Nehemiah: "I shall look upon them as those who raised an evil Report upon the Work, in the Case of Rebuilding the Wall of Jerusalem—Whom, though Nehemiah

was Grieved at, yet THE WORK WENT ON, and so will this, when they have done cavilling and have nothing left to say" (III, 196).[5]

Nehemiah was no prophet but, according to the scant information that exists in the Bible, he is known for his rebuilding of a desolate Jerusalem and providing aid to the poor and downtrodden. Defoe has worked tirelessly in Scotland for Harley to persuade important people to support the Union, and he has given it a great deal of attention in the Review. Therefore, by putting himself in the place of Nehemiah, he not only brings together the old and new Israel but also establishes himself as an important instrument in saving it. The Union, at the time, was conceived as a wall against the Pretender. After the Union, Scotland would, as a united part of Britain, abide by the Protestant succession. There would be no chance that the Pretender could take the throne in Scotland and get a foothold for taking the English throne.

Perhaps Defoe's earliest attempt at drawing the prophetic parallel comes when he compares himself to Demosthenes. The importance of the parallel for Defoe seems to be that Demosthenes "was just in my case," so that Louis XIV becomes Philip of Macedonia, Englishmen become Athenians, and Defoe becomes the Greek orator: "he [Demosthenes] was continually setting out the power of Philip of Macedon, to his Athenian

---

[5]Though I have taken "WORK" to mean the actual making of the Union, the paragraph preceding the quotation allows the work of the Review—i.e., opening the eyes of the people—to be the work implied in the passage. In this case, Defoe would be more clearly Nehemiah, but the wall would be less applicable. For another example of Defoe's use of Nehemiah in connection with the Union see III, 638-9.

citizens; and so earnest and particular was he in telling them of their own Follies, of Philip's Greatness, his Policy and his armies, that the Athenians were several times going to tear him to pieces, and Demolish his House as a Friend to the Macedonians" (I, 154). As he suggests here, many people have not been so pleased that in Volume I of the Review he has often spoken of the great French power. The whole thing has happened just this way before, he seems to be saying; they persecuted Demosthenes and would not heed his warning. Will you do the same to me? In the comparison, therefore, Demosthenes becomes a kind of type for Defoe and, as such, it brings together the soothsayer and persecution, a pose that Defoe does not find difficult to assume. He finishes the story of Demosthenes by noting that the failure of the Athenians to respond to warning brought on their defeat and that Philip, who was not blind to the dangers of wisdom, demanded Demosthenes' removal from the city.[6]

But for Defoe's appeal or moral setting to suit the tastes of his readers, he needs the voice of God as his authority, not an allusion to some Greek wise man. As a result, he sometimes assumes the mask of Jeremiah in giving his baneful warnings. For example, in 1710, soon after the new Ministry and heavily Tory Parliament has been seated,

---

[6]In the same issue Defoe contrasts himself to the "Spyes sent into the Land of Cannan, [who] were not blam'd for bringing a True but a False Report of the Land" (I, 154), and notes the similarity between himself and the famed geese of Rome: "I am like the Geese in the Capital. If the Roman Soldiers should have killed them, for frightening them out of their Sleep, they would soon have found the Gauls at their backs, and have blamed themselves for the mistake" (I, 155).

Defoe notes a parallel between that present party of dividers and the ones God warned his people about via Jeremiah. They are bosom serpents, always secretly working to divide the people and stir up trouble for their master, the Pretender. They are, Defoe says, like that "Party of Dividers" in the days of Jeremiah "whose Business it was to delude the People, and draw them off from the Worship of the true God . . . and under pretense of extraordinary Zeal for the Temple, prompted the People to follow them as Oracles of their Law, while at the same time, they went on in Oppression and Violence, perverting judgment, and shedding Innocent Blood, that is in all manner of Vice and Extravagancies . . ." (VII, 430). The Highflyers (whom Defoe generally relates to High Churchmen and Tories, as well as Jacobites) are the modern "Party of Dividers."[7] They are actually Papists, but they cry out, with their leader Sacheverell, that the Church is in danger. They riot, rouse the rabbles of London and other towns, and tear down dissenting meeting houses. He then proceeds to quote Jeremiah 7:4-10, where God warns the people not to follow these liars who go about crying "the Temple of the Lord." Particularly in 7:7-10 God asks the people how they can presume to stand before him in his temple after the terrible sins they have

---

[7]There was apparently a division in the Tory party—if "party" is an acceptable term—between high and moderate Tories. High Tories were strictly High Churchmen, but moderates, like Robert Harley, were not so adamantly opposed to Whig's and Dissenters. As Secretary of State Harley tried to draw support from moderates of all sides. It is often convenient for Defoe to speak of Tories only as high Tories.

committed with these deceivers. Following the quotation from Jeremiah, Defoe paraphrases his own warning:

> This is such a Voice to the High Flyers of this Age, that I should wonder if they do not tremble when they read it—See how it speaks, Will ye Rabble and Huzza, raise Mob and Tumult, Swear falsely to YOUR QUEEN, and burn Incense to your Idol, the PRETENDER, and walk after French Tyranny (other Gods) which ye know not—And come and stand before God in his Protestant Congregations, which are called by his Name, and say, we are deliver'd (at the Revolution) to work all these Abominations? (VII, 431)

The single warning in paraphrase of Jeremiah does not alone suggest Defoe's typological connection with Old Testament men of God, but what Defoe says in the paraphrase is what he says throughout the Review: the Highflyers are at the bottom of the plot to bring in the Pretender, to bring back Catholicism, and to destroy British liberty. What God said through Jeremiah, He has, one might assume, been saying in the pages of the Review from its beginning.

Perhaps better to demonstrate his divine orders to save the British people from their political sins, Defoe manages to make somewhat veiled parallels between himself and Christ. One remembers that Defoe himself once stood in the pillory, a martyr for a group of people who despised him for what he did. Unfortunately he did not have a murderer and a thief on either side of him, but the parallel to the cross is close enough for Defoe. He addresses the Dissenters:

> Well, Gentlemen, I know, that in your Ignorance you did it—and . . . I have never, in Regret for this, stept one Step out of the Cause of English Liberty, or withheld one word that I could speak to serve this Interest to this Day, nor I trust, shall not. No fear has deterr'd me, tho' often threatened, bully'd and insulted. No Fevour has withdrawn me, tho' often caress'd, and tempted with Wheedles and Promises, Arm Mortibus

> Auri. I am to this Day ruffled by your Enemies, insulted by those that hate you, threatened and maltreated for the little Endeavours I use to serve you—And by your selves! I am us'd—How! Just as you know, and as I expected—And who am I to repine? Am I better than Delaun that starv'd for you or D_____ that hang'd for you? No, no, he that will serve you must be hated and neglected by you, must starve and hang for you, and must yet serve you. . . . (VI, 455)

Most of the passage simply refers to Defoe's suffering for the dissenting cause, but the beginning obviously is intended to echo Christ's words on the cross. In the final words, when he notes that even the Dissenters have persecuted him, perhaps he wants to remind his readers that the Jews turned against Christ, too. "Hang for you" near the end of the passage could refer to D_____, but the allusion is more clearly to Defoe in the pillory because the whole passage is concerned with how Defoe has served the Dissenters.

There is one other striking instance of Defoe's association of himself and his work with God's work as told in the Bible. The passage is a kind of revelation, though a lesser one than John's on the isle of Patmos. It recalls the medieval dream vision and is generally related to the allegorical quest. In it appears a character who seems to parallel Christ in bringing peace to the world; and Defoe, when he speaks to the character, laments that without the power of Christ he will fail. The peace that the stranger cries among the bushes is peace among parties for the good of Britain, the same appeal that Defoe makes again and again, especially when Harley is in office:

> When I contemplated with all the Tenderness and possible affection, the Miseries of my Native Country, Torn to Pieces by the Vultures and Tygers of Parties. —I saw a Vision, a strange Sight, a Stranger, a Single Man, venturing, as I had

> done, to thrust himself among the thicket, and Cry Peace, Peace; and wondering what would be the Issue of such a Desperate Undertaking, I looked more earnestly expecting to see his Fate: He was a bold BRITAIN, and seem'd resolved to go on: But alas! said I to him, Honest Britain, unless thou hast with thee some supernatural Power, some of that Voice who when he said to the Winds and the Seas, Peace, be still, could Immediately cause them to be so; It is in Vain. —And I find others have told him so as well as I: But still he goes on. —Well, though I despair for him of any Success, yet the willing Peacemaker shall never want my Blessing; May he go on and prosper; only in his first Success, let him like the Men that attempted to quench the Fire of London, expect to be scorch'd with the Flames of the Parties, on every side, abandon'd even by those whose Madness he reppoves [sic], and Insulted by those he may Sacrifice himself to serve. ([IX], 115)

Although the vision serves to repeat Defoe's own story, he admits to having failed to bring peace; it is an inhuman task, he is saying, one to be handled only by someone like Christ. His "Stranger" implies the Christ who in Matthew 25 explains that men will be judged according to response to human need: ". . . I was a stranger and ye took me in . . ." (Matt. 25:35). Finally, the use of "Sacrifice" enforces the feeling that Defoe finds Christ's ministry on earth analogous to his own effort to save Britain.

The sacrifice theme receives its clearest association with Christ when Mr. Review is threatened with a crucifixion worse than the one he suffered for The Shortest Way with the Dissenters. In July, 1712, Defoe mentions receiving two letters—one from a Jacobite, the other from a Whig—both threatening him with bodily harm. The one from the Jacobite, appropriately written in French, promises his murder à la Tutchin because of a poem, printed in the Review, which referred to the Pretender as a rascal. The Whig letter threatens him with hanging, which, the writer

suggests, will be worse than the pillory. Whether the letters are authentic or not, they clearly depict the way Mr. Review understands himself. Because he always maintains Truth and because Truth is of no party, he is beset from both sides.[8] The Whig letter, by mentioning Defoe's symbol of his own martyrdom, gives Mr. Review the opportunity to remind the Whigs how much he has suffered for truth:

> Whether this Gentleman Means, that he who dares stand in the Pillory must expect Tyburn from them in Reward; whenever he presumes to tell them freely their own Mistakes, a Thing I'll witness to the Truth of; or whether he means, that when they RETURN they will have no Mercy on all those, who have not thought it their Duty to follow them in all that they have thought fit . . . Whether of these two he may mean, I know not, but this I know, that hitherto I have follow'd strictly the Dictates of Truth and my own Conscience. . . . (VIII, 814-15)[9]

These parallels to great prophets are presumably intended to encourage the audience to understand Defoe as performing a comparable service for his people, but they also imply that Defoe's people and their circumstances are somehow similar to those in the Bible. He

---

[8]Before 1710 the Jacobite letter might well have come from a Tory but perhaps Defoe felt that with a moderate Treasurer, a generally Tory Ministry, and a heavily Tory Parliament it would be better to employ a different word. I will show later that Jacobite, Highflyer, Tory, and High Churchman mean, at various times, the same thing; Defoe simply used the term that best suited his purpose.

[9]The pillory appears as an ironic symbol in Defoe's account of the George Ridpath case. Ridpath, a Whig, had Defoe arrested for writing Reasons against the Succession of the House of Hanover and What if the Pretender should Come? but Ridpath was also under indictment for writing seditious material. (Defoe believes that Ridpath brought the charges against him because he was angry over his own plight.) To Defoe's great satisfaction Ridpath jumped bail rather than face the pillory. Defoe gleefully parallels his own case to Ridpath's; he was an honest Whig writer who respected his cause and his friends too much to run away. If one's cause is just, one never has reason to fear, he says. See [IX], 183-184.

has, one might say, come close to typology. But the emphasis in Defoe's parallels is more upon himself because he is developing himself as one qualified to make moral judgments.[10]

The primary purpose of the Review, however, is not to persuade Dissenters and Whigs that Daniel Defoe is a perfect, divine creature, although one is sometimes inclined to fall into that error. Defoe must make his readers respond emotionally, and he can do so by showing them that what is happening in their own times can be interpreted morally.

Luckily for Defoe, moral interpretation is not difficult. As he often understands the fact, the struggle at home and in the war is basically Protestant against Catholic; and, since it is commonly accepted that British Protestants are God's chosen people in the modern world, it naturally follows that the Catholics, who want to prevent Protestant worship, are the modern equivalents to the Egyptians. Once these identifications are accepted, various other details fit into the scheme. The reigns of Charles II and James II stand for the period of bondage, but the New Israelites were freed by William, who becomes the latter-day Moses. Like Moses, William was fated to lead a quarrelsome and disloyal people, many of whom, not appreciating their deliverance, went back to worshipping the idols of their bondage. These people, now known as

---

[10]According to Thomas M. Davis in "The Traditions of Puritan Typology," p. 15, typology is the assumption of two events, "promise and fulfillment" which "have taken place in time as real historical facts." When early Puritans saw parallels between themselves and the Israelites, they assumed that they were to be the fulfillment of the prophesied new Israel. Defoe simply delays the fulfillment about half a century.

Highflyers, have also tried desperately to return the whole nation to bondage. Of course, the French, the chief agents for popery and the Pretender, who wants to return popery to Britain, also are easily identified with the Egyptians. Naturally Louis XIV is Pharoah, and after the death of William, his Hebrew counterpart becomes Marlborough, whom Defoe sometimes calls Joshua.

Obviously such a contrived set of parallels can not always work: the modern Children of Israel fight only Egyptians, for example; and it is not very clear how Queen Anne fits into the scheme or what William did that kept him from reaching the Promised Land. Nevertheless, Defoe seems satisfied that his readers will rationalize and oversimplify the present so that it accords with the moral story in the Bible. If Defoe succeeds in encouraging them to make the association, their emotional responses to characters and actions, pretty clearly defined in terms of good and evil in the Bible, will be carried over, too. Above all, Whigs and Dissenters must remain unified against the evil Highflyers and Jacobites.

Defoe's desire to identify the modern Whig unmistakably with the dissenting cause is very apparent in his argument with Charles Leslie of the Rehearsal over the legitimacy of the Revolution of 1688. Leslie, a Highflyer and advocate of passive obedience, has argued that since the Israelites did not actually revolt, their escape cannot be used as precedent for revolting against a ruler. Pharoah, according to the Rehearsal, gave his permission, and (though it is not clear in Defoe's account of his argument), the Israelites were not initially aware that

they were making an escape. Leslie, then, is not actually drawing a parallel to the exodus of the Jews; he is arguing that there is none.

In Defoe's answer, however, there is an unabashed attempt to make an argument based on parallels. Pharoah, he claims, may have consented to let Israel go, but he secretly resolved to go back on his word, just as James II really wanted to retake the throne after his forced abdication. As for Leslie's contention that the Israelites did not actually revolt, Defoe answers that God had informed them of their deliverance: "Was the whole Congregation [my italics] ignorant of GOD'S Promise to deliver them? Did not Joseph foretell them on his Death-Bed, that GOD would bring them out of that country, and made them swear to carry his Bones with them? Had they not the Promise of GOD which he swore to Abraham and his Seed, that he would give them the Land of Canaan to possess it?" And, Defoe asks, Why were they taking Joseph's bones with them if they were not planning to leave? Clearly, he concludes, they revolted against a ruler who did not really give his permission and they left by God's direction (IV, 699-700). For proof Defoe relies on evidence from the Bible, but to make the second part of the argument apply to 1688, he must expect the reader to make a typological association based on his parallel between Pharoah and James II; if James II is Pharoah, then the revolutionaries are the Children of Israel who were directed by God in their escape from bondage. Passive obedience, then, has no force as an argument.

Most of Defoe's attention, however, is focused on preventing the return to bondage. When, for example, in 1708 Harley and the other

Ministers come under attack from Whigs who want to gain office, Defoe defends them first by suggesting that the Ministry is already Whig and that those who attack them logically must be Tories. If these people persist, he warns, they will find themselves back where they were before the Revolution, because they are only helping the Tory cause. Then, in a rhetorical surge, he ends the case by reducing the whole matter to the old return-to-bondage theme.

> These Men [i.e., those Highflyers, tackers and "mad Men" who want to destroy free, protestant government], as they now joyn with you [the Whigs] in railing at the Ministry, and in crying out of Mismanagements, will effectually cure you of that Cry, their little Fingers are heavier than the Loins of these, they shall deliver your fancy'd Miscarriages the shortest way, they shall sink the Ship to drown the Ratts, they shall mend one Breach in the Government and make two, they shall remove your fancy'd Grievances, and bring you real ones, they shall take away your fallible Ministry, and supply your want with infallible Tyranny . ... then you shall cry out because of the Bondage and Captivity you shall be brought under, and there shall be none to Deliver you—. (V, 98)

The Biblical flourish at the end leads to a quotation from Deuteronomy in which Defoe applies to the Whigs each verse of Moses' warning to the Children of Israel:

> The Lord shall smite thee with Madness, and Blindness, and Astonishment of Heart, there is a possess'd deluded Nation, v. 29. Thou shalt be openly oppressed and spoiled evermore, there is a Tory Administration restored, and no Man shall save thee, v. 30. Thous shalt betroth a Wife, and another Man shall lie with her, there is K. Charles II restor'd; thou shalt build a House, and thou shalt not dwell therein, there is 1680 exactly, v. 31. Thine OX shall be slain before thine Eyes, and thou shalt not eat thereof; . . . thy Sheep shall be given to thine Enemies, and thou shalt have none to rescue them, there's the Plundrings in the West of Scotland return'd; the Fruit of thy Land and all thy Labours shall be a Nation which thou knowest not, eat up, there is Invasion, and thou shalt be only oppressed and crush'd always, there is French Government, v. 37. Thou shalt become an Astonishment,

> a Proverb, and a By-Word among all Nations, there is the just Contempt you ought to have that enjoy'd Liberty, and neither have Hearts to vallue it, nor Hands to keep it, v. 43. The Stranger that is within thee, viz. the High Flyer, shall get up above thee very high, i.e. in the Government, there is a Tory Ministry, and thou shalt come down very low; there's Bondage the Natural Consequence of a Jacobite Administration. (V, 99)

Here then because of the danger of the Pretender without and the Highflyers within, the theme in his typology is the return to bondage. He develops it thoroughly again in an essay which begins with a sardonic retelling of the story of the Israelites, as if his audience had never heard it before. The point is that those people who worshipped the idols began to do so after only six weeks. "And who in our Days," Defoe pointedly asks, "does this sordid, bruitish, unthinking Spirit of this ungrateful People reprove?" The guilty are those who had their places and possessions taken from them by papists during James II's reign but who now "are the hottest High-Flyers, the rankest Jacobites, the strictest Passive Obedience Men now in the Nation." It seems that these people were willing to help pull down James when they stood to lose so much, but now that the danger is over, these "High-Flying Church-men . . . seek the Ruin of that very Government they are sworn to" (IV, 446). Defoe ends the essay by encouraging the newly elected members of Parliament (1707) to exert their power to remove all "Poisons of Envy and Malice, which infect the air round about you" (IV, 448).

If the Highflyers are the ones who want to return the Church to bondage, it is only natural to assume that Dr. Sacheverell, whom Defoe identifies as a Highflyer, is working for that end when he preaches that

the Church is in danger. The purpose of Sacheverell's plot as Defoe understands it is to destroy the Dissenters and, at the same time, their opposition to Jacobite treason. It is a mystery to Defoe that the Churchmen and the mobs who follow Sacheverell do not remember their plight before the Revolution. For the Church was in real danger then, but

> Church and Dissenter join'd heartily to pull down the Popish Babel, that was built upon our Liberties, and Nature shone with a Light of Conviction into all your Understandings, Teaching you, that Nations were not tamely to give up their Laws, Religion, and Estates, to the Arbitrary ruinous Projects of a Tyrant[.] Would any Man, I say, that had ever seen this, believe it possible, without a Judicial Infatuation, that the same People should reassume their Blindness, and rise up again for Bondage? —Never since the Children of Israel, who were fed by Miracle from Heaven, demanded to go back to make Brick without Straw, and to feed on Onions and Garlick: was any Nation in the World so sordidly and unaccountably bewitch'd. (VII, 107)

The Children of Israel serve effectively for developing Defoe's moral setting for the Revolution and the war with France, but as a type the Jewish bondage is limited in its application to themes of oppression. Luckily for Defoe, the Bible supplies an abundance and variety of types, types that Defoe may use in the same ways that he used the Israelites: as exhortations to action, as evidence in arguments, or as ammunition in attacks.

The first class may be demonstrated by two parallels out of Jonah which are designed to goad or shame people to give pious, proper thanks to God for his favors. When, in the first instance, the Anglicans, Presbyterians, and Dissenters balk at Queen Anne's proclamation for a joint celebration of the completion of the Union, Defoe finds an

appropriate parallel in the story of Jonah: "Do as the Men of Tarshish did, let every Man call upon his GOD; Difference of Religion made no Scruple upon their Minds at such a Time as that, but they all come about poor Jonah with a general Cry, Arise, call upon thy GOD; they never ask'd what GOD it might be, but let it be what GOD it would, their Case was desperate, and any God, that would help them, would be welcome to them" (IV, 134). The three Protestant sects are perhaps in no danger of shipwreck, and they probably have the same God, although the readers can by no means be sure that Defoe wishes to imply either possibility. Nevertheless, the surface moral is clear, despite the ambiguities that arise from the story: the Protestant groups have much less excuse for discord than the men who were about to go down with the ship.

In the second example, because many people do not obey the Queen's command to give thanks for Britain's deliverance from the French invasion of Scotland (1708), Defoe warns them that Britain cannot continue to expect victories without their proper recognition of God, who at present protects his people from their enemies (V, 154). To drive home his prophetic warning he refers again to Jonah and to Jonah's ministry among the Ninevites. At the warning of reluctant Jonah the ruler and all the people of Ninevah put on sackcloth and began to fast (Jonah 3:4-9). Such has not been the case among the Britons. Defoe asks, "I wonder, Gentlemen, whether the Ninevites kept their Day of Humiliation, as you do or No—and if they had, . . . would GOD have repented of his fierce wrath, and delay'd his Vengence 40 years for them, as he did?" (V, 157).

Defoe's use of the Biblical parallel as proof of argument is amply demonstrated in his argument that "the Limitations of Power and Superiority of Laws in Matters of Government have an Original in the very early Ages of the World." He takes for his text the story of Darius who was forced to put his beloved prophet Daniel into the lions' den because he had signed a law that made praying to any power other than the King punishable by death in the lions' den. The point is that, although Darius opposed the law because it was simply a device to destroy Daniel, he signed it anyway because the Council had passed it. Then, as soon as Daniel broke the law the princes and rulers under Darius demanded that he enforce the law. He so abhorred hurting Daniel that he suspended the sentence for one day until he could think of a way to circumvent it, but, as Defoe relates, he succumbed to pressure:

> And tho' the King suspended the Execution but one Day, see the Unweariness and Clamour is rais'd Then, that is, at the going down of the Sun, these Men assembled unto the King. Now mark the Emphasis; they do not come with another humble address to his Majesty, that the Laws might be put in Execution, but they come with a Claim of Right. KNOW O KING, that the Laws of the Medes and Persians is, that no Decree or Statute, which the King establisheth, may be changed; as if they had said, Sir, we come to demand our Rights and Liberties according to the known Laws of this Land; and to tell you, Sir, that to dispense with the Laws of the Land is illegal, and is not in their Power. The King took their Meaning presently, and knowing he could not contend with them, or in meer Veneration to the most sacred Authority of the Law, gives them no Answer, but delivers up Daniel to their Mercy. (VI, 430-31).

Here, Defoe suggests, is the exact principle of the Revolution and an excellent example of the way a king must recognize and respect the power of the law. It is as if God himself has provided a definition of the Powers of a ruler in relation to the power of the State. Also it

has the needed emotional appeal of Darius' sacrifice of his friend for the sake of the law, a point that Defoe really develops to an inordinate length.

A vicious attack on High-Church immorality affords Defoe opportunity to apply damaging parallels. In No. 126 (Jan. 15, 1709) Defoe prints a letter from a reader reporting a Dr. ----- [identified as a clergyman, "the same who formerly would have no Drink in his House brew'd with Presbyterian Malt" (Cf. IV, 538)] who cursed the church members of his town with "G-d D--m" and told them that they could "go to the Devil" (V, 503). This revealing letter then leads him, in the next number (No. 127), into a severe moral attack on such "Sons of Sodom." There, after some fiery rhetorical prose in which these clergymen are called "Factors of Hell, and Stock Jobbers for the Devil" and generally blasted in every conceivable manner, he gets down to texts and parallels. They are first compared to Judas. It is no sin "to have Hypocrites, and Wolves in Sheeps Clothing" in the Church just as it was no reproach to the Apostles that one of them was a traitor; "but the Reproach is, when this Devil is known, and yet suffer'd, embraced and let go unpunish'd." It is, he suggests, up to the leaders of the Church to get rid of these Judases, a point which leads him to Samuel and the sons of Eli. "These are the Men, who like the Sons of ELI, make Men abhor the Offering of the Lord, 1 Sam. 2.17. —And what said Old Bishop ELI to them? Truely Nothing; but, nay my Sons, for it is no good Report that I hear of you, &c. v. 24. and the rest of that Chapter will tell you, how GOD resented his Coldness of Discipline, and punish'd it upon ELI

himself. . . ." The significance of the punishment—i.e., the defeat of the Israelites by the Philistines who then took the ark—could not have escaped Defoe's readers (see III, 67-68). This story leads him to a final and contrasting text which best suggests the debauchery of the High-Church clergy. Phineas, Defoe notes, was rewarded by God when "in his warmer Zeal [he] stabb'd Zimri and Cosbi in the Act of their prophane Love . . . Numbers 25.13" (V, 507). The moral is clear: there must be reformation in the Church because God's anger might be vented in destruction of both Church and Nation.[11]

With Defoe's use of typology and Biblical parallels for political argument, it would be strange if for the same purpose he did not employ God's Providence as well. After all, Providence is the agency of the supposed Divine plan on which the prophetic nature of typology depends; and the various parallels imply a world totally suffused with the moral reality of the Bible. Recognition of Providence in political and military matters is only a natural extension of typology and Biblical parallels. There is, however, an inherent danger in determining God's Providence, since one can determine it to be whatever one wants. Defoe himself voices fear that the political opposition (Jacobites, Highflyers, and Tories) will play politics with Providence so that it will seem to

---

[11]The extent to which Defoe's scriptural parallels may be pursued is suggested by William L. Payne's Index to Defoe's "Review" (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948), pp. 110-111. It should also be noted that Defoe uses parallels in ancient and modern history much as he does Biblical parallels. For examples, see I, 135; I, 191; II, 145-46; II, 436; IV, 485-88; V, 477; VII, 37-8; VII, 521-2.

support their position (I, 266). There is, of course, no danger of Mr. Review taking such advantage of his readers. Except near the end of the war when Defoe must, for the sake of Harley, argue for Peace, his commentaries on the fighting almost always imply that British troops are under the watchful gaze of God, who causes them to triumph over His enemies unless He has some reason to be angry with Britain. When the Virginia fleet managed to escape from a much larger French force, for example, Defoe explains that God brought down a fog bank to protect their escape (I, 381). During the seige of Lille God caused the French to commit a great tactical blunder, for when they lifted the seige of the city they left behind only 8000 men to protect their artillery. As a result they lost the artillery and many of the men. Ordinarily no one would ever expect the French to make such a mistake, "But thus infatuated are Nations, Princes, and great Men . . . when Providence has determin'd their Fall; French Power seems sentenc'd from Heaven . . . " (III, 459).

On the other hand, Defoe does not fail to provide stern prophetic warnings to Britons that God may not, indeed sometimes does not, always smile on their cause. He warns them in an early Review that it is perilous to support the Hungarian revolutionaries even though they are thought to be Protestants fighting against Catholic oppression. The real reason for Defoe's anti-Hungarian argument is that he does not want to disrupt the Confederacy, a result which would certainly be achieved if he took sides against the Emperor. But instead of admitting his motives he prefers to point out that the Hungarian cause is already lost. They have been, it seems, under a curse from God ever since they joined the

the Turks against the Holy Roman Empire. God will not abide the encroachment upon Christianity by infidels (I, 239; I, 266).

At home Defoe encourages political parties to make peace because, he warns, God will never allow the English to succeed in the war until they can live peaceably among themselves. "Heaven," he balefully informs them, "sees not fit yet to trust us with Peace . . . How can we expect Peace abroad, when 'tis plain, as soon as ever we had but a Prospect of it, as soon as by the Victory of Blenheim we began to think the Danger from Abroad was over, we turn'd all the Call, all the Fire, all the fermented Blood of the Nation, one against another" (II, 190). Later, when the French have recovered from the disastrous campaign of 1706 and are able to prolong the war, he attributes their success to God's pleasure from their prayers (IV, 250). The moral is obvious: when God's people do not behave properly, He punishes them by helping the other side.

By 1712, however, God seems to have grown tired of the War. True, He will still protect Protestants in Northern Europe from the scourge of the Muscovites (VIII, 622-23), but He so wants an end to the War that He brings defeat to the Dutch for not joining the British in a peace treaty with the French (VIII, 839-40). Meanwhile, the Whigs have to be content that the Tory peace is God's Will; the evil Louis may be punished in some other fashion, for who knows the intentions of God? Finally, as if conditioning the Whigs to their fate, he suggests that if the Pretender should come it is only because God will have taken the great work of securing Protestantism from the Whigs ([IX], 2).

So convinced is Defoe that God controls every aspect of Protestant affairs in Britain that he has compiled a catalogue of coincidences and signs to prove it. Is it not strange that William landed on the same day that the people were celebrating their deliverance from the Popish plot? or that 1688 is exactly one hundred years after the attempted Popish invasions from Spain? or that James II was voted abdicated by the Lords on the same date (February 6) that he took the throne? or that James II died on the same day of the month (September 3) that London burned? In the recent defeat of the Spanish at Barcelona, is it not peculiar that they should have suffered defeat on the day of an eclipse of the sun and that the sun should be the emblem on their flags? (III, 309-312; 313-315) Indeed, "Defoe's God is a sort of English Jehovah with a distinct bias toward nonconformity."[12]

Not all of Defoe's providential reasoning is concerned with the War or the Revolution. For instance, in the last volume of the Review when he gratefully drifts away from a very confused and somewhat embarrassing political situation, he supplies a striking example of how God's providence applies to trade.[13] He begins the developments in the issue for February 3, 1713, with a sort of materialistic ode "To Penshurst" in which he says that God created oceans, rivers, climates, soils, etc. in various places in order to facilitate trade. In the next

---

[12]Sutherland, Defoe, p. 128.

[13]The essays on trade do help support Harley's South Sea project.

number Defoe accepts Burnet's theory that the world was changed significantly by the flood. Before the flood the world was more beautiful and there were no wide seas separating the bodies of land. But Defoe does not pine for the antedeluvian world; God meant to create the wide oceans for the sake of trade:

> The Remote separated State of the Parts of the Earth one from another, are the Reason of Commerce, and the Wisdom of Providence having appropriated to several Parts, the most necessary Things, requisite for the use of Men, frequently at remote Distances from one another necessary, to convey to, receive from, each other, those Things they want; and this indeed is the short Synopsis of what we call Trade. ([IX], 109]

God could have, Defoe admits, left things as they were in the Garden so that people everywhere would have all they needed to survive, "but wise Providence having resolv[']d Man to Eat his Bread with the Sweat of his Brow" spread these treasures throughout the world and necessitated universal correspondence among people. Finally the essay ends with a crowning climactic sentence:

> Not the Variety of the Climates, not the Beauty of the Heavenly Bodies, not the Influences of the Elements in the Productions of Nature; not the Harmony of the Creation in General, or the wonderful Operations of the Parts in particluar, afford a more profitable, instructing, and diverting Observations [sic], than the pleasing Diversity of Nature, from whence is derived the Foundations of Commerce, and the Chain of happy Causes and Consequences, which has now, more than ever, embark'd the whole World in a diligent Application to Trade.

Because Defoe knows that people will react more emotionally and more enthusiastically when there appear to be only two, easily definable and antipodal sides to an issue, he works very hard to make British politics seem to be a simple conflict. The effect can be partially

achieved through a typology in which one finds God's chosen set against the heathen but even with this method there can be ambiguity, since not all the Jews are good or all the heathens evil. Apparently Defoe feels that, to reach his audience effectively and steel their attitudes toward the High Tories, Jacobites, or anyone wanting to overthrow the government in its present state, he must devise an easily definable enemy, an unforgiveable sin, a monstrous form of evil like Christianity's Satan so that whatever can be associated with it may be called evil and whatever opposes it may be called good. When there are ambiguities, these must be further confused so that Defoe can say they do not exist; where there is gray, Defoe must bleach it white or blacken it into polarity.

For Defoe, a moderate, dissenting revolutionary who agrees with Locke, the absolute evil is tyranny. Its ultimate cause is the doctrine of divine right; its immediate cause is pride. Its original practitioner was Satan who, because of Pride, tried to be equal with God; but he was punished, cast out of Heaven to suffer eternally in Hell. And so will the modern tyrants—Louis XIV, Charles XII, and the Pretender—be punished. Perhaps Defoe's best expression of tyranny appears in one of his typical, emotional, figurative outbursts:

> Tyranny! A Composition of all Human Plagues, a Bundle of Deaths, a Weed that grows upon the Verge of the Bottomless Pit, cultivated from Hell, and planted by the Devil. TYRANNY! a Medicine for Nations grown wanton with GOD's Goodness, and kicking against their Maker; a Drug—which well dry'd by the Heat of Ambition, pulveriz'd in the Mortar that Solomon braz'd Fools in, decocted with a proportion'd Quantity of a modern Plant call'd SLAVERY, in about a Tun of a Nation's Tears—Boil'd up to a Consistency by the slow Fire of Oppression, and administer'd in a hot Draught of innocent Blood.—'Tis a vomit for a whole Nation, which rightly taken, generally works

> Parliamentarily, and so the Kingdoms heave and cast gradually or legally; but if it be given in a little too large a Quantity, it works violently, and the whole Nation grows sick, and Sp . . . s; then up comes Tyrants, ill gotten conquests, broken Laws, and such Stuff; just as People bewitch'd vomit crooked Pins, old Iron, Glas, and any thing the Devil supplies them with. (V, 455)[14]

There are in Europe three prominent tyrants—Charles XII, Louis XIV, and the Pretender—during Defoe's writing of the Review (the Emperor is generally excluded by Defoe from the group because he is one of the Confederates). Of these Charles XII deserves least attention because he is, though a frequent object for attack, outside Defoe's pattern of morality for the War and British politics. Nevertheless, he is important because Defoe must discredit him as a Protestant hero.[15]

Defoe's treatment of Charles very neatly mirrors the images he would like to project of Louis and the Pretender. According to Defoe, Charles has attacked the Poles not because he wants to secure the Protestant religion in Poland but because he lusts for power and more territory. No one can argue his just motive when he puts the whole of European Protestantism in danger; he not only draws his own troops out of the service of the Confederacy but keeps the Poles, who are allies of the Confederacy, occupied as well. And what is perhaps worse, he has left his own people to the mercy of the Muscovites, who sell them into slavery

---

[14]See also II, 326; III, 685-6; IV, 643-4; V, 454-5; VI, 2ff; VI, 250-2.

[15]Since Charles jeopardizes the Confederation by attacking Poland and refusing to join in the battle against France, he is considered dangerous by Defoe. Therefore, Defoe would like to dampen any movement by Protestants to support Charles.

to the Turks. As a result Defoe thinks the Swedish government the most tyrannical possible (I, 193-5; 97-9; 201-3). But God does not forbear to punish tyranny. In June 1709 news arrives of the Swedish defeat at Poltava and to Defoe the defeat simply demonstrates God's Providence in the matter: "Unhappy Ambition! That when it once flatters men with the Glory of Conquest, binds them with Mists and Shadows of imaginary Glory in Pursuit of which they precipitate themselves into the deepest Gulphs of Human Misery." Also "the Wisdom of Providence is conspicuous in nothing more relating to such Cases, than in Chequing the Pride and Vanity of Ambitious tyrannical Princes, Men of the Sword, whose Pride runs upon subjecting their Fellow-Creatures to Violence and Destruction . . ." (VI, 235).[16]

There may be some mitigation in Defoe's handling of Charles, who is young and a Protestant, but Louis, a major evil character in Defoe's moral drama, receives the full force of Mr. Review's spite. As a prideful tyrant bent on conquest for the sake of his own glory, he naturally falls into the role of Satan:

> Here's a Monarch raises Armies, invades his Neighbours, oppresses Kingdoms, destroys Governments, and becomes terrible to Mankind; and this is call'd Glory. He's a great Man, gets the Title of Immortal, Invincible, the Conqueror, the

---

[16]For other essays on God's punishment of Charles for tyranny see VI, 261-3; VI, 270; VI, 295; VI, 351. Also the plague that Defoe warns Britons about in Volume [IX] notably has been spread by the suffering Swedish army.

> Thunderer, the Great, and the like[17]—Just thus is King Lucifer become terrible— . . . Will ye call mighty Oppressions, inexpressible Devastations, and invincible Injuries by the Nick-Names of Merit? Are these Glory? Then all the Tyrants and Destroyers of the world, Enemies of Mankind, and Insulters of Heaven, are Men of Glory; Hell is the Fountain of Praise, and Satan ought to be call'd Lucifer Le Grand. (VI, 289)

If the Devil is called great because of his crime, then "He and Louis le Grand much [march?] upon the same Foot, for illustrious Mischiefs, glorious Distractions and Disorders committed against the Peace of Mankind, Temporal and Eternal, adorn them both." The real glory of a monarch is to fight for peace, and his rule is "founded on Justice, aim'd at Peace, and pursu'd with Truth"; but people cannot talk of Glory "when the Laurels are handled by a bleeding Nation, Honour founded on Injury, and War made for meer Conquest; this is all Blood, Rapine, and cruel robbing Mankind; such Monarchs are Thieves to their Fellow-Creatures, and vile usurpers of that Dominion, GOD in the original Design of Government never bestow'd on them" (VI, 290).[18]

As in the case of Charles XII, Defoe predicts in 1706 that God will not allow Louis to go unpunished; rather, like Leviathan and Behemoth, Louis is being used by God so that "the Hook of Vengence being put into his Nostrils, he may subimit to the Chastisement of his own Pride" (III, 442). The disastrous French campaign of 1706 should be a clear

---

[17]See VI, 54-55. Here Defoe mockingly describes some of the medals and verses made in honor of Louis XIV. The epithets mentioned are among them.

[18]See VI, 56, for a mock dedication to Louis as the world's greatest tyrant.

warning that the time is near: "If he has not Eyes to see the painting Hand of Divine Justice, it must be from some secret judicial Blindness, equal to that of Pharoah and the Egyptians; and to me is a signal Token that God has not done with him yet" (III, 443). Three years later France seems to be finished and Louis has made overtures of peace. Now Defoe points out that all tyrants throughout history "from Sardanapalus to Lewis XIV" have been finally brought down by the very nations they oppressed. Louis's long reign has left him with less than he originally had. Such is the fortune of Pride, Defoe moralizes (VI, 291-2).[19]

It is true that God will eventually unseat tyrants, just as He did James II, but the people must suffer until God is ready to exact His vengeance. It is best, then, to prevent tyranny if possible. The tyranny of France and its danger to the people are well established in the Review: according to Defoe, the subjects' only benefits from tyranny are "Poverty and Subjugation" (I, 62). It follows, then, that the people of England must prevent the coming of the Pretender because he is inseparably linked with Louis (IV, 533). His success in taking the throne depends upon French success in the war. Conversely, since Louis's whole justification for breaking the Treaty of Partition was to help the

---

[19]Defoe also provides a catalogue of tyrants who were brought down "by the Hands of those very People that have been oppress'd by them. For each tyrant Defoe gives his crime and his punishment. The list includes Adonibezec (Judges 1:7); Ahab (I Kings 22:38); Hamon (whom Defoe invites Louis to read about in Isaiah 31:1); Charles IX of France, who died mad; Henry II of France, who was murdered; Henry IV of France, who was also murdered. The list could include, Defoe suggests, a host of tyrants "from Sardanapalus down to Tarquin Julius Caesar, and afterwards down to Adolph of Nassau" (IV, 490). Cf. VIII, 585-88.

Pretender become James III, any treaty which Louis made with William would be invalid (V, 46). Moreover, it is Defoe's contention that the link between the two threats to British liberty reflects more than convenience or necessity; the tyranny embodied by Louis is the same strain of disease that once thrived in England under the Pretender's uncle, Charles II, and his father, James II. In short, Louis and the Pretender are naturally allied. If the Pretender comes to the throne, the Revolution has failed and political and spiritual tyranny, as it now exists in France, will return to Britain.[20]

The problem of the Pretender brings one to the party conflict in England and Scotland—a topic that occupies the bulk of the Review. Briefly, Defoe recognizes a number of parties and/or factions, but he still manages to simplify the struggle into one of good and evil. The good people support liberty, toleration, the Protestant religion, parliamentary power, and the Protestant succession. Almost always the good people are designated as Whigs. On the evil side, the side of Tyranny, the word game is more complicated: there are Jacobites, Papists, Highflyers, High Churchmen, and Tories. Fine distinctions may be drawn

---

[20]The war has several closely related meanings for Defoe. At times it is a war for peace and extending trade, and in this sense, peace at home becomes as necessary as peace abroad for a flourishing commerce. It is also a war to preserve the Protestant Church in Europe; for the spread of French power means the spread of the Catholic Church. Political and religious oppression are inseparable. Finally, as noted in the text, the war is a battle for British liberty. It should be noted, however, that these generalizations do not conform to Defoe's position on the Peace of Utrecht. During the Harley ministry (1710-1713) Defoe must forget about pushing on the war, assure his readers that the Pretender will not come, and emphasize the need for peace to save the nation from financial ruin.

between some pairs, clearer distinctions between others; but Defoe, most of the time, wants to blend the terms so that they are not necessarily readily distinguishable in a given circumstance. Once definitions—if there ever were any clear ones—are blurred he can use one particular term (Jacobite or Papist, for example) to injure any person or group of persons that he wishes to present as opposition for the Whigs. In short, Defoe manages, paradoxically, to complicate through oversimplification an already muddy political picture so that he can use terms in whatever way he wants.

Jacobitism, the most conspicuous and unchanging doctrine of the evil side, is defined in the Review as being not so much the belief that the Pretender should be James III, but "the Spirit of Tyranny and Oppression, which reign'd in the Persons of our two Princes before the Revolution, and which led them into all the Extravagancies, Irregularities, and arbitrary Practices, for which this free Nation depos'd them . . ." (VI, 70-71). This is, of course, the same doctrine that brought tyranny to France and the same doctrine that links the Jacobite cause to the cause of the French (V, 46; VI, 115). Therefore Jacobitism and French tyranny are the same and whoever can be logically or illogically associated with Jacobitism may be considered enemies of Britain.

True and pure Jacobites are at work most conspicuously in Scotland where they are protected by strong Catholic and Episcopal support and by their great distance from London. Their aim is to arouse and disrupt people as much as possible because the Pretender can never return if the people are united. Thus one finds them deluding the ignorant Protestants

from Glasgow and inciting them to rebel against the Union (VI, 603); but Defoe, who is not deluded, attributes the whole anti-Union movement to "Jacobite Infusions, Popish and High-Flying artifice" (III, 631). At other times they can be found starting rumors that the high price of grain (1709) results from exportation so that Whigs will be blamed for what Jacobite stock-jobbers did. Or Jacobites might be found lurking about whispering that the British, who have been forced to contribute most of the money and soldiers for the Confederates, have been treated unfairly by the Dutch ([IX], 53). In short, whatever scheme is afoot to divide the people, a Jacobite or one of his tools is probably behind it.

Jacobites, in order to be called such, must, of course, be openly treasonous; that is, they must refuse to take the abjuration oath and openly work for the Pretender. As Defoe puts it, "a Nonjuror is a Jacobite, profest such; and a Jacobite is no longer a Jacobite if he is not a Nonjuror (V, 135). Ironically this makes them much better than their English counterparts, the Highflyers, because "they seem much honester Men, less to be blam'd, and better to be thought of, who making it Matter of Conscience openly profess and own themselves Jacobites, and Act as such . . . telling you what they are, and what you are to expect from them, than that wicked, cursed and abominable Race of Men among us, call'd High Flyers . . ." (V, 235).

Defoe's main point about the Highflyers, then, is that they are hypocritical Jacobites, and this makes them doubly dangerous because, like bosom serpents, they do their work in secret to destroy the very establishment they pretend to uphold. Because they are not what they seem, therefore, they must be identified by certain characteristics of their behavior. As Defoe explains in the Review for March 16, 1710, "They are, when view'd in Perspective—exactly in the Form of other Men—As Saint-like, as soft and smooth as any of us; and none can, till they come nearer, distinguish them from the Elect." Close examination of a Highflyer, Defoe goes on to suggest, is like the horrifying experience of drawing close to a dragon:

> The lines of his Face are all Fury and Malecontent; his Breath is a Contagious Flame, that both burns and poisons at the same time; his Words come from him like Vomit, filthy and furious—He curses his Sovereign at the same time he prays for her, wishes her Confusion when he drinks her Health, and resolves to oppose her when he swears to her—His Eyes sparkle with Rage at that Government he submits to, and he bites his Tongue when he speaks of the Revolution, that he may put himself in mind of reproaching it with Bitterness enough; He is a Hypocrite, that no Party is safe in; the Jacobite cannot trust him, for he really betrays their Cause by taking the Oaths; The Government cannot trust him, for they are always betray'd by him, notwithstanding his Oaths; The Papists cannot trust him, for all he has to value himself upon, is now and then an Excursion at them to make himself popular; The Dissenters cannot trust him, for he breathes Death and Destruction at them—Yet over all this, he wears the Sheep's Cloathing, he prays for his Enemies, and betrays his Friends; he gives Indulgence to Dissenters without Toleration, swears to his Sovereign without Loyalty, he raises Tumults by Way of Non-Resistance, and reconciles Passive-Obedience with the Revolution. (VI, 586-587)

In particular, whenever the Confederates lose a battle one can see the Highflyers smiling and rejoicing and find them spreading morbid

prognostications around London in order to break the spirit of the ignorant people (IV, 277; IV, 545-47). But when the French lose they moan, "We are all undone," and show long faces (III, 483). A profane, blasphemous lot, they can be depended on to sprinkle their letters with oaths (see VII, 253-4) and their speech with "by Gods" and "Damns." Defoe even has a story about a High-flying parson who openly condones swearing (III, 403). In fact, they go so far as to commit perjury with a curse on their lips. For example, Defoe knows about a High-flying Justice of the Peace who, when taking the abjuration oath and hearing the clauses on opposing the Queen's enemies, turns "his Head to his Bretheren that stood near, and far enough from whispering, says every now and then, nay, G_d d_n me if I do that—nay, By G-d I'll never keep that—and the like; and yet at the End, kiss'd the Book and took the Oath—and now he is as Loyal as other Folks" (VI, 446-47). Defoe also provides an account of a High-flying clergyman who, when he discovers that the Bible he has picked up in a bookseller's shop has a picture of Queen Anne in the front, blasphemously throws it down in disgust (II, 226).

What is a Highflyer? He is definitely a Jacobite, but he pretends not to be. As a Jacobite he is certainly a Papist (see IV, 482), though he pretends to be a Church of England man. When he cries that the Church is in danger, he does not really mean the Protestant Church of England but, rather, the Church as it existed under James II—i.e., the popish church (II, 76-77). Highflyers are perhaps like Salem witches or Soviet spies: we know that they exist, but, because we do not always recognize

them in their false identities, everyone becomes suspect. Defoe is trying to create much the same atmosphere of distrust; although he can provide signs for recognizing Highflyers he in no way intends for them to be truly identifiable. As long as any opponent can be aspersed as a Highflyer, so much the better for Mr. Review. Whoever is an enemy can be called a Highflyer, a term that automatically makes that person a Jacobite and a Papist, without Defoe's being pressed to prove very much. At the same time, although there are obviously Highflyers among High Churchmen and Tories, he can "moderately" suggest, whenever necessary, that not all High Churchmen and Tories are Highflyers. Typical of his ambiguous use of the term is his description of the two sides in the election of 1708.[21] The first group—those who "Unanimously Vote for the Highflyer"—is composed of "Papists, Jacobites, Nonjurors, the Unthinking and surfeited Tories, The Drunken, The Debauched, the Swearing, [and] The Persecuting." Those who "go with the Whig" are "The Moderate Churchmen, The Dissenter, The Religious of any Sort, The Grave, The Sober, The Thinking, [and] The Prudent" (V, 134-5). Obviously nothing much is clarified by the schematization except that Whigs are good and whoever opposes them are stupid, wicked, and traitorous. "The Unthinking and surfeited Tories" may include only a portion of the Tory party; the others, one may assume, fall in the category of "The Thinking" who vote for the Whigs. Thus, Defoe seems to be suggesting that Tories are separated into high and low Tories. Yet

---

[21]Harley is not in office.

"The Unthinking and surfeited Tories" may well include all those known as Tories—i.e., they may all be "Unthinking and surfeited." Conspicuously absent from the first group are the High Churchmen, whose opposites, the "Moderate" or Low Churchmen, are present in the second. Possibly they are included among the Highflyers who are opposing the Whigs. Perhaps they are among the Tories. Perhaps a few may even be among "The Religious of any Sort."

Two years later (December 2, 1710) Defoe provides a completely different system of classification which makes Highflyers appear to be a division equal in prominence and kind with Jacobite, Whig and Tory. The four types of political animal are listed in order of excess: "profess'd Jacobites, High-Flyers or mask'd Jacobites, Tories, or High Church Men, Low Church Men, or Whigs and Dissenters." One wonders how Highflyers are supposed to be something different from the others, and Defoe makes a show of trying to explain the classification. Jacobites clearly imply their design—popery and the Pretender; on the other side, everyone knows that a Dissenter wants toleration and that a Whig wants liberty and the ideals of the Revolution of 1688. "But a Highflyer, he is a Man whose Character is neither to be found in his Pretensions or in his Practice; you can gather no Definition of him, either from what he is, or from what he seems." Mr. Review goes on to explain how Highflyers appear to support the Queen but work for the Pretender and how they profess support of the Constitution while covertly trying to destroy it (VII, 429). While Highflyers must be defined at some length, Tories and High Churchmen remain totally undefined, perhaps because the

recently elected Parliament and the new Ministry, which includes Robert Harley, have a strong High-Church and Tory element. Defoe, at least in this instance, wants to imply some sort of separation between Tory or High Church on one side and Jacobite and Highflyer, but such is not always the case. He can play the labeling game other ways.

According to Geoffrey Holmes, High Churchmen during Anne's reign aimed at reunifying the Church of England and its authority by suppressing Dissenters on the one hand and increasing the strength of the Church on the other. They would prevent occasional conformity and suppress dissenting seminaries and academies while working to revive Church courts as a disciplinary force over the laity, would secure public financing for church construction, and would censor what they considered heretical literature.[22] And, if Dr. Sacheverell can be considered a representative High Churchman, they wanted a reunification of Church and State (a union that had been at least weakened by the Revolution of 1688) and a reestablishment of the link between the Church and the gentry that had been fostered by the two universities.[23] Needless to say, for Mr. Review High-Church designs are not so innocent.

Those people whom Defoe designates as High Churchmen are really trying to destroy the Protestant Church of England. Their aim is to revert to the Church and government that existed under James II:

---

[22]Geoffrey Holmes, The Trial of Doctor Sacheverell (London: Eyre Methuen, 1973), p. 42.

[23]Holmes, Trial of Doctor Sacheverell, p. 51.

> I allow these Gentlemen covet the Fall of the Dissenters, in order to their own Eccleiastick Tyranny; but they have always found that State Tyranny must go with it, and only will support it; from whence we have seen, that these Gentlemen have always prompted the Breeches of our Liberty, by Politick State Invasions [i.e. the Occasional Bill], . . . that the Examples in the State might Encourage those in the Church; and that one Tyranny might support another. (II, 366)

By such a doctrine, which to Defoe is clearly Jacobite, Defoe would suggest that "these gentlemen" also intend to impede the war effort (IV, 281-3) and ultimately to make Catholicism the religion of Britain again.

The High-Church design gleams brightly, Defoe believes, if one assumes that a person whose interest is the good of the Church should be highly moral and pious. Such is hardly the case among the High Churchmen. The inferior clergy, who are almost entirely High-Church, are driving the people out of the Church and into the arms of the Dissenters and atheists by bringing "the Publick Worship of God into Contempt; and this is done, by rending the Pulpit Odious and Scandalous to the People; by the Intolerable Invectives, Horrible Excitations to all manner of Inverterate Feuds, Uncharitable Heats and Animosities one against another . . ." (II, 414-15). Moreover, their behavior outside the Church has just as little to recommend it. Defoe reports two inferior churchmen in Devonshire who impersonated Justices of the Peace in order to provide an illegal warrant to have the servant of an honest Whig taken into the army (III, 91-2). At Oxford, according to Defoe, the High Churchmen have been drinking too much: "Dr. C___t, Head or Principal of a certain College, with some other Heads of the University in the

Company, and Meeting at New College, to take a Bottle, &c." Ordinarily, there might be nothing wrong with a little innocent diversion from scholarship, but these gentlemen became so inebriated that they were unable to recognize that a tankard was not a lantern:

> . . . it came to pass, that when they went home, and the Doctors Man took the College Tankard up instead of the Lanthorn to light him with neither the Doctor nor his Man, could agree the Point, whether the Candle in the Lanthorn was Lighted or No, which falling out about, and the other Gentleman and his Man coming, and holding a real Candle up to Decide it, Affirm'd the Doctor's Candle was Lighted; the Grave Gentlemen went on, with an Ay, I think it does begin to Illuminate, and so walk'd Home, by the Light of the Silver Tankard. . . . (III, 107-08)

The debauchery of the High Church, which separates it from the pious Low and dissenting churches is clearly symbolized by the High-Church love for the playhouse. Fortunately for Defoe, the Anglican church at Russell Court has arranged with the Theatre Royal at Drury Lane for a benefit performance of Hamlet (June, 1706). Defoe reacts with sarcasm and irony: "If the D___l," he suggests, "be come over to us, and assists to support the Church; the D___l must be in it, if the Church be in Danger." The building, he points out, once served satisfactorily as a dissenting meeting house, but now to convert it to their uses, the High Churchmen must go to the evil playhouse for their funds. Perhaps the High Churchmen think their people will not give unless they can see a play for their money, or perhaps it is a design to make High-Church ladies look pious while they satisfy their vices. Now when Jeremy Collier attacks the lewdness of the playhouses, Defoe suggests, he will also be attacking the Church. Now we have heroes at home as well as abroad in

the war who support the Church: Peggy Hughes, Mon. Romandon, Miss Santon, and Mon. Cherrier. Now it will be determined who are the staunchest supporters of the Church, for they will be present on the Church's day. And now the church at Russell Court has as its wardens "Lucifer Prince of Darkness, AND Hamlet Prince of Denmark" (III, 293-95).[24]

The High Churchmen at Oxford also receive a just reprimand for encouraging lewd plays at the university:

> I hope, the Players are not gone down at the Request of the Church; if they are, no Man need say any thing more to the Church's Disadvantage; if it be a Dishonour to the Church to admit publickly of all the Helps to her own Destruction; if it be a Reproach to her to see some of her Reverend Clergy preaching against Plays, and others crowd the Boxes of the Theatre—With what Face can an English-Clergy-Man suffer the Habit and Vestments of a Christian Priest, which distinguish him for a Person set apart for the Service of God, to be seen in the lewd Crowd of the Admirers of Vice—How can ye, Gentlemen of the Gown, preach against Vice, cry down the Immoralities of the Age, and struggle with the Torrent of the Nation's Crimes? How can you bear Testimony for God, and vindicate the Church as the Bulwark of the Christian Religion, while you are seen every day encouraging the Interludes and vile Representations of the corrupted Stage? (III, 378)

According to Defoe, no rationalization can bring the behavior of High Churchmen into conformity with their professed doctrines: such vice among them, and especially among those whose job it is to train other

---

[24]The topic is continued in No. 76, III, 301-04, in which Defoe takes a different approach and suggests that it is an absurdity that a playhouse should support a church. Churches are supposed to preach against vice. The conclusion is that the Church, that is, the High Church of England, is not really against vice. Cf. III, 317-19; III, 369-72.

ministers for the Pulpit, serves only to destroy the Church. The Church is in danger from within, not from the highly moral Dissenters.[25]

The destructive aims of the High-Church party are most clearly tied to the Jacobites, Papists, and Highflyers through another Oxford man, Dr. Sacheverell. Dr. Sacheverell, in his attacks on the Dissenters for endangering the Church, was in 1702 and is again in 1709-10 a primary spokesman for the High Church cause. And if he can be shown to be a Papist, Jacobite, and Highflyer as well, it follows, as far as Defoe is concerned, that the cause he espouses is also of the same ilk.

That Sacheverell expounds a Jacobite doctrine is easy for Mr. Review to prove. Defoe has with him, he says on October 28, 1710, a man "who came lately out of France" and who reports that the exiled Jacobites in Paris "Universally drink Dr. Sacheverell's Health, as the great Friend to their Prince, as they call him (in which the Dr. as I am inform'd, is not behind Hand by way of return) and that they say openly, that the only Hope they have of restoring the King (Pretender) is by our Divisions in England, and setting the Church against the Dissenters" (VII, 369).

---

[25]With the closing of the playhouses in 1709 Defoe again associated vice and depravity with the High Church party and with Charles II and James II. After William's death the players took heart because they knew the High Church to be a friend of vice: ". . . and as they know, debauching the Peoples Morals was always a Maxim of High-Church Politicks, that Tyranny and Vice were always Brethren and Assistants to one another, and Liberty was the Friend and Foundation of Reformation, they made no doubt, but as long as High-Church kept their [post] they should flourish" (VI, 258). He also notes that "in the first two Years of Her Majesty's Reign, when the High-Flying Party had the Ascendent over our Councils, and High-Church Principles govern'd the Nation—The Kingdom of Crime began with them; May-Poles and Play houses grew up like Churches in the Reformation, and Vice began to thrive, as a constant Contemporary with the Party" (VI, 258).

To be a Jacobite and a Papist is bad enough, but, as Defoe argues in his attacks on the Highflyers, to be a hypocritical Jacobite is to be monstrous indeed. Sacheverell advocates divine right and passive obedience but, at the same time, claims his allegiance to Queen and government. Defoe finds these two positions absurdly incompatible, not unlike pretending to be a Christian while preaching the doctrine of the infidels (VI, 482, 494, 457-8).[26] How can Sacheverell support the Queen who rules solely by the power of the Parliament? As a Highflyer Sacheverell becomes even worse than the arch-fiend Greenshiels, a Scottish Jacobite who tried to use the Episcopal prayer book in his Church (though he was not legally ordained). Greenshiels, though a Jacobite and a minister under false pretences, is more moral than Sacheverell, "a Swearing, Oath and Abjuration-taking Jacobite" (VI, 489-92; 494). Finally, as an advocate of nonresistance and jure divino he becomes, Defoe hints, a Papist as well. When supporters of Dr. Sacheverell argue that passive obedience is a doctrine often voiced by Bishops of the Church, Defoe answers that the Bishops may have advocated it before they saw their error but that he cannot blame Cranmer and Tyndale for what they did while they were Catholics (VI, 534).

As for the whole High-Church party, Defoe's position throughout much of the Review can be summed up by the observation in his

---

[26]Defoe also says that Highflyers and Jacobites who argue that there was no real rebellion are "Traytors to the Revolution," "Betrayers of GOD," "Mockers of Oaths," "the QUEEN'S Enemies," "the Church's Judas," "Sellers of Liberty," and "Destroyers of the Present Constitution" (VI, 457).

"Advertisement to the SUFFOLK Justices": "I hope no Man will any more question but High Church, and Jacobitism, and French Power are but Synonymous Terms . . ." (V, 616). As supporters of various occasional conformity bills, they automatically become tackers, a fact which in turn also makes them Jacobites and papists. The tacking of the Occasional Bill, Defoe reasons, helps Jacobites and papists who want to depose the Queen and destroy the Church. It follows, therefore, that if Jacobites and papists side with tackers, tackers must also side with Jacobites and papists (II, 129-32). On the question of the danger of the Church, Defoe slyly suggests that High Churchmen are either like the wicked men in the scripture who "flee when no Man pursues" or like the enraptured Pope who, when he saw the great heaps of money brought in by indulgences cried out, "How much Money do we pick up here, by this Fable of Christ!" (II, 225). In other words, although they see no danger, they pretend it in order to destroy the Dissenters. Regarding the Union, Defoe reasonably inquires who would be hurt most by the Union. And just as reasonably he answers. There are nine overlapping groups, he concludes, the most prominent being the High Church party: (1) Louis XIV; (2) those bribed by Louis to cause turmoil; (3) those who work for Louis in England without pay; (4) those who warn both sides that the Church is in danger; (5) the Jacobites; (6) the enemies of party peace; (7) those who would persecute the Dissenters; (8) the papists; (9) those adhering to the doctrine of jure divino (III, 481, 482, 485, 489, 493-4, 497). Specifically, the High Churchmen fear the Union because it would indeed jeopardize the Jacobite Church (III, 522). One must conclude, then,

that that High Churchmen are among Defoe's Highflyers, tackers, papists, and Jacobites (all of which are, in many senses, synonymous). They also fit the category of extremists, a distinction that automatically labels them as wicked.[27]

By the time Defoe begins writing the Review, High Churchmen and Tories, long allies, are again working together for the restoration of Church power.[28] As a result he has no trouble assuming that all damnation heaped on High Churchmen may also be applied to Tories.[29] Yet as a party which apparently embraces all the other separate but synonymous groups, Tories receive comparatively little direct attention from Mr. Review. And when he bothers to define them, they are likely to

---

[27]Defoe suggests the madness of the party when he reports that, because he has exhorted them to be peaceful, he has received threatening and treasonous letters from High Churchmen and tackers (II, 213). He also describes them as "hellish Volcano's . . . whose Throats are a Burning Abyss, a center of Envious Exhalations set on Fire of Hell, which break out in Horrible Execrations against their Neighbours, but will at last end in Burning up and Destroying themselves, and their Malice will go out with a Stench" (II, 226).

[28]Holmes, Trial of Sacheverell, p. 42.

[29]It should be mentioned that, although most historians and perhaps most of Defoe's contemporaries would label Robert Harley at least a moderate Tory, Defoe never refers to him as such. Actually Defoe almost never mentions him by name, but even when Harley and other ministers are treated together they are always moderates, moderate Whigs, or the court party. Therefore, Defoe may attack Tories whenever he wants because Tories are totally separate from Harley, Godolphin, and Marlborough. Geoffrey Holmes also notes that it was the general practice of partisan writers grossly to exaggerate the differences of parties by applying the aims of a small portion to the whole party (The Trial of Doctor Sacheverell, p. 56). Defoe cannot be classified as a partisan Whig or Tory writer, but he uses all the tricks of party writers.

be described in terms of some other group: "By Tories I mean, that kind of Amphibious Monster, that Swearing to the Government, yet retains his Desires, and reserves his Endeavours for a pretending Invader" (VII, 401). But even in this instance Tories are defined as Highflyers. It is possible to conclude, therefore, that, with the connection of High Churchmen and Tories, Defoe wants to concentrate the whole chain of guilt in the Tory party: the Jacobites want to overthrow the government, depose the Queen, bring in the Pretender and tyranny, and return to Catholicism; the Highflyers want all of this but, because they are too cowardly to openly proclaim their treason, take the abjuration oath and pretend to be loyal citizens; the High Church party is composed of Highflyers, and its designs for the Church are the same as the professed plan of the Jacobites—return to Catholicism; the Tories, therefore, because they are High Churchmen are also Highflyers, Jacobites and, by consequence, papists (see IV, 102; VII, 417-18). Only near the end of the war when the ministry under Harley is trying to negotiate a treaty with France does Defoe directly suggest that there are moderate Tories who join with moderate Whigs and work for the good of the country (VII, 425).

At other times one is likely to find Defoe calling Tories traitors, Jacobites, and Highflyers. For example, when he speaks of those office holders who abused William he notes that some of them might have been renegade Whigs, but for a Tory to have done this is "natural" because it is the nature of that party to be traitorous (IV, 102). On November 25, 1708, he calls for Whig unity to keep out "the Tory, the Jacobite, and the High-Flying Herds of Vultures" (V, 414). In May of 1709 during a

Whig ministry and a predominantly Whig House of Commons, Defoe identifies Tories and Highflyers as traitors and declares that no punishment is too severe for them. Even after Harley returns to the Ministry and a Tory Parliament is sitting, Defoe does not immediately change his tactics. On November 25, 1710, he answers charges from some people, whom he identifies as Tories, that Whigs are really Jacobites, Low-Churchmen actually atheists, and the Bishops truly Presbyterians. Without bothering with the question of Presbyterians, Defoe answers: "It is in vain to Tax the Whigs with being for the Pretender, or the Dissenters being Jacobites—For the Nature and Circumstances of the Things are Inconsistent—A Tory by Principle, herds with a Jacobite, and a Jacobite by the very Nature of the Thing, shakes hands with a Papist—A High-Flyer runs such Mad lengths in his Politicks, that they force him to be an Atheist, and to practice what he does not believe . . ." (VII, 417-18).[30]

Those opposed to the evil designs of Jacobites, papists, Highflyers, High-Churchmen, and Tories are called Whigs in the Review. Actually Defoe recognizes a party of people generally defined as Whigs and,

---

[30]If Defoe were really only a spokesman for Robert Harley or for whatever ministry happened to be in power, it seems improbable that he would continue to attack Tories after he knew in October, 1710, that the next Parliament would contain a heavy majority of people considered to be Tories. Nevertheless one finds him excusing the Whig defeat by charging that the Tories controlled the results of the election and comparing the new Parliament to the one Oliver Cromwell had elected with a standing army (VII, 355-361). Furthermore, he predicts that the violence used by Tories to control the election is a sign of their intention to destroy British liberty and bring in the Pretender. The Tory mobs, he notes, have been heard calling for the Pretender. Defoe could have hoped to gain nothing but enmity by these attacks. Godolphin was already out of office and Harley could not have benefited by antagonizing Tories in Parliament.

principally, these are his audience; but because this party has control of the ministry only during the two-year period from 1708 to 1710, when Harley is out of office, Defoe chooses to define a Whig not as a group of men of that name but as anyone who will "renounce the Scandalous Impostures of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance, Recognize the Superiority of our Soveraign Lord THE LAW, acknowledge the Jus Divinum of the Revolution, and act upon the new Scheme of the Subjects Liberty" (VI, 82-3). More specifically,

> 1. A Whigg, is one that adheres entirely to the Legal Right of the Queen to these crowns, the Establishment of the Protestant Succession, and for ever excluding the Pretender.
> 2. A Whigg, must be one, that acknowledges the People of England have a right to be Govern'd by their own Laws, to have their Taxes Levied by their own Consent, and the Succession to their Crown, be limitted and settled by Parliament.
> 3. A Whigg is a hearty Enemy to Usurpation, and Exorbitant Power of France, and therefore joins heartily in carrying on the present War, till France may be reduc'd to Terms of Peace, which may be Safe, Lasting, and Honourable to all allies.
> 4. A Whigg is a true Friend to the Union of Great-Britain, and will assist to the preserving it entire, and to prevent any Invasions upon the Liberties and Privileges of Scotland, contrary to that Treaty, whether Ecclesiastick or Civil.
> 5. A Whigg is one that abhors Persecution for Conscience under pretence of Wholesome Severities, (as Dr. Sacheverell calls them) and therefore willingly, heartily, and in meer Sense of Religion, as well as in Justice, agree to preserve Inviolably [sic] the Toleration. (VII, 246-47)

It is Defoe's contention that anyone elected to Parliament or made a minister must act according to these characteristics because the British constitution demands it. If they choose to do otherwise they become traitors, not Whigs.

Yet a great cloud of ambiguity remains. A reader may believe that ministers must be Whigs in 1710, but they certainly were not Whig when Nottingham and his cronies were in office in 1703. Also one must assume by Defoe's definition that people not ordinarily designated as Whigs are really Whig; conversely one must guess that no moderates were ever included in such terms as Tory, High Church, Highflyer or Jacobite. The conclusion must be, for example, that Defoe is never guilty of condemning all Tories; there must be people known as Tories who are not extremists and, therefore, not really Tories. The political turmoil of multiple parties in the reign of Queen Anne is reduced to something quite simple; one is either Whig or Jacobite, good or evil.[31]

---

[31]The political parties have also posed a problem for historians. Until the 1920's it was commonly accepted that there were two distinct parties—Whig and Tory. Then Sir Keith Feiling in History of the Tory Party (1924) suggested that party government seldom functioned during Anne's reign and that there were divisions within parties. It soon became acceptable that among Tories, at least, there were moderate and High Tories. Since the 1930's theories have become more radical. Robert Walcott in the 1940's and in a later book, English Politics in the Early Eighteenth Century (Oxford, 1956), p. 160 and passim., argued that a large portion of Parliament was made up of "connexions," or individual groups of members gathered around influential leaders. His theory played down the role of the Whigs and Tories as parties. Lewis Namier in "Country Gentlemen in Parliament, 1750-84," in Crossroads of Power (New York: Macmillan, 1962), p. 32, said that during the Augustan Age Whigs and Tories had a "Court and country wing, and neither side being permanently in office, the balance of that double division was maintained." J. H. Plumb in The Origins of Political Stability: England, 1675-1725 (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1967), p. 129, strongly discounted Walcott's theory, between the two parties, "the confusion [derives] . . . from the failure of either party to secure effective domination over the other." According to Plumb, ". . . Whig and Tory remained one of the basic facts of political history." Geoffrey Holmes in The Trial of Doctor Sacheverell, pp. 19-20, seems to take a position combining Namier's and Plumb's analyses. I am indebted for part of this summary to Holmes, British Politics in the Age of Anne (London: Macmillan: New York: St. Martin's Press, 1967), pp. 1-8.

Defoe tries to simplify matters even more for his readers by obectifying the agents of evil as something unnatural. For Defoe evil is extremism or diversion from the moderate order of the middle way, and, as such, it upsets the natural balance of the state; it brings chaos. Thus, Defoe objectifies extremism as monstrous deformity, as sickness (imbalance or unnatural condition of the body), as natural disaster, or as a burning building (the frame or order of the building being destroyed). By contrast, the symbol for right government or moderation is Defoe steering a ship between Scylla and Charybdis.[32]

As monsters, the Highflyers are always pregnant to bursting with their vile offsprings. The attempted tack of the Occasional Bill by the Highflyers or High Church party is described as "a Monster big with unknown Embrio's and brooding all the Civil Plagues that can be imagin'd possible to befall this Nation" (II, 97). In another place the tack appears as "a Womb big with Monsters to eat out the Bowells of the Churches Peace" (II, 430). Also these monstrous tackers are in some sense the brood of an earlier monster. When Henry VIII took over the Church it meant that the civil ruler became a tyrant over the Church

---

[32]"It is my work, and ever shall I hope to steer the middle way to bring every thing to its true Ballance, and find out the Golden Mean of every Action, in which alone is Wisdom, Safety and Peace" (IV, 561). Several years later he uses a more developed figure: "I Am enter'd upon a large Field, and difficult to move in, Launch'd out in a Vast Ocean full of Rocks and Shoals, and full of Variety of Dangers: Party-Pirates and Storms of Strife, disturb the Surface; and if I fall upon High-Church Rocks, or Low-Church Shoals, my Arguments may suffer shipwreck on both Hands, I'll steer as steady as I can, if I get safe through, without reproach, Cavil, and Exception, it will be strange" (VII, 353).

in place of the Pope. It happened, then, that these civil tyrants failed to carry on the Reformation so that the present conflict between the papist High Church and the Protestant Low Church is the Result: ". . . this Monster [civil tyranny] was big with future Mischiefs, which generating from one another, would still bring the Church under, and keep her in perpetual and unscriptural Bondage" (IV, 114).

The occasional Bill which the Highflyers tried to tack to the Land Tax Bill is itself, as an agent of tyranny, an unnatural Monster. According to Defoe it had its origin in Coventry when "Dr. Arm----d and Mr. K----ly" wrote a pamphlet called A Letter from a Friend in the Country to a Member of Parliament (II, 227). But from contemptible sources great rivers flow: "So the Devil making use of these two most Contemptible Agents to usher in this Brat of persecution into the World, it was his next Case to bring in Servitable Assistants from the Neighbouring Country to Nurse and Cherish this Embryo, and lick it into Shape" (II, 229).

Another offspring from the High-flying party receives the same treatment. The first government after the defeat of Nottingham and his High-flying Tories is a perfect unity of Queen, Ministry, and Parliament. Since the time they lost their places, the Highflyers have been trying desperately to bring discord to the government so that they might get their places back. The Memorial failed them and their second attempt, a pamphlet called A Speech, has come to the same end: ". . . all these Clamours are struck Dumb, and our Party-Monsters Quell'd at once; the Embrio, like a half made Birth, brought forth with a great deal of

uneasiness and Pain, just liv'd to Croak a little in the World and Dy'd: it Expir'd even in the Birth, in the Hands of its Midwife" (II, 471).

In the Review Highflyers are also monsters and unnatural because they are such hypocrites. They are so hypocritical, in fact, that Defoe finds Milton's Sin to be a perfect symbol for them:

> . . . the Beast with Seven Heads and Ten Horns, if she was to be drawn in a Picture, would not make half so uncouth a sight [as a Highflyer]; if I ever saw a Scheme of such a Wretch, it is drawn to the Imagination in the Frontice-piece of the 4th Book of Milton's Paradise Lost; I think 'tis the 4th Book, for I have not the Book with me at the writing of this, where the Brazen-Gates between Hell and this New World, and the last to let the Devil in. Sin is here Pictur'd with a Fair Face, Beautiful in her outside and upper parts, but her lower parts have the shape of Devils, and innumerable Snakes, Serpents, Monsters, and Fiery Devils twisted together, serve her for her Bowels, thro' whom Circulate her Excrement or Ordure, which issues at her Mouth: Thus her Breath is Fire and Poison, her Hands hold Mortal Weapons; her Eyes dart Contagion to a World, and in her Womb Sathan and Death bring Twins, gender'd neither by Succession nor Coition, but by meer Genuin Corruption. This is the very Emblem of a Jacobite High Flyer, that takes the Oaths. (V, 135)

Although Defoe is away from his book at the time of his description of Sin, a fact that causes him to mistake the fourth Book for the second and somewhat confuse the origin of Satan, he manages to give a memorable description of that unnatural creature. She is fair and foul together and—in Milton, an unnatural issue herself from Satan's pride—she performs an incestuous act with her father to beget Death. Like other examples of Defoe's prideful, tyrannical monsters, she is teeming with monsters which eat her bowels. She is, indeed, the "very Emblem" of a Highflyer.

Defoe's error that Satan is a twin of Death and begotten by Sin upon herself is carried over in the idea that the Highflyer is a hermaphrodite monster—hermaphroditic because, since it appears to be a Protestant while it is really a Papist, it is two kinds of persons at once. The disgusting sexual aspect comes out in Defoe's account of the origin of Exorbitant Power:

> When Pride, a self-begetting Species, had swell'd with its own injected Filth, impregnate by some Infernal warmth from the antient Tophet, and therefore calling Sathan Father, tho' of Truth her self old as Angels, and older than Hell—At the first Birth the seeming Mischief brought forth two Bastards, Ambition and Usurpation; and these again generating with their Sire each of them conceiv'd a-part; Ambition brought forth Tyranny, and Usurpation Conquest—These last, after having been separately the Parents of innumerable Plagues to Mankind by a mysterious conjunct Conception, and by like Infernal Generation, brought forth this Heterogeneous Birth, we are now speaking of, call'd Exorbitant Power—. (VI, 9-10)

The best example of the hermaphrodite monster appears in a story about that epitome of Highflyers, Dr. Henry Sacheverell, whose attacks on Dissenters caused Defoe to write The Shortest Way with the Dissenters and in 1709-10 to use the Review in the Whig campaign against him. According to Defoe, who pretends that the story is absolutely true, a Coventry follower of Dr. Sacheverell vowed to name his unborn child after the Doctor, whether it proved to be male or female. But

> it pleas'd Heaven, whether for Humbling the Man in his Native or in his Party-Violence, or for a special Declaration, from above, of its Detestation of the Dr. and his Practices, to deliver the Man from the Burthen of his Vow, had he thought fit to have been so deliver'd for that the poor Woman when her Time came, brought forth neither a Son or a Daughter, but an Odious Hermaphrodite Creature, with a Conjunction of Sexes, and other parts unfit to name—The poor Man, however, Infatuated with Zeal to his Party, and to the Reverent Person above, perform'd his Vow, and gave it the Name of Sacheverell; so that it may

> now be said, there has been more than one Monster of that Name in the World. (VIII, 778-9)

There is a related tendency in Defoe, though less frequently and extensively employed, to associate extremists of various sorts with animals. There could be several explanations for this practice. He may be simply ridiculing or railing at his enemies, or he may be using the animal associations in a very commonplace way—in the sense, for example, that one might say that a person works like a horse. But there is some evidence that he is sometimes, at least, implying that an extremist is lower than the human level, just as in the Renaissance chain of being a man who succumbed to passion might be termed an animal.

In September of 1705, for example, he speaks of Protestant parties fighting, while they are urged on by the High Church party "as Butchers do their Bull-Dogs, and Shout, Halloo, and Rejoyce, when they see the Blood of the Unchristian Wounds, stain both Parties . . ." (II, 347).[33] A short time later he speaks of the High Church party at the beginning of Anne's reign and of its design to depose the Queen. But the Queen saw through the plans of the High Churchmen and removed them from their offices. This so angered them that it caused them to "Burst the Bladders of Gall that lay under their Adder Tongues" and say vicious things against the Queen (II, 358). In another place Defoe attacks the High Churchmen (who rejoice over British defeats) as "Vipers nurs'd up in the Bosom of a Protestant Church" and "Vultures that tear the Bowels of their

---

[33]Here it seems possible for Tories to be Protestants, too. When Defoe speaks of "both Parties" he generally means Whigs and Tories.

Benefactors" (IV, 472).[34] "Tyrants, such as Louis, are such beasts that should be given no quarter; they are mad dogs, Crocodils, and Rattlesnakes" (V, 454-55). Sacheverell, who is the supreme spokesman for tyranny, is characterized as a furious horse that will run himself down without anyone's taking notice of him:

> . . . the faster he runs, the sooner he will be out of Breath—You [i.e. the Dissenters] should use him as we do a hot Horse—when he first frets and pulls, keep a stiff Rein, and hold him in if you can; but if he grows mad and furious, slack your Hand, clap your Heels to him, and let him go, give him his Belly full of it—Away goes the Beast, like a Fury, over Hedge and Ditch, till he runs himself off of his Mettle, perhaps bogs himself, and then he grows quiet of Course—. (VI, 421-2)

Defoe then continues with the story of a large black dog, chained in a kennel "about the size of a pulpit," that barks furiously and frightens people. But as a lady in the story realizes, "Thou art a terrible Beast, but thank GOD, Thou art like Satan, THOU ART CHAIN'D" (VI, 422). The animal reference, it seems, come to suggest unreasonable behavior or madness by which men upset the natural order.

The madness of rabid party extremism, especially of those parties that try to return Britain to tyranny, is reflected also in Defoe's sickness theme. A healthy Protestant, economically sound nation is Defoe's professed aim; Highflyers threaten it with disease and poison. The examples are numerous.

---

[34]The bosom serpent and the vultures are proverbial as well as emblamatic, but Defoe provides enough association to the present case so that the animal thesis seems to hold. Also, of course, both cases imply unnatural acts.

In an address to the first Parliament elected after Nottingham and the High Church Tories lost control over the government, Defoe speaks of "Infinite Divisions, Clashing Interests, and Contending Parties . . . in every Cornor of the Nation; the Fatal Strife is crept into our Families, our Co-partnerships, into our Beds; we can agree in nothing; . . . Uneasie under uninterrupted Liberty; wishing for those Chains and that Bondage we could not bear, if it should be laid upon us, desiring we know not what, and to be delivered we know not how, and from we know not who." The cause of all this madness is a party of men whose aim is to engender such divisions in order to topple the government. Defoe, therefore, implores the House of Commons to Action: "the Nation's Distempers, are arriv'd to such Corroded Extremes, such Gangrenes and Mortifications, that there seems a more than ordinary occasion for you to Summon, not all your Members only, but all your United Skill, to Remedy the Mischief, and restore the Health of the Nation" (II, 402).

Gangrene is but a festering sore that may be cured by simply cutting away the affected area, but Defoe knows that getting rid of Highflyers may not be easy, even by radical methods. He generally treats them, as a result, as a communicable disease, a figure of speech that is quite effective because the plague is raging throughout Europe during the time of much of the Review, and many of his readers are probably old enough to remember the last time it visited England and Scotland. Thus Defoe warns the people in 1705 of the dangers of tackers and Highflyers:

> To pursue Peace by Feuds, and Flames, by Occasional Bills, by Tacking of Clauses, by Virulent Conferences, by Bitterness of Expression, by Politick Harangues, Specious and Insignificant

> Elegance, by pointed Speeches, clandestine Cabals, and Concerting Clubs, by Oblique Insinuations, Invidious Reflections, Unheard of Addresses, and all the Exotic Methods of Commitments and Recommitments, Ruining and Supporting; these are in their Nature and Tendency so directly contrary to this Blessed Healing Temper, that upon the House—lately touch'd with the Contagion of this Spirit Lord have Mercy, and a Cross ought to be wrote, as in a House Infected with the Plague, and the Members be shut up, for fear the Inverteracy should be spread over the Nation. (II, 98)

In the Review for November 20, 1707, he tells the Whigs that they must not under any conditions "open . . . a Door to such a Contagion again," (IV, 482) and to seal his meaning he gives them a striking image of what will happen if they do not unite against Highflyers and Jacobites: "Behold, they stand at the Door waiting this unhappy Hour" (IV, 483).

In the summer of 1712 a mild distemper began to spread in London which most people attributed to the weather, but Defoe predicts that it is a preface to the Plague which is each year creeping closer to Britain (See [IX], 13-14).[35] After putting the people in mind of their danger, he draws on it to warn them against believing the lies of such peoples as Abel Roper, author of the Postboy:

> Lying is a private Crime, and lies particularly upon the Persons and People who are Guilty; but Believing Lyes is a

---

[35]The germ for the Journal of the Plague Year perhaps lies in this Review. Defoe mentions, for instance, that such a sickness occurred the year before the great plague of 1665. In the next issue ([IX], 15-6) he prints one of the bills of mortality and warns the readers in the fashion of the Journal: "I need not tell the Reader here, that at the Time that this Bill was so high, the City was so thin of Inhabitants, that one might walk from Aldgate to Ludgate, and not meet, or see, 100 People; that the generality of the People were all fled, at least all such as had any Retreat; that above 70000 were dead at that Time of the Plague, and in their Graves Inclusive of this Week; That Grass grew in the Streets in the Markets and on the Exchange; and nothing but Death and Horror was to be seen in every place."

> National Judgment [like the plague; see Defoe's text from Isaiah 29:9 ([IX], 17)], a Humour that Taints the whole Blood of the People: The First is a Disease, and like our New Distemper, Multitudes more than usual are Sick of it; but this is a Plague, a meer Visitation, that Rages over the whole Mass of the People, and so Universally is the Contagion spread, that not a man of us that has the least byass to this or that Party, but is Infected with it. ([IX], 17)

The Highflyers may be a disease to threaten the body of the state, but there is a kind of general madness affecting all the people in Defoe's sick world. The Review for July 30, 1706, contains a lengthy catalogue of various kinds of madness: some people are mad "for Want of Sence and some by having too much; some rave in High-Church Extasies, some in no Church Extravagancies; some have State Calentures burning in their Breasts, some rage in Party-Madness; some have Court Frenzies, some are Country Bedlamites; some are melancholy mad for Want of Places, some mad with Rage, and envy at those that have them, and some are delirious in them" (III, 361). The list of madmen continues at some length until Defoe adds that the political madmen serve to infect the people "and unhappily set the whole Nation a madding, like a Herd of Swine Devil-driven, that will run down the first Precipice they come at." The effect is "as if the universal Lunacy had infected the Climate, and the Air was tainted with some infectious Particles, some little Animalculae mix'd with, and drawn in with our Breath, which once got into the Body, creep up into the Brain, and by a National Ferment Act in Conjunction to form a universal Frenzy" (II, 362).

If anything was feared more by Londoners than a mysterious disease like the Plague, it certainly must have been fire. Defoe seems obsessed

with fire and it is a good figure of speech because his readers must have experienced such a catastrophe: they knew how it can spread and destroy everything in its path; they knew the chaos that results when the alarm goes out; and they had seen the crumbling structures, the people desperately trying to save life and belongings. The strife of parties, the chaos of rumors, the secret workings of the High-flying demons to destroy Church and Nation, the ever looming presence of the Pretender—all these fit very well into the fire motif because the danger of fire in a crowded city is something always to be feared.

The fires in the Review are almost always political ones and Defoe is the country's full-time fireman. He wants Peace not strife; he is the man who throws water on the fire (II, 218). He is a man who has a house on a street where there is a fire; he has an interest in what transpires and shouts fire to save what is his, as well as the belongings of others (II, 435-36). He is not, however, a man who tries to keep everyone excited and in turmoil so that they do not know where to look; there are too many like the blind man, who, having been told by a mischievous fellow that a house was on fire, ran about the streets shouting fire when there was none (II, 207).

But when there is danger, Defoe cannot allow the people to be like

> An old Woman that had her House richly furnished and full of fine Things, a great deal of Money, Plate, &c. [who] was Terribly affrighted . . . when her Maid came roaring into her Chamber and wak'd her—O Madam, rise for the Lord's sake! You'll be burnt in your Bed, the next House is all of a light Fire! The good old Woman leaps out of Bed, gets on her Cloaths, and runs down Stairs; and when she see[s] her Condition, there she sate raging in Despair, and a kind of extremity of Passion. O, I shall be undone! My House will

> be burnt down immediately! O all my Goods will be burnt! I shall be ruin'd and utterly Undone! O what shall I do!

At this point a practical, Defoe-like fellow comes by and soundly advises her to stop mourning what may happen and start saving the goods in her house, ". . . don't stand whyning here, and cry you are undone; that's the way to be undone indeed" ([IX], 147). Such is Defoe's advice to those Whigs who rage in despair that the Pretender is going to be brought in by Harley and the High Tory St. John, now that peace with France has been accomplished.

It is not the Ministry that will bring in the Pretender, Defoe tells the Whigs in another fire story; they are looking the wrong way like the people of Alresford who rushed in confussion to try to put out a fire at one end of the town. While some were fighting the fire and others were standing by looking on, another fire started at the other end of town and burned down the whole place. The danger from the Pretender now involves a plot by Highflyers and Jacobites to convince the common people that the Pretender has turned Protestant in order to remove any legal bar to the throne ([IX], 35-6).

Since the Pretender never comes, he remains a fire in the next house, but in some senses the fire is already started, in which case the owners of the house must put it out before the whole structure is destroyed. Defoe pursuing his analogy, tells the governors of the Church that if some action is not taken against the disreputable, High-flying clergy, the whole structure will collapse. The fire is already kindled "that will consume and eat out the Vitals of true

Religion from the Church of England, and she will at last be bury'd in the Ruins of her own Establishment—For the Church of God can never stand upon the Foundation of Sin" (VI, 371). Moreover, as he tells his audience in May of 1706, the peace that seems to exist presently among the parties is probably not a long one; the fire is still smoldering and may spring up at any moment if all good men are not careful: "In the frequent sad Occasions, you have to see your Houses and Streets on Fire in this City; I have observed when a Fire is down, . . . the Engines are it's true sent Home, and the People Dismiss'd, and the Water-Pipes Stop'd—But you always take care to Watch the Ruins, lest the subtile Enemy should creep into the Cellars, and secret Corners of the Adjacent heaps, and break out afresh" (III, 210).

At the end of the Review Defoe is still fighting fires, but he is tired and the battle seems hopeless. For nine years he has tried to bring peace and moderation into British politics, but the parties rage on just as always. Appropriately the comparison is to the great fire of London:

> I remember very well what I saw with a sad Heart, tho' I was but Young, I mean the Fire of London. That all Endeavours having been fruitlessly used to abate the Fire, the People even gave it over, and the despairing Citizens look's on and saw the Devastation of their Dwellings, with a kind of Stupidity caused by Amazement; if any People, still forward for the Public Good, made any Attempts, the water they cast upon it, made it rage with the more Fury and boil like a Pot; 'till scorch'd with the Flames from every side, and tired with the fruitless Labour, they gave over, as others had done before them; and what was the Consequence?—The Incendiaries that began the Hellish Work, went on with it and the whole city was laid in Ashes. ([IX], 115)

But Defoe was not often so gloomy; through the storms of strife he could sometimes see the sun of moderation shining.[36] Perhaps Defoe's best description of his hope that order would return to Britain occurs one month before the end of the Review. The lyric quality of the passage is matched nowhere else in the Review and perhaps not in the whole of Defoe's writings.

> The people of this Nation seem to me like the great Ocean of waters; the original Surface was smooth and fair; it was created calm and still; when the Sun shines upon it in its Native Posture, it smiles again, and reflects back the Rays of Light with a Brightness, a kind of Pleasantness very delightful to behold: But its Nature being fluid, its Particals easily separated, the least aggression of Wind puts it into Motion. If the Winds blow hard, that Motion encreases, and in proportion to the force of those Winds, all those Smiles of the Ocean's Face are soon turn'd into Wrinkles and Frowns: Again, If that Violence encrease to a Storm, but especially if it blows from several Quarters at once, if the Wind and Tide meet, or the Storm blows against a strong Current of the Waters; this puts it into an inexpressible Rage, the Waves mount up to Heaven; the roaring of the Waters drowns the Voice of the lowdest Thunders; the beautiful Face of the Sea is turn'd all to Horrour, and the most lively Representation of the utmost Confusion; a raging Madness seems to possess the Water, and the Waves dash not only against the impenetrable Rocks, and the Shoars, that are set for its eternal Bounds, but, as if rais'd up to Lunacy and Madness, and bent upon self-Destruction, they dash one against another till they spend themselves into Foam and Froath, and Sink down under the Weight of their own Disorder; then rise and rage again to the same fruitless Purpose; describing exactly a Powerful and most Furious Body, who has Will and Strength enough to destroy the World, but no Agency within it self to put its enrag'd Desires into Execution—And yet after all the fury of the Waves, let the Winds abate, the Storm cease, and a Calm come on, The Sea returns to its native Beauty, bright and smooth as it first. ([IX], 187)

---

[36]See II, 294-95; III, 518.

Clearly Defoe's moral setting depends upon things familiar to an audience of middleclass or lower merchants, shopkeepers, and tradesmen steeped in Low-Church Anglicanism or dissenting sermons. At bottom his treatment of political issues takes on a heavy pulpit tone: by becoming prophet and preacher he identifies his deliberative function and projects his sincerity, by using the Bible he appeals to the Protestant tendency toward typology and the moral conflict of good and evil; by blurring the lines between factions and parties he can simplify the struggle as one between good and evil, thereby gratifying a basically Whig audience and appealing to their prejudices as well; finally, by objectifying good and evil through things familiar to people of London or Edinburgh, Defoe intensifies the emotional response. In sum, his creation of a moral setting for contemporary political events allows him to interpret those events and have his audience accept them as part of the same moral drama unfolding before them every Sunday in Protestant pulpits all over the nation.

CHAPTER III

THE PERSUASIVE STYLE: RHETORIC AND ORATORY IN THE REVIEW

It is no secret that Daniel Defoe could and did write fiction and nonfiction prose in whatever style best suited the subject, the audience, and his own purposes, and the Review is, naturally, no exception. Many of the Reviews, especially those which complete arguments made in earlier issues or that have as their purpose to inform the audience are written in what could pass for loose or baroque style, to use Croll's terminology; or in Senecan, Puritan, scientific, oral, natural, colloquial, and journalistic style, to use the terms of various other critics.[1] This loose style is characterized by long, multiclause sentences, the parts of which are usually connected rather casually by and, that or which. The typical loose sentence has direction but only because one clause leads to another until it meanders to its end. Such sentences are anything but emphatic and appear to be written without plan or revision in the hurried manner usually attributed to Defoe. Or Defoe can, when he wishes to be philosophical or when he is engaged in a rare,

---

[1]For various discussions of the tendency of plainness, see particularly Morris Croll's two essays, "Attic Prose: Lipsius, Montaigne, Bacon" and "The Baroque Style in Prose," republished in Style, Rhetoric, and Rhythm: Essays by Morris W. Croll, eds. J. Max Patrick and Robert O. Evans (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966); Richard Foster Jones' argument for the influence of science on prose style in the seventeenth century in "Science and English Prose Style in the Third Quarter of the Seventeenth Century"; in Richard Foster Jones et al., The Seventeenth Century: Studies in the History of English Thought and Literature from Bacon to Pope (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1951), pp. 75-110; Ian Gordon, The

tightly constructed logical argument, write a style that recalls Bacon. The sentences tend to be shorter than the loose periods; they often have balanced phrases and clauses, paradoxes, and even chiasma; and they are frequently distinctly aphoristic. Naturally diction is not usually so coarse as in loose periods and there is likely to be more figurative language, especially plays on words.[2] But the style that Defoe uses for persuasion is quite different. It is what may be called Defoe's pulpit style because it combines rhetorical and oratorical devices to produce an excited, often hurried, exhortative, prose that Defoe probably heard ringing from nonconformist pulpits from the days of his early childhood. The style primarily depends upon the sound of the discourse for its power. True, there is often some argument being set forth, but the weight of persuasion more heavily falls on parallel structures, repeated rhythms, words and sounds, and a highly emotive diction. It is with this style that Defoe seems closest to the audience because he is

---

Movement of English Prose (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1966), p. 114.

[2]Such a style suggests a thoughtful pace and demonstrates that Defoe is not so casual a writer as some critics would like to presume. Bonamy Dobree in "Some Aspects of Defoe's Prose," p. 174, remarks in his discussion of Robinson Crusoe that "it seems unlikely . . . that Defoe ever thought about style in the way that Addison, or Pope, or Swift, or Bolinbroke thought about it. His great strokes of artistry . . . seem entirely unconscious." Gordon, p. 136, says of Defoe's journalistic style that Defoe wrote to reach his audience and that usually meant simplicity and clarity. James Sutherland, On English Prose (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957), p. 64, notes that similarity between Defoe's style and that of Sir Roger L'Estrange. Like L'Estrange, Defoe had to write in a hurry. John F. Ross, pp. 90-91, suggests that Swift could never have written the loose, careless prose of Defoe. According to Ross, "Defoe plunged into his long periods careless of what, or how much was to go in—but the more the better."

furiously talking directly to it. The style is necessarily less controlled than his sophisticated philosophical style, but though it dashes madly about, smashing everything in its path like a wounded animal bent on revenge, it is more studied than his rambling expository style. Yet it seems that Defoe loses himself in the patterns so that he hardly has time to catch his breath. He apparently wants to sweep up the audience into the same enthusiasm or anger.[3]

Before moving into an analysis of the persuasive style we should put it into perspective. First of all, while Defoe's persuasive style may be termed rhetorical or oratorical, it is still, in many ways, what his contemporaries considered plain. As Richard F. Jones, Morris Croll, and others have shown, there was a general reaction in the seventeenth century against rhetoric as simply a means of decoration for oral and written discourse.[4] Whether the reaction was against the over elaborate "Cireronian style" as practiced by Hooker and Milton (to name two prominent examples), whether it was a result of scientific influence on all kinds of writing, or whether it was the result of some still uncovered set of causes is of little concern here. But it is important

---

[3]The variety of styles in Defoe's nonfiction prose is duly noted by James Sutherland in "The Relation of Defoe's Fiction to his Nonfictional Writings," p. 39. Cf. James pp. 15, 19, 23, 36, 41-2 for arguments regarding Defoe's variation of style.

[4]See Croll, Style, Rhetoric and Rhythm: Essays by Morris W. Croll, pp. 167-202, 207-233; Jones, The Seventeenth Century: Studies in the History of English Thought and Literature from Bacon to Pope, pp. 75-142; W. Fraser Mitchell, English Pulpit Oratory from Andrews to Tillotson (New York: Russell & Russell, 1962), pp. 308-379.

that Defoe shared the notion that style should be primarily functional, rather than merely aesthetic.

Essentially Defoe agreed with Richard Baxter, the nonconformist plain-style preacher, who believed that

> the Plainest words . . . are the profitablest Oratory in the weightiest matters. Fineness is for ornament, and delicacy for delight; but they answer not necessity. . . . Yea when they are conjunct, it is hard for the necessitous hearers or Reader to observe the matter of ornament and delicacy, and not be carried from the Matter of Necessity: and to hear or read a neat, concise sententious Discourse, and not be hurt by it; for it usually hindereth the due operation of the matter and keeps it from the heart, and stops it in the fancy, and makes it seem as light as the stile.[5]

In similar terms Mr. Review tells his readers as he warms to the attack on the Tories during the Parliamentary elections of 1710, "I could give you Similies, and Allegories to represent the Case to you, and read you long Lectures upon the Roman Affairs under the Government of their Consuls and Tribunes; from which you might see readily what I mean, and might make applications to your selves—But I have chosen a down-right Plainness, and to speak home both in Fact and Stile; A Method however less safe to my self, yet more generally Instructing and Clear to the Understanding of the People I am speaking to" (VII, 149). Later when a "wise Gentleman" finds fault with Defoe for speaking too plainly about the Tories "and with too much Fire," Defoe answers that

> 'tis for want of speaking plain, that the Party has gotten such a Head, and that they are able to Impose upon the poor People, with such gross Absurdities—Had not some People, such as he, who pretend to be for a Right Cause, let it cool

---

[5]Quoted in Mitchell, pp. 270-71.

> in their Hands, Temporiz'd, Flatter'd, and Halted, between their Zeal, and their Politicks—Had they dar'd to espouse plain Truth, in her Native Dress; had they spoke and acted plainly, to the information and Instruction of the Nation—Our poor Commons had never been to be Deluded with such ridiculous things, as now do this Party's Business.

He goes on to add and reiterate: "If these things require Similies and Allusions, to explain them to people; if a dark way of ambiguous doutful speaking, will open the Poor People's Eyes, I am not your Man, Gentlemen, you must turn another Way" (VII, 191-92).

It is clear that by plainness Defoe means particularly a direct approach: if Tories are traitors they should be identified as such. Figurative or allegorical approaches on the other hand are indirect methods that require the audience to infer meaning. At the same time, however, that he is rejecting the rhetorical trope, he employs a rhetorical scheme—anaphora ("Had not some People . . . Had they dar'd . . . had they spoke"). Also it will be remembered that the frequent parallels to Biblical events, the typology, and the extended figures and allegories of sickness, storms, madness, monsters, and burning houses noted in the previous chapter are all examples of the very sorts of devices Defoe says he never uses. Nevertheless he is not being completely dishonest; his many figurative devices and associations and his persuasive style are almost never employed as decoration or as demonstration of his virtuosity. His purpose is to intensify meaning so that it rings out clearly. In short, rhetoric, as described by Baxter and Defoe, is of two kinds, functional and decorative, and both men heartily reject the latter and exploit the former.

As W. Fraser Mitchell and Richard F. Jones have shown, the theory of preaching held by Baxter and Defoe came to be the one accepted in the latter part of the seventeenth century and the early decades of the eighteenth century. No more were the witty sermons of Donne and Andrews in vogue, or the infinite divisions of Puritan preachers who could discourse for hours from one short Bible verse.[6] Preachers began to realize that they needed to reach the hearts of the audience and that they could do that better through rhetoric designed to stimulate reaction than through rhetorical gymnastics. It was this kind of sermon that Defoe admired and to which he aspired. His reference to the sermon preached by "the Reverend Mr. Knagg's Lecturer, of St. Giles's in the Fields" clearly demonstrates his taste and his notion of what is effective preaching:

> In representing the Spirit of Fury and Persecution, the Reverend Author Breaks out in this significant Ejaculation. O Holy Jesus! (says he p. 8) where was it ever thy Command, thy Religion should be propagated by Consecrated Daggers? Or when didst thou ever bring Men over to Christianity, by Barbarous and Bloody Means. P. 9 he goes on, to Conclude, If you prize your Religion, lay aside your Divisions, for there are too many among us; Endeavour to preserve Peace, Christian Concord, Charity, &c. by these Means and Principles, you shall secure the Protestant Interests and free you and your Posterity from Superstition and Arbitrary Governments.
>
> I pass over a great many of his most Eloquent Expressions, and Significant Arguments for Peace, referring my Readers to the Sermon it self, which very well merits a Serious Reading; and I shall wish and hope for an unusual Practice of Peace, if all the Reverend Clergy of the Church would set themselves to work, to press their Hearers to Peace, with the same Zeal and Religious Earnestness; But I cannot omit his Extraordinary Observation near the Close of the Discourse, in these words, p. 19. How many are there among us (says this Worthy Divine, who sees the just Causes of our Disorders) that have nothing

---

[6]Mitchell, pp. 351-365, 369; Jones, 112 ff.

> to boast of, but the Empty Name of the Church, and under that Skreen, do more Mischief to her than those that Dissent from her. And to close all, he Addresses to his Hearers thus.
> "Would you prevent the Effusion of Blood in our Land? Would you prevent the Loss of your Religion, and the Ruin of your Country? Would you advance the End and Design of the Gospel of Jesus Christ? Would you that Truth should be kept up, and flourish in the Kingdom? And would you Subdue and bring under the Great Disturber of Christendom, the French King? Then be at Peace with one another, and the God of Peace will be with you." (II, 167)

The style of this sermon strongly suggests some of the features of Defoe's own sermon style. The first part of the quoted passage begins with an apostrophe (aversio) which includes rhetorical questions (interrogatio), irony (i.e., that religion "should be propagated by Consecrated Daggers"), metaphor (the daggers), and alliteration ("by Barbarous and Bloody Means"). The quotation from p. 9 of the sermon begins with two clauses balanced in sound and rhythm: "If you prize your Religion, lay aside your Divisions. . . ." Here the verbs assonate the [aI] and the objects assonate the [I], a device perennially popular with both poets and prose writers, especially in the period of Defoe and Pope.[7] The second paragraph of Defoe's quotation from the sermon includes anaphora, a metaphor that is a proverb, and a reference to Solomon's memorable words, "only of Pride cometh Contention" (dictu commoratio). Both of the final passages quoted by Defoe demonstrate the preaching

---

[7]See, for example, Jacob H. Adler, The Reach of Art: A Study in the Prosody of Pope, University of Florida Monographs (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1964), p. 76; and Percy G. Adams, "Harmony of Numbers: Dryden's Alliteration, Consonance, Assonance," TSLL, 9 (1967/68), 338-339, and "Pope's Concern with Assonance," TSLL, 9 (1967/68), 498-499.

device of asking something directly of the audience (percontatio) in parallel multiple questions (quaestium), each one implying its own answer and building in emotion until the calm statement of the doctrine of peace.[8] There is no obscurity, no rhetoric for its own sake, but there is a significant number of rhetorical devices to heighten emotion so that the audience may be persuaded ironically to peace. This sermon, as we shall see, could easily have been preached from the pulpit by Defoe.

In order that his sermons should take on the tone of those delivered from the pulpit or on the street corner, Defoe frequently creates the fiction of an actual audience so that he may speak directly to them. It has been noted that Defoe, taking a hint from Sir Roger L'Estrange, habitually interjects "Gentlemen" as a form of personal address into his sentences.[9] But the oral tone of his persuasive style is often more direct than an address to faceless "Gentlemen."

The Review for December 17, 1709, for example, again takes up the question of whether the Church of Scotland ought to tolerate Episcopal clergymen. It is Defoe's argument that all attempts to force Scotland to allow these men to have meetings, even though many of them have never taken the abjuration oath, are simply a Jacobite plot to make Scotland dissolve the Union. Thus, he makes an emotional address, loaded with

---

[8]Throughout this chapter Latin or Greek terms for rhetorical devices as well as definitions, quoted from rhetoricians or their sources are taken from Lee A. Sonnino, A Handbook to Sixteenth-Century Rhetoric (London: Routledge & Kegan,Paul, 1968), passim. For a glossary of terms see the Appendix.

[9]Sutherland, On English Prose, p. 73N.

oratorical devices, directly to the Whigs. The reader gets a distinct image of pews lined with Whigs hanging on every word of a preacher trying to open their eyes to their own safety:[10]

> And all this [abuse and insult by Jacobites] She [the Church of Scotland] suffers, while Acts of Parliament, Proclamations, Treaties of Union, and the Power of the Civil Magistrates are all on her Side—Not England being engag'd to keep the Union entire, not the solemn Ratification of that Treaty, in which the Act of Security of the Church is incorporated, not the Queen's Resolution of supporting and maintaining the Church in its legal Constitution, express'd in her Majesty's Letters to Scotland, not the Civil Power; in short Nothing can procure the Church the peaceable Possession of her establish'd Liberties, but she has a Constitution and no Constitution; she is as it were establish'd, and not establish'd; she is harrass'd, insulted, clamour'd, and maltreated on all Hands; and if she offers to put the Laws in Execution in her own Defence, if she claims the Protection of the Civil Magistrate, if she flies for Succour to the Government under any of these Insults—Then the Party in England cries out of Persecution, and behold (God forgive your Blindness) you suffer yourselves to be impos'd upon by the Artifice, and you say so too—You Whigs, I mean you. . . . something else I should stile you—That seem willing to have Jacobitism and Faction trample down Revolution and Establishment, even before your Faces—As if the Experiment being made in Scotland with Success, it would not some time or other reach home to your selves—and be felt even by Your own Families, or your Posterity; and well you would deserve to feel it. (VI, 437-38)

The long series of parallel introductory phrases to delay the completion and to heighten the effect of the sentence, the anaphora, and the other parallel elements suggest the mounting outrage of Mr. Review as he finally points his finger at the guilty Whigs who do not even care about losing their children's liberty. He becomes so angry that he almost

---

[10]The only discussion of Defoe's rhetoric, oratory, and address to a seemingly present audience in the Review occurs in Bonamy Dobreé, English Literature in the Early Eighteenth Century 1700-1740 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), pp. 49-51.

calls them an unpleasant name—"fools" perhaps or perhaps even "traitors." Such technique is much more effective in producing a sensation of oral delivery than is the simple reference to "Gentlemen," because here Defoe resorts to shouting at a particular group of people.

Defoe's addresses to imaginary congregations fall into three categories. He may castigate a friendly audience of his regular readers because they are not working for the good of the country. In such instances Defoe's pose is like that of the preacher who frequently reminds his congregation that their lives have been imperfect. On the other hand, he may take it upon himself to preach to the enemies of the state or, to maintain the analogy, to the sinners in the congregation. Or, as sometimes occurs in the Review as well as in the pulpit, he addresses each group, Christian and sinner in turn.

A suitable example of the first category occurs when Defoe is forced to preach to his own people about their backsliding spiritual support of the war effort. Following military victories the English resort to the tavern, but the French

> on the contrary . . . are on their knees praying for Deliverance and for Success against us: Unpraying Protestants! Don't tell me they pray to False Gods, till we can see you praying to the True; That they pray to Saints and the Virgin Mary, and innumerable intercessors that cannot hear them, some of them may chance to be sincerely praying to the True GOD, and if you wholly neglect it, you may expect what you will, but if GOD should deliver you, that seek it not, and deliver up them that are crying for Mercy; He would Act in a way you have no warrant to hope for. . . . (V, 299)

Here Defoe sounds very much, and without doubt deliberately like those Old-Testament prophets who were always warning their people that God would punish them for their sins.

When, in another Review, he turns to the traitors, his approach is equally direct as he warns them that they deserve no mercy for their sins. Their only chance, he tends to argue, is to purge themselves totally of erroneous doctrines. For example he speaks to the "Incorrigible" of the Jacobites and rhetorically enumerates their wicked designs in order that they may understand how little they deserve the Queen's forgiveness:

> Nay, if you look into your Conduct from the Beginning of this War, how you have, without any Compassion for your Native Country, us'd all Means possible to involve it in Blood, Destruction, Slavery, and the Return of all that we have so long strove to keep out; if you look back upon the Steps you have taken to bring this to pass Whether by private Plot or open Cabals, Party-making and Faction, by Intriguing, Assassination, Invasion, and every possible Method, having left no Stone unturn'd: I say, if you look on this, you cannot but in Your Thoughts expect it should be now too late to cry Quarter—That the Flag of Peace has been so long held out, and you have rejected all Terms so long, you could not have the least Reason to think, there was any Room left you to treat, or any thing before you but meer rendering at Discretion. (VI, 65-66)

In these two passages the sense of audience is strongly present, but it appears, perhaps, even stronger in another sermon in which he again touches upon the need for the Jacobites to give over their cause and accept the Queen's forgiveness. In this particular issue (April 28, 1709) Defoe seems to stand before an audience composed of both loyal Whigs and Jacobites. When he addresses the Whigs it is generally to catalogue the sins of the Jacobites; when he speaks to the Jacobites he exhorts them to support their own country. The effect is that Defoe, by distinctly addressing each group in turn and by changing his style according to each segment of the argument, appears to be alternately turning from one part of the congregation to the other. The result is

not only a division of the group into sheep and goats but also the creation of a strong sense in the reader of the existence of audience.

First, he speaks to the Whigs and, very calmly in short tight sentences that hardly exhibit a trace of his more emotional harangues, explains that the intends to be kind to the Jacobites because he hopes that he can persuade them by a friendly approach to accept the Queen's offer of clemency and give up trying to destroy the nation: "I cannot think, railing at them at all the proper method of treating them; ill Language is none of my Element, I shall use them as Christians, as Gentlemen, as Britains; and let their Designs have been what they will against us, I shall not revile them . . ." (VI, 41). As he progresses, however, Mr. Review becomes more and more excited, his accusations stronger, his style more inflammatory, and by the fourth paragraph one finds him turning to the Jacobites with a threat: "Men of Sense and Men of Honour can never long resist the Importunities of Gratitude and Kindness—An Enemy, that has any Principles of Generosity, when Force has not been able to reduce him, will be won with Acts of Goodness—Now, Gentlemen, here is a Government, that like Heaven has strove to conquer you with Mercy, when at the same Time it is evident to your selves—It wants not Power to reduce you by Force" (VI, 42).

The irony in paragraph four carries Defoe to a greater one: as the present government has become more and more able to crush all opposition, it has become proportionately more merciful toward its enemies. Yet all the while the Jacobites have provided the government with fewer and fewer reasons to be merciful. What follows (paragraphs 7-11)

is a vicious attack on the Jacobites that is directed to the Whig audience. It becomes quite apparent that Defoe's purpose is not to persuade the Jacobites with gentle logic to give up their cause: he is really encouraging the Whigs to destroy all Jacobites. He concludes his catalogue of Jacobite sins:

> Upon all Occasions, wherein they have lain open to Justice, we find as few of them suffering as possible; in Plots, in Correspondence with Enemies, in betraying our Councils, in Invasions, in Tumults and Riots, in Pamphlets and seditious Writings, in furious Preachings; in short all their Excursions, wherein the Law could take hold of them, and in which the Government had it in their Power to punish, all the Tenderness in the World has been used towards them—The very Sentences of the Law have not been executed; how many have been pardon'd how few punish'd; in their Assassination of King William, how few were put to Death, and none but such as against whom there was no other Defense? In the Tumults about the Union in Scotland, not one Man suffer'd; in the Invasion, not a Drop of blood yet spilt. . . .
>
> Will any Excuse, after this [the Queen's offer of pardon to all Jacobites], be left to a Party to oppose this Government? Is it possible, the Queen could do more to oblige them, than to make them easie under all their State-Apprehensions, and frankly remit all their Follies?—What can be expected after this, if Men will renew their Opposition?—I hinted already, that the Clemency of the Government should not be expected to last always, that a Time would come, when the leaden Feet of Justice would come up with a continued offending Party, and they cannot have the Face to expect more Patience in a Nation, that has already so long labour'd under the Disease of their Disaffection. (VI, 43)

The contrast between this address to the Whigs and his opening remarks to the same audience is quite striking: not only is he doing exactly what he said he would not do, but he has also completely changed the mode of address. Now the rhetorical question (interrogatio) carries the emotional appeal, backed strongly by anaphora, alliteration, balance, adjunctio and parallel structures abundant with duplication. Together

these devices make one imagine a fiery speaker, breathlessly shouting his anger and contempt as he glares at his audience, hoping to stir them to the same fever pitch.

Yet just as quickly the mood changes again. Like a preacher who, after frightening his congregation by enumerating their sins and predicting their damnation, turns to tender phrases to cajole them to accept God's grace, Defoe turns to the Jacobite part of his audience and dispenses soothing words:

> The Queen has strove to conquer you all with Clemency and Kindness; pray, Gentlemen, examine, what End can her Majesty propose to her self in it—'Tis plain, Power is not wanting to crush you . . . 'Tis plain, it is by no Means in Apprehension of your Party, which is now grown contemptible and despicable to the last Degree—It must be to win you, and if possible to persuade you to see and know your Happiness, and prevail upon you to return to your Duty and restore your selves to your Country. (VI, 43-4)

Finally, he heightens the emotional pitch again in the last paragraph of his sermon and address to the Jacobites by again employing rhetorical questions (interrogatio and rogatio) and repetitions, parallel structures. In this section also Defoe makes his most direct appeal. The questions help to provide the fiction of an audience, but Defoe achieves an even stronger effect when he directs the attention of Jacobites to various places where they may mistakenly expect to receive succor. They may cast their eyes about but there is no hope. Let us listen as Defoe makes his last exhortation and punctuates it with another friendly threat.

> If then there is any Honour, any Gratitude, any Sense of Kindness in Jacobitism, nay, if any Prudence, any Policy, any Wisdom, any Sense of Danger, any Sense of Interest—Gentlemen

> Jacobites, you will now come in—Pray, will you cast your Eyes about you in the World?—From whence must your Hopes come? From what Quarter of the world must your Help appear? Miracles indeed may be wrought, but Human Affairs view'd with Human Wisdom offer no Prospect. Look to the Right Hand, and to the Left; French Power, on which you rested, is broken [the French appeared to be defeated in 1709]—Home Distractions, which you have in vain try'd, are decreas'd—Peace is at hand abroad, Union is settled at home—Whither can you look?—Will you look up, Heaven has declar'd against you! Will you look down, Hell submits, and can no longer uphold French Exorbitance, by which it promis'd you Relief! Will you look at home, your Number is small, Your Party discourag'd, poor, and ill cemented, and you have no Power! Will you look abroad, your Enemies prosper! At home you have no Force, abroad no Friends! For your own Sake, Gentlemen, come in—And do it now for this is the last time of Asking. (VI, 44)

Defoe's rhetoric in this final exhortation is two-fold. First he fashions his closing remarks after the "invitation" often found at the close of the Puritan sermon. Normally a preacher, after providing his text and explaining it in the "doctrine" of his sermon, moves into a rhetorical "application" which usually ends with an invitation to the sinners in the audience to renounce their sins and give up their souls to God's grace.[11] Likewise Defoe asks the Jacobites to give up trying to destroy the nation and enslave the people. Their support has disintegrated, he tells them, both at home and abroad. The French are almost beaten and their own efforts to create discord at home have failed. God, with the misfortunes of the French, has shown His opposition to them, and Satan has shown himself powerless to maintain them. Their only hope of avoiding total annihilation is to accept the Queen's mercy. In addition Defoe underlines the hopelessness of the Jacobite position,

---

[11] William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), p. 134.

first with an ironic allusion to Psalm 121 ("I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help.") and then with effectively balanced clauses. For the Jacobites, of course, there is no help, and so Defoe invites them to lift up their eyes not just to the hills but to all points of the compass. The results of their observations are then couched in the pointed, balanced structures: "French Power, on which you rested, is broken—Home Distractions, which you have in vain try'd, are decreas'd—Peace is at hand abroad, Union is settled at home. . . . At home you have no Force, abroad no Friends!" No one can argue that Defoe is not trying to reach the hearts of his imagined congregation. The only question is which side of the church is he trying to reach—Whigs or Tories?

Whoever the pretended audience is supposed to be, Defoe's sermons usually develop one of several attitudes toward it. His normal method is to reduce the distance between himself and his supposed listeners so that he can address them in the familiar second person (communicatio).[12] For example, in a condemning sermon preached to the High-Church Clergy on June 14, 1705, he points his finger at the High Churchmen as the only ones who are discontent with the existence of Dissenters:

> Who then are the Uneasie Discontented People? Who are the Reviewers of old Animosities, the Wideners of Breaches, and Dividers of the People?
> Why really, Gentlemen of the High Church, and amongst you in especial manner, the Inferiour Clergy, as Nathan the Prophet

---

[12]Both Ian Gordon (p. 137) and James Sutherland in On English Prose, p. 69, note the tendency for Restoration and Augustan prose to be a conversation between the writer and some person, real or imaginary.

> said to the King, Thou art the Man; you are the Men that cry Fire before you see a Smoak: Pardon me that I am oblig'd to be so plain with you, Ill fairly make out the Fact, or Acknowledge the Error.
>
> From whence proceed the Incessant Clamours at the Queen, the Railings, the Lampoons upon the Government, the Villifying even the Clergy and Prelates of your own Church, with Scandalous Reflections? Come they not hence? Even from the Mouths of the Clergy of that Church, which own Her Majesty as Supream Head, and those very Reverend Prelates as Fathers in God.
>
> How is the Pulpit Daily Prophan'd with Invectives, Satyr, and Recriminations, instead of Sermons, and Expositions of the Sacred Text? How are you thundering out Curses and Exclamations, to stir up the Spirit of Strife in the People, the Daily business of the Lord's Day, while the Good People, who come to church, in order to [hear] Spiritual Gostly Instruction, are frightened, and sent Home full of Apprehensions of their Innocent Neighbours. (II, 174)

It is notable that here Defoe not only directly identifies his audience but speaks to them familiarly as "you" and even sardonically asks their pardon, as if they might be in a position to give it. Also his practice of using a series of rhetorical questions as an orator, rather than as a writer for a reading audience might use them, also strongly implies a living, breathing congregation of High Churchmen listening to Defoe accuse them of using their pulpits as he is using the Review.

Yet, the reader of the Review is often aware that even though Defoe may be employing some of the same rhetorical devices the distance between himself and the audience is greater, the tone more impersonal, more ecclesiastical than his fiery, direct discourses to political sinners. There are times then when the pulpit is higher. Usually such sermons appear when the purpose is less to attack than to reform. In his sermon on January 18, 1709, his subject is the reform of the Church of England and the rather ironic aim of his argument is to remove the

opportunities of Dissenters to attack the Church for its immorality. At the end of the previous issue Defoe had reported a story about a blasphemous, cursing minister of the Church who demonstrates a total lack of concern for his parishioners. The story serves as a point of embarkation for Defoe's own sermon.

In order to examine the difference in distance one needs to listen to a lengthy passage from the address. Although Defoe is here speaking to the "Gentlemen of the Church of England," his references to sins are usually in the third person and the questions are not specifically directed to the audience; rather Defoe provides the answers himself (rogatio):

> To hear a Minister of the Church Blaspheme that Blessed Name, by which he is, or pretends to be call'd; to see a Preacher of Righteousness be a Belcher of Oaths, a Guide to Salvation be a Defier and Insulter of Heaven; to hear a Minister swear and curse—Thou that preachest that Men should not steal, DOST THOU steal? Thou that abhorrest Idols, DOST THOU commit Sacrilege; for the Name of GOD is blasphemed among the Gentiles THOROW YOU? Rom: 2. 21, 22, 23
>
> Is this the Way we honour the Vocation, and lead by the Hand the dark World into the Light of Truth?—Is this the Way to preserve or secure the Church? No, nor will the Church of England be ever secur'd, till her Discipline is restor'd, and some new Course taken to put her Cannon strictly in Execution against all Manner of Vice, but especially among her Clergy: To say a Church can be safe, when she is not reform'd in Morals, I mean her Ministers; when her Instructors are debauch'd, when the Sons of the Church become Sons of Sodom, and Guides to the Devil, is to say, what we have very little Ground to hope for—A Minister of the Gospel, by how much the more Honourable he is by Office, Sacred in Person, and Reverend in Name, by so much the more odious and contemptible he grows, when he abandons his Morals, and gives himself a Loose in Debauchery—Nay, as they are Men most capable of serving God and their Country when sober, and prescrib'd so; I think, when they give themselves up, they prove the worst of Men—They turn the Diametrical Opposites to the Employ they are dedicated to, they grow Factors of Hell, and Stock Jobbers

> for the Devil; they drive Men to destruction, and damn more by their Example, than they recover by their Doctrine—I will not say, but a wicked Minister may by his Preaching be the Means of converting a Sinner; this may be; but we are too sure, that he is the Cause, humanly speaking, of the Hardening many. . . . (V, 506)

It is significant that in this slashing attack Defoe does not accuse the pretended High-Church audience of being wicked themselves; instead he is charging that since they have failed to punish the disgraceful examples among them they have hurt the Church. What seems to be accusation in the first paragraph does not really have the same force as Defoe's own angered questions because the quotation from Romans serves only as an analogy. Even when he does become personal with the audience, it is not with the whole group, and it is not upon the central issue of the sermon: "You that have endeavour'd to blacken her [the Scottish Presbyterian Church] all you can, reproach'd her Judicatories, and condemn'd her Ministry—you have not once attempted to blame her Discipline; you have pretended they have depos'd Men innocent, tho' that is not made out either, but you cannot pretend the Guilty are conniv'd at, and her Clergy let run out into Excesses and Immoralities" (V, 506). Thus, to conclude from a typical example, although the presence of the imaginary audience is apparent, the emphasis is more on the interest of the Church of England than upon the audience present, which may not necessarily include the wicked ones. This kind of sermon, then, is not an attack, as so often is the case when Defoe speaks to High Churchmen. Rather, it shows a sincere Defoe and not a Defoe whose function is to keep the Whigs at white heat against their political enemies.

The final class of sermon-address employed frequently by Mr. Review is, in its appeal and tone, significantly different from the other two. Whenever he speaks to Whigs, Dissenters, Tories, High Churchmen, Highflyers or Jacobites, whether he designs to remove the barriers between himself and the audience-congregation or maintain them, he always speaks down to his listeners. It seems to matter very little that those listeners, his invented audience, may be important churchmen, wealthy merchants or knights of the shire. But when he moves his pulpit before the Convocation of the Church, before the ministry, or even before the Parliament, he necessarily treats his audience very differently. He is like a minister invited to give a sermon before a powerful monarch: the preacher may, for instance, want to condemn the riotous living of the king, but he has to be very careful how he does it. He must be humble and respectful, he must plead and imply, but he must never insult, correct, condemn or in any way anger his audience. When Defoe is speaking to ordinary Whigs and Tories he may viciously attack Lord H_____ or Sir E_____, but not when he is standing before those men in the chambers of Parliament.

On January 7, [1710], for example, when Defoe decides to address a sermon to the House of Commons to argue that they should show their extreme displeasure with Dr. Sacheverell's crime, even if they should decide to mitigate his personal punishment, he makes his approach very humbly and applies comprobatio liberally:

> Now that this [Defoe's pursuit of the general good] may be more effectually and seasonably done—As Heaven has mov'd the House of Commons to resent it in the Man, so I cannot but

> most humbly apply my self to them to resent it as a Crime; and tho' it may be look'd upon as arrogant in me to address this Paper to so great an Assembly, yet as their Doors are open to the Grievances of all Britain, I doubt not, but their Ears will be also open to every modest Representation, especially such as are visibly pointed at the general Good—As, I hope, this shall appear to be.
>
> Wherefore, with the humblest Submission to the Opinion of the British Parliament, and yet in a chearful Confidence in their Justice, Love to their Country, and Zeal for the publick Peace, I take leave to address this Paper to the Commons of Britain assembled at this Time in Parliament, as follows. (VI, 469-70)

What follows is a highly rhetorical address that continues through the next issue and ends in the same tone of total submission and praise:

> May Heaven inspire you all with Love to your Country's Peace, as it has always done with Zeal for her Liberties! May Divine Illuminations clear your Politick Eye-sight from all Jacobite Mists and Antirevolution Delusions—The House of Commons cannot, but by a Judgment from Heaven, be darkned in Judgment, or cool'd in Zeal, to secure the Liberties and Constitution of their Country. . . .
>
> . . . . . .
>
> I hope, in this humble Representation I cannot have offended—I protest to have design'd neither to lead, direct, or reflect—But from a true Principle of, and, I hope, a rightly inform'd Zeal for the General Good the Peace, the Priviledges, and the Prosperity of Britain, I have presum'd thus far; and for my Self, I entirely submit to the Justice and Censure of the Parliament; in which every honest Man is safe, his Property and Person secure, and over which, I hope, no Prejudice shall ever prevail. (VI, 475-76)[13]

Defoe also sometimes gives the reader a feeling that an audience is present in some form by having the audience actually respond to

---

[13]As several scholars have noted, the students at Newington Green, where Defoe attended Mr. Morton's School, were made to practice writing addresses and letters to people in high places. A study of Defoe's letters to Robert Harley, Sunderland, Hallifax, Godolphin and others shows that he is very adept at formal flattery.

Mr. Review. For example, in his essay on February 21, 1708, Defoe's subject is the possibility of a French invasion, because the French are obviously preparing for some great expedition. In the second paragraph he suggests that such an invasion might have a good effect, meaning that, like his "French Spectacles," it might serve to open the eyes of the blind. But upon the phrase "good effect" there comes a shout from the audience: "Good Effects of a French Invasion! What's the D . . . in this Fellow now, says one that reads this Paper? This is a fine Tale indeed, what does he mean by that?" Defoe then proceeds to untangle the paradox for the "Gentlemen of Faction and Party" (IV, 641-42). A similar effect is gained when Defoe uses the imaginary taunt of a Tacker who believes that his fellows will all be reelected despite Defoe's campaign against them: "Well, says the Opponent, you may say what you will, and Print what you will, but you see the Country is of another Opinion, and in spight of all your Party, the Tackers will come in again; when there was not above Ten Members Chosen Five of them were Tackers" (II, 117).

Mr. Review even finds himself accosted by a raving Whiggish supporter of Prince Eugene who is angry at the governor of Lille for having held out so long during the Confederate seige of the town. It so happens that the man's outburst introduces another of the "madman" papers, making the fellow appear madder that the proclaimed madman from Bedlam[14]:

---

[14]In Volume V Mr. Review encounters a mad man and has a number of interesting dialogues with him. The mad man has two purposes: frequently in his madness he espouses doctrines that Defoe would identify with madness; yet he may speak with great wisdom. In the latter instances the reader finds him blurting out dangerous truths—observations and

> WHAT a Dog is this Boussiers now? Says a swaggering Fellow, that told us at the Beginning of the Siege of Lisle, we should carry it Sword in hand, as it were—I would have that bullying Fellow us'd like a Dog, Prince Eugene should give him no Quarter—He is a Soldier, he's a Desparado, a Fellow, that keeping out of the Breech himself, only set the Men there to butcher one another—It's plain, his Design was meer Murther and Destruction of our Men; if he had Capitulated, when the Counterscarp was taken, as all Governors do he should have been well treated—But this way of holding Out was purely a Design of his, only to butcher and destroy our Men—and sacrificing his Garrison purely for that Purpose. He's a Dog, a meer Dog, a true Bloody French Man, a Cut-throat, a Papist, a Bully, let him be hang'd, cut-a-pieces, give him no Quarter—a Dog, give him no Quarter—He have Quarter! He should have no Quarter, but to be quarter'd upon the Breach—Patckul him[15]—Had we but a Gothic General, he would be us'd like himself. (V, 329)

By pretending to address a live audience and having the imagined audience respond to him, Defoe makes his style more dynamic. Thus, many of the oratorical effects may be more clearly realized by his reading audience if they are themselves caught up in the sermon atmosphere of the presentation. Also, of course, making the essays appear to be sermons or addresses to groups of people gives Defoe's arguments a certain dignity and authority that a simple political journal hawked about the streets of London would not have. Finally, the fiction of the address provides Defoe with a rationale for using the rhetoric that he employs. Preachers, after all, no matter how

---

conclusions that only a mad man would dare to speak in public. Thus Defoe can either identify all kinds of immoderation with madness or express dangerous opinions through him. After all, who would blame a mad man for his ravings?

[15]The Russian officer tortured to death by Charles XII of Sweden. See V, 237, 263.

much they subscribe to plainness, have a duty to reach the hearts and souls of their congregations. Rhetoric and oratory are long established ways of doing that.[16]

Although feigned interaction with the audience gives Defoe's printed sermons the tone of oratory, were there no other oratorical-rhetorical features of the style, the appearance of personal contact would have little persuasive effect. Yet taken with the many other emotional devices employed in the Review, Defoe can generate excitement in the reader that may make him suspend his disbelief and imagine that he is experiencing a real oratorical performance. For an audience whose most popular form of reading was probably still the sermon, such an imaginative response to the printed page is, perhaps, not such an unreasonable theory.[17] The popularity of the sermon also explains why Defoe chose to use it in the Review.

---

[16]According to Baxter (Reliquiae, 1696), the masses during the Protectorate liked "'a Preacher that speaketh to them in a familiar natural Language, and exhorteth them as if it were for their Lives.'" Quoted in Mitchell, p. 331. Much the same might be said of Defoe's preaching. The language and style may not be totally natural but Defoe almost always speaks his highly oratorical pieces in a desperate, emotional, excited way.

[17]Speaking of the Puritan and Independents of the 17th Century (whose direct descendents are the Dissenters of Defoe's day), Mitchell points out that the 17th Century was "an age when those who read at all read mainly sermons, or other devotional works written by preachers." As a result, "the influence of current preaching fashions was immense, and largely determined the literacy taste of the period." He goes on to note that sermons reflected audience taste as well (p. 397). We can be reasonably sure from the position taken by the Review that Defoe's real audience was made up mostly of Dissenters and Low-Churchmen, to give a religious classification, and Whigs, to give the political one. Thus, we may assume that his persuasive style is at least likely to be a

Certainly one of Defoe's most common and most useful devices in his persuasive style is the rhetorical question. It serves to underline the orator-audience relationship, but, more important, it becomes in Defoe's hands a highly emotive tool. Defoe does not simply interject questions at crucial moments; he builds up long strings of them so that whole pages and sometimes almost whole issues are series of rhetorical questions. Furthermore Defoe has all the figures that rhetoricians have traditionally used for asking questions—interrogatio ("To ask a question which needs no answer"), percontatio ("To enquire of others in order to set forth the speaker's own opinion"), quaestium ("A question for emotional emphasis"), and rogatio ("To ask a question and add one's own reply"). The result is that the message carried by the question need not be argued because the question either demands that the audience concur on a predetermined, obvious, but unspoken answer; or it provides its own answer in the way the question is asked or in the form of a direct answer. Moreover, when the questions come in long, parallel strings, each succeeding question often being more emotionally loaded than the last, the audience does not really have time to stop and think the answers. As an orator would hardly pause at all between questions to let the proposed answer formulate in the minds of the audience, so Defoe drives on with anaphora, parallelism, and repeated rhythms.

---

reflection of the taste of that audience. One has to go only to Dr. Sacheverell to find that the High-Church masses liked the same kind of emotional address.

Sometimes he simply places commas between questions, perhaps to indicate the pace. Sometimes he lets a single predicate support several parallel interrogative beginnings. But whatever the method, there is usually an obvious, emotionally exhortative tone in the Reviews which extensively employ the question. A few examples will suffice to demonstrate how the question is used by Defoe and why it is a prominent feature in his persuasive sermons.

Defoe's questioning process is usually assertive. Speaking of those who supported the tack of the Occasional Bill, for example, he wishes to suggest that tackers are enemies to the Church. The questions then are used to set up a seemingly logical response.

> What were the Men that Opposed this thing? What the remainder of the House of Commons? What the House of Lords? What the Bishops? What the Queen? Will any Man have the Face to say, the Bishops of the Church, are not of the Church; or that the Queen is not of the Church?
>
> Was there but 134 [the number of tackers] Churchmen in the House of Commons? Or must none be of the Church, but such as would run her upon the Rocks, and force her to Blood and Persecution?
>
> What Church is that which cannot be upheld, but by Ruining, Plundering and Starving our Neighbors? The Church of England abhors it; and therefore the Queen, the Bishops, the Nobility, and all Wise Men in the Nation have declar'd the only way to Preserve and Maintain the Church, is to Preserve and Maintain Peace and Union among our selves. (II, 76)

Actually no one of the questions needs an answer because the premise it implies allows only one conclusion. In the second paragraph, for instance, "was there but 134 Churchmen in the House of Commons?" implies that only Churchmen voted for the tack, an obviously false premise. In the third paragraph Defoe almost directly answers his own question by setting up two enthememes: first, since the Church abhors what the

tackers did, so do the Queen, bishops, nobility and wise men (the premises are certainly questionable); secondly, since the Church is against what they did, they must support some other Church.

The emotional effect of Defoe's rhetorical question depends heavily upon repetition of rhythm and idea, in a series of rapid questions, and upon anaphora. With each question the "voice" of the imagined speaker rises in pitch, and with continual repetition the tempo increases as the voice gets higher at the end of each repeated pattern. Though we have some degree of assurance that the Review, like other papers, was read aloud to groups of people, the audience may get the same effect by reading it.[18] Defoe so strongly devises the presence of a speaker and audience and employs the oratorical methods so frequently that the reader 250 years later automatically is caught up in the emotion of such passages. For example, in his attack on Dr. Sacheverell and the Highflyers (of whom Defoe considers the Doctor to be one) in the issue for December 31, 1709, Defoe fires the questions in long volleys, much as television lawyers do when they are forcing a confession from a guilty witness on the stand. At one point he even taunts the Jacobites to answer his questions, as if they have been sitting dumb and amazed in the face of damning evidence. The questions are short, they frequently repeat the phrasing of previous questions, and they all pound away at the same idea. Defoe's point is that the doctrine of passive obedience

---

[18]James Sutherland in Defoe, p. 112, refers to a contemporary report of the Review and the Observator being read on the street to groups of people.

is nothing but a High-flying argument full of contradiction and absurdity. He wants to know how Sacheverell can pretend loyalty to Queen Anne, who came to the throne as a result of revolution, while Sacheverell preaches passive obedience and jure divino:

> Have we resisted King James, or have we not? Did the People of England invite over a Foreign power, or did they not?—What did King James call it?—Did he call it a dutiful, obedient, and peaceable Requesting him to redress Grievances, when he march'd to Salisbury? When he saw the General Defection, What did he call it? Did he not call it, The Nation being poison'd? Did not all his Adherents call it a Rebelling against him?
>
> Again; What do the Jacobites call it?—If they do not think it was a Rebellion, why do they reject the QUEEN, and refuse to swear? Why do they not all come in?—Let them speak; Was K. James resisted or no? Did he fly when none pursued? Did he yield to no Force?—Wherefore did he abdicate! Was it a voluntary Resignation? Speak, Jacobites, why are ye Jacobites, if the present Title of Her Majesty be hereditary?—Either this Great Doctor has talk'd Nonsense, or else the Jacobites are all Fools, and the Refusing the Oaths can have no Foundation at all.
>
> And what would it have been called, if it had miscarried? If the Prince of Orange had been beaten, and had been forc'd back again, would not his attempt have been called an Invasion, and Boudon-Downs Meeting, and the Nottingham Rendezvouz a Rebellion? Would not the Scaffold and the Gallows been the Portion of many that had joyn'd in these things, for resisting their Sovereign?—What can we say to these absurdities?—In short, they are things made up of such Nonsense in Politicks, and are so contrary to common Reasoning, that every Child can contradict them; and it is not worth while to talk to them—Dr. Sacheverell should be ask'd, who was the QUEEN'S Father?—how he came to quit Salisbury, and afterward the Boyn?—how many Children he had, and which way the Succession devolv'd by hereditary Right to the late King William?—In short—he must either go to School again, to learn his Logic, or to his Horn-Book, to learn his Letters. (IV, 458)

Two effects are obvious. First a syllogistic argument is developed through the implied answers to the questions so that, by accepting the answers, a reader or listener seems to draw his own conclusion. In

short, Defoe presents an argument without supplying any evidence; he easily assumes that his premises are all valid. Secondly, he achieves a high emotional pitch, particularly in the second paragraph of the passage when he seems to be shouting at a group of Jacobites. Here questions become shorter and highly repetitious in form and content. "Speak, Jacobites, why are ye Jacobites, if the present Title of Her Majesty be heredetary?" he exclaims, but he hardly gives them a chance to answer.

One final example, one which perhaps shows Defoe in some of his highest emotional oratory, will serve to conclude the discussion of Defoe's use of the question. The passage is from an attempt by Defoe to lessen the criticism of the Ministry, and particularly Harley, for the serious setbacks suffered by the Confederates during the campaign of 1707. As he makes his point that the losses are a judgment of God on the people rather than the fault of the ministers, the questions become very short and the pauses between questions are reduced to mere commas. The questions are also heavy with anaphora and alliteration. Then, once the point is made by the questions, Defoe reduces the emotional level with his own answer and ends rather calmly with admonitio:

> In our Losses and Perplexing Difficulties how are our Eyes fix'd upon the Miscarriage of Instruments, as if the whole Weight of our Losses depended upon the Villany of Traytors!— Have you Traytors, have you Spyes, have you corrupted agents among you? Has French Money touch'd the Hands, and tainted the Hearts [compar] of any of our great Ones; bring them but with the Priests of Baal, and let them be hew'd in pieces before the Lord, make a Sacrifice to the People of the wicked Instruments, But pray, Gentlemen, do not rest there. Can Traytors sell you, can Fools undo you, can false Friends betray you, can Cowards dishearten you [complexio], and the

> permitting judgment of Heaven not be concern'd in it? Can this Evil be in the City, and the Lord has not done it [complexio involving the two units beginning "Can Traytors" and "Can this Evil"]? Deceive your selves as you please, and rail at Traytors, and among them, call your best Friends so, as you never fail to do, but be assur'd this thing is of God—And if you won't see it, you must be blind, and go on till you come to the Pit [an allusion, perhaps, to Proverbs 28:10] GOD grant you may open your Eyes, before you fall in. (IV, 474)

The repetition of beginnings of clauses and phrases, of rhythm, and of words with similar sounds or sense, so prevalent when Defoe applies his long strings of rhetorical questions, is also a prominent oratorical feature of the Review, even when questions do not carry the argument or effect the emotional response. The reason for its frequent uses is that repetition tends to subordinate sense to sound. Extensive repetition so buffets the reader or listener with words what he may find it rather difficult to sort out the arguments. Moreover, Defoe's most emotional appeals usually concern partisan issues. He has no hope of changing the minds of Jacobites or High-Church Tories with logic or by any other means, but he can intensify, focus, or, in rare cases, even mitigate the vehemency of the ideas of people who are already in general agreement with his position or who may be moderate enough to be receptive. Thus premises, in many instances, are less important than the style of the address.

Anaphora, the most common of Defoe's devices of repetition, is generally characterized by the development of patterns, not only in the repetition of the initial word or phrase but in what follows them as well. Although it is difficult to make distinctions in emotive

levels, more emotion seems to be generated when the repetitions are numerous and the parallelism strong. For example, a comparatively moderate level of emotion is created in Defoe's argument for the Union on October 19, 1706, because the repetitions are limited to three or four elements and the patterns following each repetition show some variation: "Union, Gentlemen, makes the Cloud vanish, Union strengthens the Succession, defeats the Hopes of those, who built upon the Expectation, if any were foolish, of an Invitation to Ja. VIII. Union for ever closes up this chasme, there can be no more Objection there; The Scots come in one and all, Hand and Heart, I mean, the governing Party to your Succession declare themselves a Part of your selves, under the same Sovereign, the same Succession, the same Power, and the same Subjection" (III, 499). For the sake of emphasis the passage ends with both alliteration of /S/ and assonance of /E/ ("Sovereign," "Succession," "Subjection"),[19] but the initial three elements of anaphora (although "Union" is followed closely in each case by strongly connotative, parallel verbs) do not initiate identical syntactic patterns.

In his final exhortation in the last paragraph of the same essay, Defoe picks up the anaphora of "Union" again, this time with slightly better results. Yet the emotive level is still weakened by variation. For one thing he begins the pattern with "Union but switches to "'twill." Also, although all verbs are in the future tense, some are intransitive,

---

[19] Adams in "'Harmony of Numbers': Dryden's Alliteration, Consonance, Assonance," 339, says that alliteration in adjective-noun combinations is easily the "most frequent sound emphasis" in Dryden and Pope.

others transitive. His point is that all the charges against the Scots by the Highflyers will prove false as soon as the Union is actually implemented: "Union will reconcile all the jarring Suggestions, Union will be the Perfection of Safety, 'twill be the Act of Security finished and then repeal'd; twill be an effectual inviting over the presumptive Heir, twill banish the old Animosities of Nations, and twill effectually crush all those that sow Divisions among us . . ." (III, 499).

In anaphora the repetition of the initial word or phrase in succeeding clauses removes any sense of progression of thought each new clause seems to be only a slightly different version of the preceding one. In the Review Defoe manages to achieve much the same effect as he does with anaphora by beginning the repetition at a significant point within a clause so that some portion of a clause not in the initial position can be emphasized. This is his method when he turns to how the Highflyers have been depicting England to the Scots. The emotional level is higher than in the previous passage because the repetition of the adverbial phrase ("as a Nation") is rhythmically supported by so many other parallel structures:

> The Particular, I point at among other, is by dispersing scandalous Pamphlets and Papers, representing England in all the reproachful Colours imaginable, as a Nation not fit to be treated with, as a Nation that will be bound by no Conditions, as a Nation that is Wheedling, bribing, and cajoaling the Scots into the Snare of a Treaty, only to pull down their Government, and then enslave them; as a Nation that will encroach upon their Liberties, pull down their Church, and break in upon their Rights with all manner of Violence; as a Nation so false, so wicked, so full of Blood, Debauchery, and all Manner of open Vices, that 'tis not fit for any civilized People to be concern'd with them and the like. (III, 589)

It is also notable that with each repetition of "as a Nation" the description of what the Highflyers have said becomes stronger so that the last three elements of the anaphora take their power from the three-part parallel structures whose elements all suggest the same idea. Indeed the sense of the whole passage is simply that Highflyers are telling the Scots that English politicians cannot be trusted.[20] But, as we shall see anaphora leads to other kinds of repetition. Here Defoe has managed to blow up High-flying propaganda in a way that no straightforward report of the same evil practices could have done. Clearly the object is to use sentence patterns to develop anger and indignation in the audience.

In 1705 in one of his frequent attacks on the "Act for the Relief, Employment, and Settlement of the Poor," a bill designed to turn poor houses into textile factories so that the poor could help themselves, Defoe employs a more complex form of anaphora to make an ironic thrust at the bill's chief advocate, Sir Humphrey Mackworth:

> I am Embark'd against, not a Ludicrous Excursion of his Florid Quality, not a Flash of his Pen, not a Hasty Thought, Excusable from want of Leisure in his more Weighty Affairs, but a thing study'd and labour'd, the Work of a Million of Thoughts, deep as the Leaden Mines of his Understanding, and refin'd with them at vast Expence for the Publick Good.
>
> A thing on which, as a Solid Rocky Foundation, he had built a vast Fabrick of Reptutation, and had wrote on the outside in Capitals, COME SEE MY CHARITY FOR THE POOR; a Thing which no Man could doubt, would have purchas'd him 3 Millions of Blessings, and daily Prayers for his Posterity, as the Saviour of the Poor, the Feeder of the Hungry, and the Clother of the

---

[20]This method of amplification (commoratio) will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

> Naked, and a thing formed into so Noble an Outside, that he need have prepar'd himself no Epitaph, but had been secur'd of the greatest Encomium and Englishman could desire after his Decease, when it should be wrote on his Grave, Here lies Sir H___ M___, the Charitable Contriver of that famous Act for the Employment of the Poor. (II, 37)

In the previous example the parallel units of the anaphora contain other parallel structures, all of which are repetitious in content or diction or both. In the present case, however, although multilevel parallelism and repetition occur, the effect is heightened because one section of the anaphora is balanced against the other. The idea so effectively expressed is that the issue would not require so much scrutiny were it only the half-baked scheme of some mindless projector, rather than the plan of a man who has both senses and prestige. Thus Defoe can only conclude that Sir Humphrey Mackworth has a selfish motive for supporting such a dangerous project.[21] The first proposition—that it is not a mindless act—is developed by short repetitious phrases, but the second, in which Defoe sarcastically makes his accusation, is composed of the repeated phrases followed by a series of subordinate clauses and parallel structures. The second idea, because of its development, is obviously the more important one.

Even more complex in its form is a passage that occurs in the essay for August 21, 1707, in which Defoe takes issue with Charles XII of Sweden, who is supposed to be planning an attack on the Emperor, an attack which would severely weaken the Confederate forces in Italy and abort

---

[21] Defoe argues that manufacture on the local level damages the circulation of trade, eventually hurting the very poor people that the scheme is supposed to help.

the seige of Toulon. The argument is directed principally to those in England and Scotland who support Charles because they envision his attack on the Emperor as an assault on Catholicism. In such matters of international politics as the Confederate efforts to prevent the domination of Europe by the French, Defoe would lie down with the worst of Papists, and he must convince his fellow Dissenters that this is no time for religious prejudice. Thus, at the height of his argument, he turns to a balanced anaphora of infinitive phrases:

> To wish him Success in general, or in particular even against the Emperor at this Juncture, at another Season let him go on as he pleases; but I say, to wish him Success now, tho' against the Popish Power of the Empire—In my Opinion is to curse the QUEEN, wish Destruction to England, and desire all our Expeditions to be Abortive to wish Success to him now against our Allies, is to wish the Confederacy broke, the Protestant Interest ruin'd, and the Liberties of Europe given up to Tyranny and Oppression; 'tis to wish our Councils blasted, our Armies overthrown, and our Enemies Triumphant. (IV, 310)

Defoe's object is to balance the first infinitive subject ("To wish him Success in general") against the other three. He wants to suggest that support of Charles at any other time might be desirable but that it is not wise to support him now. Therefore, the first infinitive phrase receives almost no emphasis: it crumbles away into a confused, fragmented clause. But the three following structures are neatly balanced with parallel infinitive phrases:

(1) to wish him Success now . . . is
- to curse the QUEEN, wish Destruction to England,
- and
- desire all our Expeditions to be Abortive;

(2) to wish Success to him now . . . is
- to wish the Confederacy broke, the Protestant interest ruin'd,
- and
- the Liberties of Europe given up to Tyranny and Oppression;

(3) 'tis
- to wish our Councils blasted, our Armies overthrown,
- and
- our Enemies Triumphant.

The result, especially with the forceful diction in these three structures, is that the danger in supporting Charles receives much more emphasis.

Although Defoe's anaphora occurs most frequently in bursts of a few clauses or phrases, there are instances when he lets it form the pattern for large segments of individual essays. In such cases the repetition almost takes on qualities of the refrain as the repeated phrases appear at the beginnings of sequential paragraphs so that the theme of the passage is reiterated. The effect is perhaps less emotional than the parallelism observed in the other examples of anaphora, but what the method lacks in intensity it makes up in a greater number of repetitions. In the following example (July 17, 1707) the repeated phrases introduce a series of one-sentence paragraphs that comprise about one half of an entire issue. The passage in question, however, begins with some of Defoe's more conventional anaphora, as he returns

the attack of those who have complained that he has been overly long upon the Union:

> And now, Gentlemen, let me tell you, 'tis the Prospect of this has made me so long even to Tautology, and some may think to Impertinence, repeat and repeat the Exhortation and pressing instances of Peace and Agreement among our selves, since not to unite in Heart, not to joyn in Affection, now we are joyn'd and united in Interests and Constitution, would be to have, as the Scripture says in another Case, the Form of the Union without the Power of it; it would be to let the Enemy in like a Flood, it would be to weaken by our private Hands, what the publick Interest has made strong, it would be to set up French Interest, let in French Power, revive French Hopes, and restore French Councils. In short, it would be to defeat the Design of the Union, and to give the Enemy the same Advantages, now 'tis obtain'd, which they aim'd at in their Designs to defeat it.
>
> With this Prospect I have dwelt so long on this Matter, and talk'd of Union, Union, till some People suspect I have nothing else to say—But fear not that, Gentlemen, the Enemies of this Paper always take Care they would silence this Paper, they have the most ready Way in the World to do, and give me leave to tell you, Gentlemen, you have but that one Way to do it.
>
> Leave off insulting the Government, under which you enjoy LIBERTY, a thing you know not how to value, and which with an uncommon Lenity bears with your Affronts.
>
> Leave off insulting the Revolution, an Article by which Heaven in a miraculous Manner restor'd Truth and Peace, and from which Tyranny and Oppression fled as Clouds and Darkness from the Beams of the Sun.
>
> Leave off reproaching the Memory of K. William, that Glorious Instrument the Almighty singled out from all the Princes of the Earth, to teach Crown'd Heads how Nations ought to be govern'd; by whose Example, if the French King would act, I mean in pursuing the Ends of Government, the Good of the Govern'd, he would soon give Peace to Europe, by laying down the Arms of Violence, and restoring the ravished Dominions of his Neighbours.
>
> Leave off abusing the best QUEEN, that Heaven ever bestow'd upon a Nation, that sacrific'd her Quiet, her Family, her Prospect, and now her Revenues to the Good of the Publick, the Aid of her Subjects, and the Interest of Religion.
>
> Leave off betraying your Native Country, which you would abandon to Popery, and the despicable Bondage of French-men and Tyrants.

Leave off inflaming the Nation, by filling the Heads of the People with Jealousies, Distrusts, and unnatural Animosities one against another, keeping up the Strife of Parties at home, when all ought to unite against a formidable Enemy abroad.

Leave off imposing upon the Ignorance and Weakness of the poor People of both Nations, by forging continual Stories of your Breathren and Neighbours, to delude the Minds of the whole, and keep them ever agitated to their own Destruction.

Leave off unchristian Jangles about Religion, and keeping up Differences about Trifles, where they agree in Fundamentals, in order to destroy Charity, and prevent the mutal Assistance, which ought to be given to one another against the growing Errors of Popery and Superstition.

Leave off the foolish Practice of railing at Dissenters, pretending the Want of Uniformity, and quarrelling their rejecting Ceremonies, as a thing fatal to Religion, and at the same time harbouring in the Bosom of the Church, to the Eternal Scandal of her Discipline, Crowds of Deists, Atheists, Arminians, and which is worse, Arians, Socinians, Pelagians, Soul Sleepers, and the like, who deny the most Fundamental Doctrines of the Christian Religion.

No more let Convocation Gentlemen resist the QUEEN's Authority, in order to preserve her Supremacy, and revive an old Game they have so often revil'd their Neighbours for, of playing the Authority against the Person of the Soveraign.

No more let them defend the Church of England, by turning Presbyterians in Practice, and setting up Convocation Power, like the Ecclesiastical, against the Civil Magistrate.

No more let those Gentlemen scandalize the Church of England, by setting her up as Body that can live in Charity with no Protestant Constitution but her own.

No more let our High-Flying Gentlemen preach up Division for publick Safety, Persecution for Christian Doctrine, and Railing at the Government for Loyalty.

No more let Jacobitism and Right-Line be pretended Jure Divino, and an abdicated Race be play'd against a Protestant Establishment, for the meer empty, ridiculous, and by all the World exploded, Pretence of an Oath of Allegiance, binding a People to be destroy'd by their Princes.

When you will do thus, Gentlemen, this troublesome Fellow, with his Reviews and Reflections, will promise to lay down his Writing, or leave off vexing you, and turn the Subject to what it was at first, A Review of the Affairs of France. (IV, 267-268).

The passage here differs from previous examples in that the parallelism following the anaphora involves all the principle elements in the opening clause of each paragraph, not just an initial parallel element. In ll. 24-70 each paragraph begins with "Leave off," which is followed by a gerund phrase that, in the first six of these paragraphs, is completed by parallel direct objects. Taken together the direct objects, then, conveniently form a list of Defoe's favorite shibboleths: "the Government," "the Revolution," "the Memory of K. William," "the QUEEN," "your Native Country," and "the Nation." In the set of shorter parallel paragraphs that end the passage and the essay, "No more let" is in each case followed by a direct object with an infinitive phrase attached to the direct object. Thus in both cases of anaphora, the emotional thrust of repetition is supplemented by grammatical parallelism similar to the rhetorical device called compar. Meanwhile the general effect arises from reiteration of sound and rhythm as Mr. Review's emotion gathers with each new repetition.

Examples of anaphora in the Review, especially when the subject is somehow related to the Jacobites, Highflyers, or Tories, are not difficult to find, and their characteristics are fairly demonstrated in the passage so far selected; but the effect of anaphora in the isolated cases only partly explains the significance of this device in Defoe's persuasive prose style. By itself or in combination with parallel structures anaphora can be a means to magnify the speaker's tone and the audience's response. But more than this, examination of an essay typical of Defoe's emotional style suggests that repetition of all kinds

(including anaphora) is largely responsible for the emotional effect of his pulpit essays.

For example, the Review for April 17, 1705, is one in which Defoe is clearly in the pulpit righteously exhorting his congregation of voters to vote for peace by keeping out Tories, tackers, and High Churchmen in general. It begins by introducing a letter which he describes as having "so much Argument in it, and such moving Importunities" that he must turn away from his present subject on trade and provide "a word in Season, to our Wounded Country, if possible, to heal the wide Breaches of the National Peace; and, at least, to show the People the "way to their own Happiness." The letter itself, as Defoe quotes it, hardly seems so importunate. It praises Mr. Review for his advice (principally in the Little Review) on many subjects and then asks him to comment on a list of eight "Particulars" that appear strangely not unlike some Defoe might have devised. His treatment of these topics, Defoe explains, will be very general, but, general or not, what follows is a very good example of impassioned oratory:

> The Author of these Sheets, without Vanity or Affectation, seriously Declares himself sincerely Desirous of the General Peace, abstracted from the Prejudice of Parties; he abhors, from his Soul, all the Remains of that Spirit of Strife, be it on which side it will, that hinder a General Union of Charity and Love among Christians, Protestants, and Englishmen of all sorts; he is a most humble Petitioner to all his Countrymen of what Opinions, Parties, Religion, or Perswasion soever they are, That they would but view with Pity their Bleeding Country, see the deep Wounds, Envy, Strife, Interests, Ambition, and Armies of private Invaders, have made in the Publick Peace.
>
> If they have any regard to the Honour of God, the Good of Religion, their Safety from Foreign Invasion, the

Security of a Protestant Succession, the Glory of a Protestant Queen, the Success of a Just War, the needful Preservation of Trade, the flourishing of useful Manufactures; if any sence of Danger's in View, of Destruction easie to be wrought by our selves, hard and morally impossible to be brought to pass without our own Concurrence; if any Pity to their Families, any Memory of their Ancestors, any regard to their Posterity, and the Liberties of their Innocent Children, to whom they ought to Convey Untouch'd and Unembarrass'd, the same Foundations their Fathers Purchas'd for them with their Blood; if they have any Forecast of Evil, any Desire of Good, any Love, any Charity, any Sence of Duty to God, to themselves, and to Their Neighbors, That they would STUDY PEACE.

Any Man that has the least Sence of these things upon his Heart, that has but Eyes to see on one side Destruction at the Door, ready to Enter, and private Disgusts, Prejudice, and Party Spleen opening the Door with both Hands to let it in; Glory, Victory, Prosperity, and lasting Enjoyments, pressing on the other side to come in, and our Follies, Feuds, and Unnatural Prejudices within, bolting the Door to keep them out; it must needs wound him to the Soul, that has any Concern upon him for his Native Country.

For God's sake let us not open our own Wounds, let us not be our own Destroyers; the Queen would save us, God Almighty would save us, if we would but Concur to be sav'd; but I am of the Opinion, the standing Rules of providence, in spight of all those things we call predestinated Decrees, are such that no Nation, no People, no particular Person's Prosperity shall come against their will; it may come unforeseen, unexpected, and very much undesir'd, but no Man is sav'd against his Will; as to secret Invincible Powers subduing the Will, I shall not enter upon that here, but that Nation that sets themselves to resist, and shut out Peace, and Damn their own Prosperity by positive absolute force, shall go without it, shall be miserable, and Enjoy the Destruction they Choose, till they are fill'd from Heaven with their own Ways, and receive the Punishment of their Folly from their own Hands.

That we may not be this Perverse People, were the Power of Perswasion given me from high, were I blest with the Gift of Unresistible Eloquence, could I speak with Words that should be felt as well as heard, that should touch the very Soul, and make the Blood of the Readers turn within them; those Powers should be all Employ'd to Perswade, to Entreat, and, if possible, to Prevail

upon the English Nation at this time, above all times, TO STUDY PEACE.

I cannot think an English Man can read this, without a secret Assent to the reasonableness of the Proposal; he cannot be a true Lover of his Country, and not be sensible of the want of be [sic] this Heavenly Temper among us; he cannot [be] a Protestant, hardly a Christian, and not be touch'd with the Miseries we feel, and those we fear from the Unhappy Divisions, which every Society every Neighbourhood, every Town, and almost every Family are Embarrass'd: With that Envying, Railing, Supplanting, Undermining, Reproaching among fellow Citizens, fellow Officers, Neighbours and Countrymen; he that is not affected with it, as a sad presage of a National Destruction, seems to have less Concern for his Native Country, than can be look'd for in any thing that merits but the Name of an English Man.

Speaking for my self, and in it I believe I speak for every Protestant in the Nation, without Hypocrisie, I profess if I had Peace in my Blood, I'd let it out for the Advantage of this Cause, if my Flesh would Poison that Brood of Devils, who are Obstructers of the Peace of this Nation; I wish, from my Soul, every one of them was to Eat of it, and that is might be Ashes in their Mouths, and Rottenness in their Bowels; for surely Accurs'd from God shall they be, as well as hated by their Native Country, who bury its Prosperity in these Unnatural and Barbarous Divisions.

From this Principle I Act, to this End I Write, and I would freely Assent to a Law, That he should Die without Mercy for the first Fact, that writes from any other Design, or Aims at any other End.

For this I am Content to be Banter'd, Lampoon'd, and Expos'd, to have my Name cry'd about Street to every Ballad, and every Villainous Perjur'd Scribler ruffle me with his Buffonery and Impertinence.

For this I freely Expose my self to Fines, Gaols, Pillories, and Exorbitant and Unjust Sentences. If the worst Enemy to me, or my Writing, will Calmly prove, I ever Wrote any thing that did not tend to this Peace, I'll Explode it, and own my self in an Error; if any thing I am yet upon, has any other End, I'll freely Decline it, and if my Silence would farther it, I'd never Write more; The End of Debate should be a right Understanding, and no War can be Just, but what is made for Peace. This is my ultimate end, ought to be every Christians Wish, and if an Angel from Heaven Preach'd any other Doctrine to us, he shall be Accurs'd.

What has the Queen so often said to us? To what purpose does Her Majesty speak? And how sordidly Blind must they be, that cannot see the reason of it? Her Majesty's Safety, the Nations Prosperity, the Glory of England, the Establishment of Religion, all depend upon Peace; Peace among our selves, Peace of Families, of Societies, and Parties, Where there is Strife and Contention, there is every Evil Work; Millions of Devils. like the Animalculae in the Liquids of Nature, hover over us, and lie brooding Innumerable Mischiefs in the Corruption and Corroded Matter of our National Spleen; which, unless some care be taken to smother in their Birth, in vain the Queen Perswades, in vain the Ministry Contrive, in vain Authors Write, and Honest Men Pray, even God himself, but by Miracle, cannot save us.

STUDY PEACE is the short Advice, if any Man can give better, take it; the Methods of Peace are Plain and Easie, every Body may see them; he that WILL Study Peace, SHALL Learn it, and the main Direction is, but to perswade all Men to be enclin'd to it, first to covet it, and then pursue it.

This will be the Sum and Substance of this Paper when it comes to speak of the Heads above mention'd: If I Offend, I cannot answer for it; let the Crimes of Men, with which this Healing Doctrine cannot suit, bear the Blame.

I am very well satisfy'd, I shall offend neither God, the Queen, nor any Honest Man; and if these are in Confederacy for Peace, who shall I fear, or who shall withstand it?

What can Hell, Envy, and Men of Blood say, to Contradict this Doctrine? Shall they say, Peace is the way to ruine the Church? How scandalous is this to the Church? And the Church of England ought severely to Censure those that thus Reproach her.

May that Church, whatsoever it be, fall like Dagon before the Ark of God, whose Foundation is not Peace, whose Prosperity is not consistent with Peace, whose Danger is from Peace.

They Insult the Church in a most Scandalous and Criminal manner, who say, That Peace and Union can be prejudicial to her, and they give too much Reputation to the Dissenters, who with want of Manners, as well as want of Duty, call the Queen, Presbyterian, a Whig, and I know not what, because Her Majesty espouses this Blessed Principle of Peace.

I am bold to affirm, without it Her Majesty could not be Faithful to her Great Trust. God from on high, and Conscience his Representative in Her Royal Breast, would

give Her Majesty no Quiet, if her Eyes, by his Distinguishing Goodness, being open'd to her Peoples Blessing, she did not to her utmost Power pursue, and with her utmost Eloquence perswade all her People to Peace.

If you would know, Gentlemen Free-holders, who to Choose in your approaching Elections, in Order to Secure the Church, to Save the State, and Protect the Protestant Religion, see their Description here, Let them be Men of Peace; the contrary is from Hell, Persecution is contrary to the Principles of the Christian Religion, Strife is born of Pride, and Pride of the Devil.

The Church can be in no Danger from Men of Peace, nor can the Church have any Safety, but in Men of Peace: From Men of Peace, Dissenters can have nothing to fear, tho' they are Churchmen; 'tis our Desire the Government should be in the Hands of Churchmen, 'tis our free Choice, that we should have a Church Parliament, only let them be Men of Peace, other Qualifications may be requisite, but this is absolutely necessary.

To tell the Country People, that such Men as these are Dangerous to the Church, that Her Majesty in perswading to Peace, is pulling down the Church, is to tell 'em, God Almighty is declaring War against Jesus Christ; that there is a Civil Commotion in Heaven, and that Eternal Truth is acting in Contradiction to it self.

The Danger of the Church, is from Men of Heat and Passion, who having Turn'd the World upside down, are come hither also; from such as these all our Ruine has proceeded, Occasional Bills, Imprisoning Electors, denying the Benefit of the Law to English Men, Addressing the Queen to Extend her Prerogative, and to deny Justice; all these things were done by Men of Heat, Men of Passion, and of Principles contrary to this Blessed Principle of Peace.

What were the Men that Opposed this thing? What the Remainder of the House of Commons? What the House of Lords? What the Bishops? What the Queen? Will any Man have the Face to say, The Bishops of the Church, are not of the Church; or that the Queen is not of the Church?

Was there but 134 Churchmen in the House of Commons? Or must none be of the Church, but such as would run her upon the Rocks, and force her to Blood and Persecution?

What Church is that which cannot be upheld, but by Ruining, Plundering, and Starving our Neighbours? The Church of England abhors it; and therefore the Queen, the Bishops, the Nobility, and all the Wise Men in the Nation have declar'd the only way to Preserve and Maintain the Church, is to Preserve and Maintain Peace and Union among our selves.

Let all True English Men but consider, how shall Popery be kept out? How shall the French be Beaten? How our Trade be carried on? How our Taxes paid? If instead of every Man's setting his Shoulder to the Burthen, we fall out, with Oppress, Undermine, Exclude, and Tack upon one another.

They certainly therefore, Delude and Impose upon the People, who offer to suggest to them, that the Church is in Danger; Choose Men of Peace, Men of Moderation, Men of Sence, Men of Morals, Men of Estates, and Men of the Church; and then, Gentlemen, tell us if you can, what Danger the Church can be in.

The Queen from good grounds has told us, in her last Speech to the Parliament, that the Nation made a narrow Escape from the Dangerous Experiment these hot Men made, from their unreasonable Humours and Animosities.

'Tis hard, Men should make Experiments upon their Native Country, and Play with the general Safety; [the] Queen and all Good Men look upon it at [as] a narrow escape, but we are not quite escap'd, if we do not with the utmost Caution prevent the like hazards, and this will effectually be done, by following Peaceable Principles, and Choosing Men that are known to be Peaceably enclin'd.

Peace can never be of Evil Consequence at Home, and is the only way to procure Peace Abroad.

Perhaps this Paper may in time, farther Explain this Matter, and tell you farther, what is meant by Peace, and what Methods to obtain it, and what Her Majesty may be supposed to mean by Exhorting us all to Peace and Union; and what by the Dangerous Experiment Mention'd in Her Most Gracious Speech to the Parliament.

In the mean time every Body knows what belongs to Peace; Peace of Parties, of Opinions, of Interests, and of Society Uniting to bear the Publick Burthens, and to Oppose the Publick Enemies.

On the foundation of this Principle, the Safety of the Church stands; 'tis the Men of Heat and Passion, that put the Church in Danger, that Expose her to the Tongues as well as Teeth of her Enemies, and that have always brought her to the greatest Extremities.

Wherefore, if any Men desire to Support and Maintain the Church, let 'em Mark those that have Endeavour'd to sow Divisions among us, study Peace, Choose Men of Peace, and having done so, let them give Instructions to them to act from Principles of the same Peace; so God shall Delight to Dwell among us, and Bless us; the Queen will be honour'd with being the Happy Instrument of settling our Felicity; Fewds, Parties, private Interest shall die, and be forgotten, and we shall once again be a Happy People. (II, 73-76)

This sermon (beginning with the fourth paragraph) has as its thesis that since the safety of the Church and the nation depends upon men who advocate political and religious peace and moderation, all who love England and the Church of England, no matter what their party or opinion, should vote for moderate men for parliament. As an argument the sermon has several fairly distinct sections, despite Defoe's frequent return to such notions as "Study Peace" and "Choose Men of Peace." First he sets down the proposition that peace is his only concern and should be the only concern of all loyal Englishmen, because without it certain dangers and diasters are imminent (11. 1-57). Secondly, by offering oaths of his sincerity and noting his past suffering for the cause of peace, he establishes not only that he has no personal or political motive for advocating peace but also that he is willing to undergo further hardships for its sake (11.58-113). Next, after a brief return to the danger of strife (11. 113-133), followed by another exhortation to peace, he is able, since his cause is righteous, to disperse with possible threats to his life from those who dislike his position on peace (11. 134-147). In the rest of the sermon he focuses on his argument that the safety of the Church of England and ultimately the nation depends upon peace among the parties at home (11. 148-261). This longest section is further developed in three parts: (1) he pits the Queen against those who oppose peace and argues that the Freeholders, like Queen Anne, should see that the safety of the Church and the Dissenters is in the hands of "Men of Peace" (11. 148-187); (2) he argues that the real danger to the Church lies with the group of men who devised the tack of the Occasional Conformity Bill (11. 188-204); (3) while emphasizing the wisdom of

seeking party peace and the value of peace to the Church and the nation, he makes a final exhortation to all Freeholders to vote for moderate Parliamentary candidates. Thus the argument is simple in form: there is an introduction to the argument; a claim of earnestness on the part of the speaker (along with an appeal to love of Church and State); and an argument that a vote for those who want to destroy the Dissenters is a vote to destroy the Church and the nation. It is not surprising that the moderates who support the ministry under Godolphin are the very people implied to be able to lead a partyless and unified England to prosperity at home and abroad.

Although simply and logically presented, the force of the sermon lies elsewhere—specifically in the device of repetition. One notices, for example how the anaphora in the passage serves to emphasize or amplify the notion of peace. In the second paragraph (11. 14-30) the if clauses build to the excited repetition of "any" at the end of the paragraph and the climactic clause "That they would STUDY PEACE." Similarly, the many repetitions of "let us not" (1. 41), of "he cannot be" (11. 68-69, 71), of "every" (11. 73-74), and of "in vain" (11. 125-126) all serve to emphasize the idea of peace. But anaphora is not the only device of repetition present; it is supported by a number of other forms of reiteration, each of which is also designed to create the oral tone of the sermon, heighten the emotional response of the audience, and amplify Defoe's theme in the sermon.

One notices frequent alliteration, especially on /p/ as in peace.[22] It occurs, for instance in "Prejudice of Parties" in l. 4; "Publick Peace" in l. 13; "Prejudice" and "Party" in l. 34; "providence" and "predestinated" in ll. 45-46; "People . . . particular Person's Prosperity" in ll. 46-47; "Peace . . . Prosperity . . . positive" in ll. 52-53; "Perverse People . . . Power of Perswasion" in ll. 58-59; "Powers . . . Employ'd to Persuade" in lines 63-64; "Peace . . . Peace . . . Parties" in ll. 118-119), "Peace . . . Plain" in l. 129; "Power pursue . . . perswade . . . People to Peace" in ll. 164-166; "Protect the Protestant" in l. 169; "Peace," "Persecution," "Principles" and "Pride" in ll. 171-173; "perswading to Peace" in ll. 183-184; "Passion . . . Principles . . . Principle of Peace" in ll. 195-196; "procure Peace" in l. 236; "bear the Publick Burthens, and Oppose the Publick" in ll. 245-246; "Parties, private . . . Happy People" in ll. 259-261.[23]

---

[22] In modern usage alliteration means repeating the initial sound in stressed syllables, but in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, at least, alliteratio was simply the repetition of the same letter at the beginning of words. Peacham, for example, says that it is beginning "diverse words with one and the same letter making the sentence more ready for the tongue and more pleasant to the ear" (Sonnino, pp. 25-26). Therefore, it seems quite probable that Defoe, as the passage quoted here suggests, understood "particular Person's" or "persue . . . persuade" to be alliteration.

[23] Repetition of other sounds is emphatically present as well. Note, for example, "who to Choose in your approaching Elections, in Order to Secure the Church, to Save the State, and Protect the Protestant Religion" (ll. 167-170); "brooding Innumerable Mischiefs in the Corruption and Corroded Matter of our National Spleen" (ll. 122-123); or the contrast emphasized by alliteration in "to see on one side Destruction at the Door, ready to Enter, and private Disgusts, Prejudice, and Party Spleen opening the Door with both Hands to let it in; Glory, Victory, Prosperity, and lasting Enjoyments, pressing on the other side to come in, and our Follies, Feuds, and Unnatural Prejudices within, holding the Door to keep them out." (ll. 32-38)

Other devices of repetition are just as conspicuous. Conversio, the repetition of the ends of phrases and clauses, occurs several times to serve much the same purpose as that of anaphora . In 11. 42-43 immediately after the anaphora, we find "the Queen would save us, God Almighty would save us." In the same paragraph, along with heavy alliteration, Defoe uses the device again: "no particular Person's Prosperity shall come against their will; it may come unforeseen, unexpected, and very much undesir'd, but no Man is sav'd against his Will . . ." (11. 47-49). Later he uses conversio in a paragraph with a markedly different effect: "STUDY PEACE is the short Advice, if any Man can give better, take it; the Methods of Peace are Plain and Easie, every Body may see them; he that WILL Study Peace, SHALL Learn it, and the main Direction is but to persuade all Men to be enclin'd to it, first to covet it, and then pursue it" (11. 128-133). The sentences suddenly become shorter, more balanced and the diction is less emotional. As a result, the whole tone of the sermon changes from fiery oratory to a calm, gentle, sincere expression of Defoe's concern for his congregation. Throughout the first part of the sermon he has contrived to raise spectors in the minds of his "listeners." Now he tries to win them, cajole them, make them understand. In form, the clauses are aphoristic, and conversio helps to underline the wisdom of Defoe's advice (experentia), as well as to emphasize the theme of peace. From the simplicity of this paragraph, Defoe begins to build a new emotional peak with rhetorical questions, the indirect answer to which is a curse that depends on conversio and compar for part of its effect: "May that Church . . . fall like Dagon

before the Ark of God, whose Foundation is not Peace, whose Prosperity is not consistent with Peace, whose Danger is from Peace" (11. 148-151).[24] In this paragraph Defoe wants his congregation to think of the wicked idol, the false god, Satan's angel crashing down before the wrath of God. He wants them to remember the Church built upon shifting sands. And he wants them to remember the High-Church cry that the Church is in danger. In contrast to these allusions is "Peace," the ark of God, the solid rock, the united Church. Defoe's repetition of "Peace" and frequent use of words with prominent /p/ and /i:/ sounds are important in making the contrast. Finally, in the last paragraph, when the exhortation must be most effective and, at the same time, draw to a calm, hopeful close, Defoe summarizes his principle idea once again: "study Peace, Choose Men of Peace, and having done so, let them give instructions to them to act from Principles of the same Peace . . ." (11. 254-256).

The intensity of parts of the sermon results most of all from the very frequence of repetition. We have already noted conversio appearing in conjunction with anaphora and alliteration, but Defoe perhaps reaches his peak for the sermon in 11. 174-181, in which he combines reduplicatio (repeating the last word of one unit at the beginning of the next), conversio, copulatio (repeating one or more words in order to suggest

---

[24]Actually this is also an instance of complexio, the repetition of the first and last words in a series of phrases or clauses ("whose . . . Peace"), but since this is the only clear example of the device, I choose not to treat it separately.

great emotion), and perserverantia (repeating the same idea over and over again in the same form). "The church can be in no Danger from Men of Peace, nor can the Church have any Safety, but in Men of Peace: From Men of Peace, Dissenters can have nothing to fear, tho' they are Churchmen; 'tis our Desire the Government should be in the Hands of Churchmen, 'tis our free Choice, that we should have a Church Parliament, only let them be Men of Peace, other Qualifications may be requisite, but this is absolutely necessary."[25] Since the point of the sermon is to persuade Freeholders to choose moderate men for Parliament, Defoe appropriately drives home his theme by employing "Men of Peace" four times. In the first two clauses the assertion that there will be no danger to the Church (again an allusion to Sacheverell) is balanced with the plea for the safety of the Dissenters through the repetition of "Men of Peace." In the remainder of the paragraph, in order to develop the idea that Dissenters do not want to split the Church or destroy it, Defoe repeats "Churchmen" and ending with the idea of a "Church Parliament" composed of "Men of Peace."

There is, finally, a more subtle kind of repetition, known as compar, sprinkled through the sermon that involves the repetition of words within balanced phrases and clauses so that there occurs a distinct balance of rhythm and sound. The emphasis is more sophisticated than in

---

[25]For other examples of reduplicatio see ll. 173, 176, and 243-244. For copulatio see ll. 42-43; 149-151, 218-220, 253 and 254. Perserverantia is found throughout with the repetition of "STUDY PEACE," "Choose Men of Peace," and similar phrases which repeat the idea of peace among parties.

the other devices; compar does not bludgeon the audience into submission, but it is, perhaps, just as effective as alliteration or conversio because its cool, aphoristic sound stands out from the excited shouting implied in certain of the other devices. Compar—the balance of sound and rhythm in successive clauses or phrases—is most apparent in such passages as "till they are fill'd from Heaven with their own Ways, and receive the Punishment of their Folly from their own Hands" (11. 55-57). "From this Principle I Act, to this End I Write . . ." (1. 93); "that writes from any other Design, or Aims at any other End" (1. 75); and ". . . the only way to Preserve and Maintain the Church, is to Preserve and Maintain Peace and Union among our selves" (11. 209-211).

Two other devices used by Defoe are congeries and commoratio, both of which are related in function to anaphora. Congeries, as defined by Quintilian, is "an accumulation of words and sentences with the same meaning. Although the climax is not in this case reached by a series of steps it is nonetheless attained by the piling up of words. It resembles the figure synathrismos, in which a number of different terms are accumulated, but in congeries proper all the accumulated words have but one meaning." Puttenham notes that it is a scheme to suggest earnesty: "we lay on such load and so go to it by heaps as if we would win the game by multitude of words and speeches, not all of one but of diverse matters and sense."[26] Commoratio is also a device of amplification. According to Peacham it is a scheme to emphasize a weighty point in the

---

[26]Quoted in Sonnino, pp. 56-57.

discourse: "The orator maketh often recourse thither and repeateth it many times by variation, . . . either by expressing one thing with many words or by declaring one thing with diverse members, causes, effects and reasons." Indeed, one of the examples cited by Peacham suggests Defoe's very method: "And shall so great a virtue be expelled, and thrust out, banished and cast away from the City?"[27]

In the Review when Defoe uses congeries or commoratio, he certainly does so to emphasize his point, but the reader, before very long, recognizes that Defoe also intends to amplify his argument, to give it the illusion of fullness and weight because he knows that clear, concise arguments invite analysis, a circumstance not always desirable to a political writer who often finds it necessary to shift his convictions with the political winds. Moreover, complicated arguments are not conducive to the coffee house, the street corner or the pulpit. At any rate, Defoe prefers conviction over intellectual agreement.

Thus in his series of rhetorical questions, Defoe almost always repeats the same question in many forms, often with staccato effect. In his sermon to the freemen, for example, he speaks of "Christians, Protestants, and Englishmen of all sorts" (11. 6-8); of "Countrymen of what Opinions, Parties, Religion or Perswasion soever they are" (11. 9-10); of "Envying, Railing, Supplanting, Undermining, Reproaching among fellow Citizens, fellow Officers, Neighbours and Countrymen" (11. 75-77); of being Banter'd, Lampoon'd, and Expos'd" (1 97-98); and of "God Almighty . . . declaring War against Jesus Christ; . . . a

---

[27]Quoted in Sonnino, p. 40.

Civil Commotion in Heaven, and . . . Eternal Truth . . . acting in Contradiction to it self" (11. 185-187).

Other passages reveal variations in his method. In 1709 an important political problem was the settling of protestant refugees from war-ravaged areas of Germany. Naturally their presence caused great indignation among many "true-born Englishmen" and it was Defoe's task to try to mitigate their opposition. The particular concern in the issue for September 8, 1709, is Defoe's proposal that each parish donate 5£ to each refugee within its bounds to help these people start a new life. His argument is simply that the 5£ would not be charity, but it would insure that the new citizens would not become charity cases. The argument itself, however, is more abundant than the summary: "and when Money is given them to the Parishes, it is not that they should be starv'd with Cold or Hunger, and live of Charity; it is not that they should become Alms-People in the Parish, and live of the meer Help they get as a Pension; but it is that they may be put into a Method of living free and independent by their own Labour and Industry, and that the said Parishes may so plant them on the Terra firma that they may no more be found asking Charity in the Streets" (VI, 272).

Beginning with the repetition of anaphora ("it is"), Defoe is not satisfied simply to say that the people will starve: His immigrants starve in two ways—"with Cold or Hunger." Hunger itself, of course, at least partially implies starving, so that to starve "with . . . Hunger" is slightly redundant. Also anyone actually examining what Defoe says must wonder how people can starve "with Cold." Could it be that Defoe

is not so much concerned with what he says as with how it sounds or with what connotations he can dredge up in the minds of the audience? In the same fashion the idea of their becoming "Alms-People in the Parish" is repeated by "live of the meer Help they get as a Pension." After the turn of the sentence, he continues on with the two doublets, "free and independent" and "Labour and Industry," which appear in the first of two subordinate clauses that say virtually the same thing: "that they may be put into a Method of Living free and independent by their own Labour and Industry, and that the said Parishes may so plant them on the Terra firma that they may no more be found asking Charity in the Streets."

Congeries and commoratio also make the speaker appear to be so caught up in sincere emotion and zeal that his words gush forth extemporaneously. The discourse loses all appearance of contrivance as the speaker, overcome by his own feelings, is reduced to listing and repeating one idea again and again. Under the spell of the speaker's sincerity, the audience, if the speaker has performed well, becomes infected with the speaker's exuberance and, as a result, becomes more vulnerable to his presentation. An example of Defoe's use of this strategy occurs in one of his attacks on the Jacobites and Highflyers for their treasonous, unnatural behavior to their own countrymen:

> And here I cannot but with some Indignation observe, that there are in Britain,—Ay and in every Part of the North or South, a Party of Men so unnatural, so prepossess'd with an Infernal Spirit, so willing to concur with the Enemies of their own Country, as to rejoyce when their own Israel flyes from the Face of her uncircumciz'd Enemies; when their own Country are defeated and slain; when their Armies are overthrown, and they see the Lists of their very Neighbours,

> Acquaintances, nay, their very Relations, who are kill'd, wounded or taken Prisoners in the bloody strife; they not only smile at the horrid Scene, and discover a Pleasure and Satisfaction at the thing; but as if the worse, the better, are ever exaggerating, doubling, and encreasing the view of our Losses, making every thing greater than it really is; raising black Schemes and Consequences, and foretelling worse things to follow, and pleasing themselves to encrease the Terror and Consternation they find People in upon the Occasion, and as far as possible, raising Clouds and Mists of Darkness and Discouragements on the Minds of People, as if all was lost, as if all our Labour had been in vain; as if one Battle in Spain had restor'd all the French Affairs, and the whole Work of the War was to be done over again. (IV, 277)

In particular, in this attack on the Jacobites and Highflyers, Defoe manages to intensify his outrage by repeating the ideas in degrees of specificity, as if, not having actually planned his speech, the first term leads him to another and then another. When he refers to the Jacobites as "unnatural" and, more specifically, "prepossess'd with an infernal Spirit," his literal point is really what he explains in the third element—that they are traitors who are happy over British defeats.[28] At the same time, the first two elements suggest, in different degrees, what monsters such people are. Thus the repetition of meaning on various levels, in combination with anaphora, strongly suggests that Defoe is excitedly searching for the exact term or phrase that he needs. Similarly, for "Israel" to fly "from the Face of her uncircumcis'd Enemies" implies not only defeat and death but also the

---

[28]Defoe may intend an allusion to Books I and II of Paradise Lost where Satan, an "Infernal Spirit" indeed, believes that "To reign is worth ambition though in Hell" (I, l. 262) and Belial is described as being able to "make the worse appear/ The better reason" (II, l. 114-115). References are to Merritt Y. Hughes, ed., John Milton: Complete Poems and Major Prose (New York: The Odyssey Press, 1957).

overthrow of the British army. As in the beginning of the passage, the first element ("from the Face of her uncircumcis'd Enemies") is the most figurative, the second and third ("when their own Country are defeated and slain; when their Armies are overthrown, and they see the Lists of their very Neighbours . . . in the bloody strife") increasingly more literal.

From the second main clause (l. 11) to the end of the passage, Defoe employs a method similar to the one that he used in his argument for aid to the protestant refugees, but the emotion is decidedly stronger because he repeats his idea more often, seemingly in desperation, as he looks for words strong enough to express the wickedness of the Jacobite designs. "Exaggerating, doubling, and encreasing"—the three parallel participles that begin a series of phrases (l. 14)—all, as Defoe uses them, have virtually the same meaning. The next parallel participle phrase ("making every thing greater than it really is") simply repeats the three initial parallel terms. Then very subtly, without breaking the parallel structure, Defoe shifts to the effects of the Highflyers' exaggerations. "Raising black Schemes" and "foretelling worse things" serve as the intermediate step as Defoe moves from the Highflyers' concern with present losses to their Design on the future. Then he finally reaches the last step in two parallel and repetitious clauses that give rise to his last flourish of repetition: "pleasing themselves to encrease the Terror and Consternation they find People in upon the Occasion, and as far as possible, raising Clouds and Mists of Darkness and Discouragements on the Minds of People, as if all was lost, as if

all our Labour had been in vain; as if our Battle in Spain had restor'd all the French affairs, and the whole Work of the War was to be done over again."

The anaphora at the end of the passage has a curious emotional characteristic. As at the beginning of the quotation, there are three elements for increasing specificity: "as if all was lost" and "as if all our Labour had been in vain" have virtually the same meaning and are almost on the same level of generalization. They are so close, in fact, that they are separated only by a comma. But the last element which refers specifically to defeats in Spain, is set off by a semicolon. It seems that before the last element Defoe wants a distinct pause in order to emphasize it. After all, since the point of his attack on the Jacobites in this passage is the "fact" that they are trying to turn Spain into a tool for propaganda, he reaches the climactic point at the very end and sets it up as the last and emphatic element of a three-part parallel structure.

The attack on Jacobite propaganda also demonstrates another of Defoe's techniques arising out of his use of parallel structures. One notices that the quoted section, although well over 200 words, is really only two complex sentences connected by and. The first part serves to identify the party of men: they are the party, in both Scotland and England who rejoice when news comes of an English defeat. The sentence ends with the last of three parallel adverbial clauses—"when their Armies are overthrown." Separated from the first only by a comma, the second part, which deals with their methods and motives of propaganda,

begins "and [when] they see the Lists" and continues to the end of the passage. The effect of such long sentences, the clauses of which are almost smothered in parallel structures on various grammatical levels, is that the idea of the sentence is effectively delayed so that suspense builds up to the climax at the end of the sentence. Like the Jacobites who believe that "the worse, the better," Defoe sometimes seems to think that the longer the sense can be delayed the more intense the emotional effect.

Defoe's most frequent method of delaying the completion of the clause and thereby building up the audience's expectations is to use a long series of introductory phrases or clauses, each beginning with the same word or phrase, so that he gets the amplification of anaphora and, at the same time, suspends his thought with each parallel element.[29] If one imagines such passages being spoken, one can hear the voice of the orator rising anew with each parallel phrase or clause but tantalizingly delaying the falling cadence of completion. Examples of this sort of device can be found in almost any random sampling of the Review, but some sections are decidedly more emotional than others. The difference seems to lie in the length of the delay, or the number and lengths of the parallel elements.

Frequently the sense of delay is carried more by coordination, subordination, and parallelism within larger parallel units, rather than by the larger, repetitious units themselves. In a rhetorical argument

---

[29]The device, as Defoe uses it, is similar to hypozeugna. See Sonnino, p. 22.

aimed at weakening High-Tory attacks upon the new moderate government under Godolphin, Defoe delays completion with four adverbial clauses, all beginning with if, but three of these are developed quite elaborately in their own right so that the anaphora, since the repetitions of the initial word do not closely follow one another, is of less importance in maintaining emphasis than is usually the case. Actually one must give each element of the larger parallel structures significant attention. As a result, the conclusion of the sentence is pushed more to the back of the reader's mind to build up potential energy in what might be termed suspended animation. The effect comes through clearly in an attack on the High-Church party on April 20, 1706:

> If these Gentlemen [High Churchmen] can tell us, that the Treasure is not as punctually managed, and faithfully apply'd now as Then [when the High-Church party under Nottingham held the ministry]; or that my Lord G...phin is degenerated from his wonted Probity, or debauch'd by the Party to sell the Church and the Nation, and slacken his intense Management of Affairs; if they can tell us, the Duke of N...stle is not so faithful a Director of the Privy-Seal, or so Pious and Religious as the D... of B.....m, and therefore not so likely to be anxiously concern'd for the Church; If the secret Dispatches of the State, public Intelligence and Direction of Ambassadors be not equally manag'd as by the E... of N.....m; Nor the Interest of the Protestant Religion and Church of England as faithfully pursued in supporting the Catalans, as in refusing to aid the Camisars: If Sir Cloudesley Shovel is not as forward to fight in Defence of the Church of England as Sir G...e R...ke; and Sir John Leake as fit to lead a Squadron as Admiral G...don; If any of these things can be alledg'd, perhaps the Church may be in some Danger from the Queens shifting Hands in the Management. (III, 190)

Defoe's use of the delaying device, as exemplified by these several examples, cannot be fully appreciated, however, without

examining it in its extended form. In the Review for May 27, 1708, he is again feverishly trying to persuade the freemen to vote for moderates or Whigs instead of Tories. Since this is, Defoe apparently believes, no time for polite, equivocal persuasion, he plunges into three, long, emotional sentences, the conclusions of which are effectively delayed by a series of multilevel, parallel, subordinate clauses, all beginning with "If you will/would." The method is successful; as emotion subsides when one climax is reached, it immediately begins to rise again with a new set of parallel structures in the next sentence.

The first section concerns the cause and results of the Revolution. The content, as well as the style, is highly emotional:

> If you would have the Revolution damn'd for a cursed Rebellion; the Name of King William and Queen Mary, which are valuable and dear to all honest Men, perish from the Earth, and their Memory be loaded with Infamy and Reproach.
>
> If you will allow the Setting King William and Queen Mary upon the Throne of BRITAIN was a Compleat National Perjury in them, an Unnatural Usurpation, the worst Sort of Parricide, and in this Nation a hardned Defiance of the Laws of God, Nature and Government, a Sin that shall not be forgotten here, or forgiven hereafter.
>
> If you will have a Sanction put upon all the Tyranny and illegal Practices of the two Anti-Revolution Reigns; if you will justifie the Popish Practices to pull down the Church, and the Court Practices to pull down the Laws, and make all the Oppressions of that Time lawful.
>
> If you will take upon you all the Guilt of the Blood spilt by King James in both these Kingdoms, and of all the Rapine and Violence committed upon the Estates of these free People; if you will be content to have 178 murther'd Innocents, whose Quarter'd limbs lie now in one Grave in a Church-Yard in Edinburgh, executed by the Hand of the Hangman, for Things Nations ought to blush at the Thoughts of; some for Treasons they never knew of, some for Trifles incredible, some for refusing to declare their Opinion of other Men's Crimes, and some for scarcely a Pretence of Crime, with about 6000 others banish'd and murther'd in Scotland at sundry Times on the same Account.

> If you will take upon you the Guilt of all the Blood-shed in this terrible War, still carrying on, which, we say, is for Liberty, and which this Tory Party would end, before that Liberty is obtain'd—O choose Tories, Gentlemen, choose High-Flyers, these are the Men, who in their Practice manifestly lead you to the Necessity of all this, and in choosing whom, it is plain, you must come to every one of these Things, as Principles which all your Actings must rest upon— (V, 102)

After a short sentence of transition the second and third series of parallel structures follow in succession. The first of these specifically concerns the danger to Dissenters and Whigs as political parties; the last is an expansion and summary of the first two series:

> IF you would renew our Occasional-Bill, repeal the Tolleration, and restore Persecution in these Nations; if you would hang out the bloody Flag against Dissenters, and have the Power put again into the Hand of a Party to ruin, plunder and impoverish their Neighbours, because they won't go to Heaven their Way, tho' they cannot deny they are as much in the true Road thither as themselves.
>
> IF you would renew the War of Parties, not yet sufficiently ceased, revive the Flame of Contention not yet half extinguish'd; if you would return to Coventry Tumults, and are willing to see the honest Citizens and Inhabitants of your Towns fighting and knocking one another on the Head in the Streets. O Gentlemen, do but choose a High Flying Parliament, do but choose a Tory Parliament, it will be done presently.
>
> IF you would give a Sanction to the Church-Memorial, prove the Bishops ploting to set up Presbytery, in order to advance themselves from the Lordship and Dignity to Calvinistical Parity, and in order to enrich themselves by giving up their large Revenues, take Possession of Parochial Stipends, to the Tune of 100 l. per Annum, and downward.
>
> IF you would unsettle the Succession, and recognize the Right of King James III. Jure Divino, only allowing the Queen to possess the Crown during life, and take care that be not over long too, making her Majesty accept of the Possession by Concession of a Pretender, and acknowledge the Settlement a Parliamentary Usurpation, and an Invasion of Right.
>
> IF you would break the Union as a Court Combination forced upon the Nations against their Consent, fatal to

> the Church, and particular to what we call High-Church, or that which would be the Church Rampant, and as an eternal Bar to the Restoration of Jacobitism and tyranny.
>
> IF you would make a Peace with France, Higle de Piglede, as they call it, on French Terms, with or without Safety, or Honour, or Conditions, with or without Allies, as if ye were in a Condition to be forced to it.
>
> IF you would retard Supplies, embarrass the Government, stagnate the Circulation of Treasure, sink Credit, and ruin the Funds on which the Nation depends, in which all our Families are embark'd, and on the Payment of which many depend for Bread.
>
> IF you will put us all into Confusion, Party rising up against Party, and Family against Family, and assist the Animosities of an exaspersted Kind of Men, to the Destruction of our Peace, the Interruption of Neighbourhood and Society, and make this flourising Nation the Seat of all Manner of Confusions.—
>
> In short, IF you will bring back the French, land them safe in Scotland, call down a Flood of Highlanders and Northern Jacobites to joyn them, commence again the old Northern Depradations upon England, expose your honest Brethren in Scotland, who have lately appear'd so vigorous and hearty for the Government to all Manner of Desolation, and make your native Country the Seat of War, a Field of Blood, or a new Aceldama.
>
> If these Prospects are suitable to you, Gentlemen, if your Designs lie this Way, then CHOOSE TORIES and High-Flyers, and send them up to the House, that by their mad precipitant Follies they may truly represent your own. (V, 102-3)

Conveniently the whole of this essay serves as a summary to close the discussion of Defoe's persuasive, oratorical, or pulpit style. In it Defoe's introduction raises the question of why the freemen should not consider voting for Tories and Highflyers, despite arguments by some that they are Christians and Englishmen, just as are Whigs and moderates. Then, after describing the kind of satirical character he might give of Highflyers, if he were inclined to comedy and satire (occupatio), he ends his prefatory remarks by identifying his audience as "you . . . who pretend to be Loyal to the Government, Steady to the

Revolution, Clear in the Succession; in short, you that have taken the Abjuration" (V, 101-102). The sermon proper contains the three parts already quoted and a conclusion consisting almost entirely of rhetorical questions:

> But after all, says the Enquirer, this is begging the Question; for how does it appear, that the Tories and High Flyers will do all this, that they have such ill Designs, or that their actions tend to it?
>
> Blind and stupid Generation! Do you want Demonstrations of this? Is this a thing that wants to be made out? Has not the whole Series of their Actions Demonstrated that this is their Meaning? Are ye at a Loss to see this in their constant Practice in their Behaviour, both in publick and private, both with the Government, with themselves, and with their Neighbours? Have not their bloody Flags, their Regalia's and Pontificates, their High-Church Memorials, their Rehearsals, their Assize Sermons, been always full of this?
>
> Does not their Practice, their Conversation, their Projects, as a Body, or as single Men, always make it plain, that this is their real Scheme? How can it be any longer doubtful, but that the present Party, whom we call Tory or High-Flyer, do directly or consequentially in all their Actings drive at Things fatal to the Glory, Interest and Safety of this Kingdom; to the Peace, Happiness and Prosperity of the People; to the Defence and Preservation of the Crown, the Religion, and the Union of the whole Island—But since they would pretend, that it remains a little doubtful as to proof; I shall enquire still farther about it in my next.

The outstanding characteristic of this Jeremiad, as with all of Defoe's emotional prose, is its repetition. The three long chains of anaphora ("If you would" (will) + verb) continually reemphasize his central point that a vote for a Tory is a vote for tyranny. The idea is further reiterated (perseverantia) at the completion of each of the three clauses when Defoe ironically instructs the audience to vote for Tories if they support his catalogue of horrors. The other forms of

repetition throughout the sermon consist principally of repetition of consonant sounds, compar, and congeries.

Defoe's method, since these five devices are the ones used over and over in the essay, may be examined by focusing on the second clause (11. 38-52) of the quoted passage. In this section the anaphora is further underlined by the use of compar in the parallel phrases following the repetition of "If you would." In 11. 38-39 and 45-48 note the structural similarity of the phrases and the repetition of /r/ and /s/ sounds in corresponding positions in the phrases. At the same time the idea of possible disaster, repeated in "ruin, plunder and impoverish" (42) is further emphasized by stressed /p/ sounds, just as the /s/ sounds in 11. 45-47 ("sufficiently ceased" and "extinguish'd") draw attention to the repetition of idea in the two phrases—"renew the War of Parties, not yet sufficiently ceased, revive the Flame of Contention not yet half extinguish'd."

Finally the direct address to the voters is emotionally emphasized in the conclusion of the essay, which begins with subjectio, a question anticipated from the opponents, follows with an exclamation to the audience, and ends with a series of questions (interrogatio) for the audience that point back to the charges made in the body of the sermon as evidence of the evil designs of Tories. Significantly all the questions make the same point: begging the question can be no issue when the facts speak for themselves.

Defoe's pulpit oratory and rhetoric are clearly designed to complement the moral oversimplifications made by Mr. Review in his role as prophet-preacher. As an interpreter of contemporary politics, he is

trying to discourage his readers from objective consideration of the facts in certain issues. Thus he always uses a vehicle—typology, the oversimplified struggle between good and evil, emblems, or allegory—to make his readers interpret the current political world in terms of that vehicle. When he succeeds in doing this with a reader or listener, Daniel Defoe has provided the understanding and made all the decisions for him. Similarly his rhetoric and oratory discourage precise scrutiny of what Mr. Review is saying. Defoe wants his audience to be swept up in the emotion created by anaphora; by rhetorical questions; by emotional diction; by the not so subtle repetitions of words, phrases and sounds; and by calculated delays in completing clauses. He wants them to suspend their disbelief for the few minutes that it takes to read or hear a Review being read and imagine themselves listening to a Sunday sermon. And he wants them to accept his sermon as having the same authority as those sermons preached in high and low pulpits all over England. It is to create this fiction of ministerial authority that he dramatizes his sermons and incorporates into them Biblical style, quotations, and allusions. In fact Defoe is so successful in recreating the fiery tone and style of some political divines of the day that his sermons can sometimes hardly be discerned from those of Dr. Sacheverell himself.

One may conclude, therefore, that Defoe's aims and methods, despite Mr. Review's professions of honesty and forthright simplicity, are not unlike those of any good Puritan preacher: He may present his "text" and the analysis of it in a very plain style, but when he comes

to his "application," his design is to reach the hearts of his congregation and shake them to their very souls. There are political dangers lurking all about his readers; Mr. Review must awaken them to those dangers before they and their children are lost to the tyranny of jure divino and the Catholic Church.

CHAPTER IV

THE SLEIGHT-OF-HAND ACT: DEFOE'S METHOD OF ARGUMENT IN THE REVIEW

The final point to be made about Daniel Defoe's persuasive techniques in the Review is that his arguments, although sometimes quite logical and tightly organized, are frequently, like his development of a moral setting and his use of pulpit oratory, designed to appeal to the prejudices and emotions of the audience and, generally, to mislead them. Again, the reasons are similar to those already given for moralizing and oratory: either his argument will not stand very much scrutiny or he finds the issues so charged with emotion and so close to the personal lives of the audience that irrational appeals are more effective. Furthermore, as noted in his use of oratory, Defoe is often not really trying to change people's minds; rather, he wants to reinforce and intensify what they already believe. When it is actually necessary to change the thinking of his audience, he is more likely to apply the well reasoned argument, at least in the early stages of his treatment of the subject.

Nevertheless, just as he tries to convince his audience that he always presents the unbiased, unvarnished truth and always writes in a plain, clear, concise style, so he would have the reader believe that he is always logical and honest, especially when he is playing the role of mediator in the conflict between extremist Whigs and Tories. Late

in the life of the Review (June 19, 1711) when he is trying to dissociate the Harley administration from Jacobitism while attacking the more ardent Whigs for wanting to continue the War, Defoe becomes very reasonable and moderate indeed:

> This Paper shall, for the future, try if fair Reasoning, and the best Arguments we can find out, may help to cool and calm both Sides, and shall offer a fair Truce of the Passions, to be accepted by both the Parties; if other Men will not be prevail'd with to accept such a truce, they must go on to try whether Railing and vile Ungentlemanlike Usage of one another, will in the End, be the Advantage of their Cause and Party, yea or no.[1] (VIII, 150)

Two months later when he is trying to convince the Whigs to support public credit even though they despise the Harley ministry, he prefaces his argument that stockjobbers are manipulating the prices at the exchange by proclaiming his sole concern to be the reasonable argument: "To lay this down as plainly as I can, I shall begin with Principles, which I hope is a right Way of Arguing, and from proving those Principles, I shall proceed to draw Consequences that shall convince any reasonable Person of the Folly I complain of, and how weak we are to be drawn into such a Snare" (VIII, 238).

According to Defoe, if one has a valid argument reasonable people will be convinced, while those who are driven on by passion will never

---

[1]This statement of reasonable moderate aims happens to follow a rather vehement attack on the style and language of Dr. Sacheverell's sermons in which, Defoe asserts, Sacheverell did everything he could to inflame people. So that the Review will never be charged with doing the same thing, Defoe pledges to appeal to the reason and never to the passions of his audience.

listen, for their minds are already made up.[2] Predictably, Defoe's clearest statement of this calm, moderate, reasonable philosophy comes after the completion of one of his most gymnastic arguments. After lashing out at Tories and urging the total defeat of France during Godolphin's Whig ministry (1708-1710), Defoe is forced to argue for peace when Harley and his distinctly Tory ministers come in after the Sacheverell disaster. In 1709 he had argued that no treaty could be made if it meant giving Spain to Philip. Now, with the ministry devising a separate peace with France, Defoe must argue that there is really no danger in Philip having Spain after all; indeed, Defoe must suggest that the greater danger lies with letting Spain go to Charles, now Holy Roman Emperor, because that would upset the balance of power. He seems to have forgotten that the Empire is one of England's allies and that he can offer no assurances that France will not control Spain under Philip as the Allies feared from the beginning. Despite, however, the logical contortions necessary to argue that position, the reader finds Defoe innocently praising his own reasonable arguments:

> I have talk'd so long, and I hope so effectually, about the fatal Effects of giving the Spanish Monarchy to the Emperor, that I think no more need to be said to that Head; and I am

---

[2]Speaking of the arguments presented to defend the separate traders who want the government to dissolve the African Company so that they can more freely indulge in the slave trade, Defoe notes that these arguments "must be a Sophism, all the gaudy Surface of Words can be no more than a superficial Gilding over a poysonous Pill, unless they can make a Proposal, that will secure the Trade to the Nation" (VI, 515). In other words, he suggests that arguments must lead to a valid and defensible end; otherwise there is no real substance to the argument. Needless to say, Defoe espouses the cause of the Company.

> glad that I can say I find so many Eyes open to the Reasons I have given, and Convinc'd of the Dangerous Consequences of it; that I have abundant Satisfaction in having Undertaken it, and abundant Peace in the Performance, tho' with so many hard and unjust Censures from Men, of whom, I think, their Prejudices, rather than their Reason, seems to Contradict me. I leave my Arguments, back'd with Truth to work their own Way, and when my Opposers think themselves Victor, and Triumph in it, let the Impartial Reader judge between them and me. . . . (VIII, 445)

From a perspective of 270 years a reader of the Review may safely conclude that Defoe's reverence for reasoned argument is designed, like his frequent assurances that he seeks only truth and peace, to gain the confidence of the audience. People naturally want to believe what is reasonable and just. Anyway, the audience might not be able to detect the reason in some of Defoe's arguments unless it is pointed out to them.

Nevertheless, when a subject arises that has no passionate associations in people's minds or which lends itself to reasonable argument, Defoe can produce a very fine argument that does not require the reader to accept questionable premises or invalid conclusions. Neither do such arguments depend upon emotional diction or any devices of the oratorical style. For example, in the issue for January 29, 1706, Mr. Review speaks out on behalf of the mercers, lacemen, and shopkeepers whose business has suffered because the Court has so frequently gone into mourning that there is little demand among the rich for new garments. Since the ladies wear nothing but black dresses, they need fewer dresses (see III, 45-47). Therefore, Defoe concludes, since the Queen's household is the center of fashion in London, "it is absolutely in her Majesty's

Breast, when the People run into any Extreme of Habit, to the Detriment, General Decay, and Destruction of Trade, to encourage or discourage, oppress or relieve, and to crush any thing or Fashion, that upon due Consideration appears destructive to the Publick Stock and Wealth of the Nation." To prove the validity of this assumption, Defoe notes that the Parliament, when petitioned by the tradesmen, suggested that they turn to the Queen for redress. It being therefore established that the Queen can solve the problem, it remains only to determine the way. Defoe reasons that, since the cause of the problem is the court fashion of wearing black so much of the time the very wearing of black has become the style, the Queen may solve the problem by regulating

> the Habits of her own Household Servants and Attendants . . . for as, when the Queen is in Mourning, no Man comes to Court in Colours; so when the Queen is out of Mourning, no Man comes there in Black; and her Majesty has nothing to do but to shorten the time of the Court's Mourning.
>
> If therefore her Majesty pleases but to make a Publick Order, that no mourning for Foreign Princes; shall last longer than a Month, or some such settled time.
>
> Of if her Majesty pleases to Order, That none of the Household shall appear in Black on occasion of State-Mournings, unless for the Death of Crown'd Heads, or such as her Majesty shall appoint.
>
> Either of these two trifling Concessions would regulate this Evil, and restore Trade to its due Channel. (III, 46)

Regarding a bill before the House of Commons to prevent fraud in bankruptcy cases (February 26, 1706), Defoe applies the same piercing logic because, as in the question of preventing the wearing of black, the case hinges on Defoe's expert opinion and is removed from politics and religion, two subjects about which people seldom change their minds. In other treatments of bankrupts and their plight Defoe can become very

sentimental, but in these economic matters he is usually attempting to persuade people to do something to help people. Here, and in the following issue (February 28, 1706), he presents a logical case for the value of the bill and answers the arguments of opponents.

The bill before Parliament, which has been thoroughly weakened in debate, was originally designed to help and encourage debtors to apply for bankruptcy when it becomes apparent that they cannot pay their creditors. As the law stands the debtor is forced to continue borrowing even though he cannot repay the loans, because to break means prison and the utter ruin of his family. According to Defoe, "If Breaking early [the theme of the previous two essays (February 21 and 23, 1706)], and stopping in Time, is the way to prevent Fatal and Numerous Bankrupts; an Act to Encourage Men to Stop in Time and be Honest, Must be Entitled, to all Preventive Quality, the other pretends to [i.e., the present law which Defoe considers detrimental to both debtor and creditor]" (III, 98). Under the then current practice the creditors did not have to accept what the debtor offered and, if they chose, might have him jailed until a satisfactory account might be made. Defoe points out again and again the impossibility of the debtor's ever raising the necessary money while incarcerated. The debtor has no means of making any money while in jail and must use what little money he may have to support his family. Thus most debtors died in jail and their families starved.

Opponents of the proposed bill argue that it would allow debtors to take advantage of creditors, especially when the debtors are

unscrupulous fellows who borrow large sums and then claim bankruptcy, offering only a small percentage to the creditors who, under the proposed law, would be forced to take it or get nothing. Defoe's rebuttal is as follows: (1) as with any law, if a man can get away with lying he can circumvent the law; (2) to allow the opponent's argument would mean that no laws could be made that might be circumvented; (3) the number who try to take advantage of the law will be few and will become fewer if it is advantageous to abide by the law; (4) if a severe penalty (Defoe suggests death) is assessed for perjury in these cases, none will risk it (III, 102).

A principal characteristic of Defoe's logical arguments is that they generally depend on one of his many philosophies about a wide variety of subjects. The argument concerning the clothiers depends on his belief in encouraging consumption, the argument about the fraud of debtors on his belief in compromise and the basic honesty of mankind. Thus, when the Observator argues, in an oblique attack on King William, that the way to win the war with France is to defeat them at sea where England is strongest, Defoe presents his military philosophy that the enemy can be defeated only by beating him at his strongest point. As is often the case with Defoe, he breaks his argument into parts. First, by pointing out that experience has shown France to be formidable even after having lost a large portion of her fleet, he proves that carrying on the war by sea is not the best way to defeat France. The strength of France is her army and military leaders; thus the best way to defeat her is by defeating her army. The French navy is so insignificant

that Louis keeps it in port most of the time. Secondly, by asserting again that defeating the French navy would not mean defeat for France, he argues that concentrating on the French navy is not the only way to defeat France. Also in answering the charge that England has not been able to defeat the French on land, Defoe points out that it is best to carry the war to France; the only way that the navy alone can be of any service is in defense of the British isles (IV, 562-563). Finally, the argument is carried on in the next issue by supplying a number of examples to show that if France had not one ship the outcome of the war would not be changed. This essay ends then with an analogy to seal the point: "as when the Town is on Fire, the Engines direct their Spout's chiefly, where the Flame is most impetuous, and it would be wasting Water, Hands and Time, to play most where the Fire is weakest, and would leave the main Force of the Fire uninterrupted, till it got such a Head, as all the Engines at last could not quench" (IV, 566-567).

For Defoe one of the principal issues of the war is the security of the protestant succession established by the Revolution of 1688, and his arguments for the right of King William and Queen Anne are based squarely on the Whig philosophy that the right to the throne is determined not by any hereditary claim but by Parliament. According to Defoe, it makes no difference that the Pretender may be the legitimate heir for birth has never been the rule of succession in England. When, Defoe relates, Henry VII questioned the Earl of Surrey about his support of Richard III, Surrey answered that when Parliament gave the crown to Richard, it made him the legitimate ruler. He would, Surrey added,

support Henry with as much loyalty when Parliament made him King ([IX], 27). Thus from historical proof Defoe summarizes his position: "This is the Foundation that I go; the Parliament of England, (now of Britain) has plac'd the Crown on the Head of our Queen, and after her Majesty . . . shall Decease, the Remainder, or Succession, to the House of Hanover: I have no need to Enquire who is Legitimate, or who not; there's my Debt of Allegiance, all that Claim against it are but Pretenders, and are to be fought against and oppos'd by me, and every honest Britain, on pain of Treason and Perjury, let their Right of Birth and Blood be what they will, till the Parliament of Britain shall alter the Entail" ([IX], 27).

This statement of his position on the succession prefaces an argument concerning a recent report that the pretender has proclaimed himself Duke of Gloucester, presumably to strengthen his right to succeed to the throne upon the death of Queen Anne. Given the Whig position of Parliamentary choice, such succession is impossible anyway, but to rebut the import of the action, Defoe momentarily puts aside his philosophy and argues that if the pretender has actually done what is reported, the act is totally absurd. Defoe's method is quite logical. There are only two possible sides to the question about the right of the pretender: either he is legitimate or he is not. If he is the legitimate heir of James II (and since his father is dead), he ranks as a sovereign. Therefore, he cannot be a duke because a duke is a subject. If, on the other hand, he is not the legitiamte heir of James II he neither has a claim as the pretender nor can be a duke because he

has never been created one ([IX], 28). Defoe never determines the truth of the report.

When he learns that Jacobites have been raising support for the Pretender among the country folk by telling them that the Pretender has turned protestant, Defoe defeats their effort with another dilemma (proof through disjunction). He offers two alternatives for exploding their claim: he can try to convince the people that the Pretender has not turned Protestant or he can argue that a change in the Pretender's religion does not change his status. He chooses the latter course, perhaps because the first would require some evidence: "Either the Pretender is the Son of King James II. or he is not, if he is not, then on what Foot is his Sister Reigning? If her Majesty Reigns by Right of Blood then the Pretender must be spurious; if the Pretender be Legitimate, then you make the Queen have no Claim by Line, and consequently her Majesty must have some better Right than a Succession by Birth, or have no Right at all, and be a Usurper: This <u>better Right</u>, is that of Parliamentary Limitation" ([IX], 38). Clearly Defoe shows that Jacobitism itself proves Anne's right via Parliament. The Jacobites, hoping that the Pretender can take the throne upon the death of his sister by claiming the Stuart line, must admit Anne's right to rule, which can only be through Parliament, or deny that right, which again means that she rules only by power of Parliament. Since she is in possession of the crown, it is established that Parliament has the power to give it to her.

In sum, although perhaps hundreds of strictly logical arguments exist in the Review, they seem to occur only when there is no chance for an emotional development of the subject or when the matter involves political, economic or religious philosophies. There are, at the same time, at least as many strict, logical arguments that involve (1) what may broadly be termed politics or (2) issues in which Defoe takes a singular personal interest. In such instances the reader is likely to find arguments that are, at best, only superficially logical. There seem to be two explanations: either a logical argument is not possible because the position he is forced to take is indefensible or his purpose is to intensify passion rather than to persuade with detached, cool logic.

Defoe, it will be remembered, has the task of defending three different ministries during a period when there are some highly controversial issues. He must do his best to sell the idea of a union to both the Scots and the English and to discredit the baneful arguments of those Jacobites and Highflyers who predict the end of the Scottish Church and general economic disaster because of it. And he must be an apologist to the Whigs for the decidedly Tory ministry that came in on the heels of the Sacheverell disaster. In short, he often finds himself in positions that may be charitably described as untenable, a circumstance that may force him to be less than honest with his audience.

In Volume I of the Review, which is supposed to be concerned with the "Affairs of France," Defoe is, for example, faced with the problem of popular English support for the Hungarian rebels who are fighting

for their political and religious freedom from the Empire. Clearly it seems a case of Protestant against Catholic, a conflict guaranteed to warm the heart of any true English subject. But Defoe, even though one of his main themes when discussing the war is that it is a war to stop the spread of Catholic power in Europe, must discredit the religious aspects of the revolt because the Hungarians are at war with the Emperor, and the Emperor is one of the confederates in the Grand Alliance. Therefore, he must be defended in order to maintain a unified effort against the French. To make matters worse for Defoe's argument, when the Hungarians offered to make peace with the Emperor, he refused them. Clearly the Emperor should have been happy to end that aggravating little war so that he might devote full attention to the French. How can Defoe explain his refusal to treat with the Hungarians?

Actually it is a very simple matter. First he points out that, prior to Blenheim, when the French were strong in Italy and the rest of the Empire, the Emperor tried to make a treaty with the Hungarian rebels, but they, hoping to reduce him to even greater submission, haughtily refused to accept his ambassadors. Now, however, affairs are completely reversed: the French have been defeated and the Emperor, according to Defoe, is simply returning the treatment he received at their hands (V, 329-30). Therefore, it is excusable, the reader must infer, for the Catholic Emperor to continue his war against protestant forces while he should be giving his entire effort to defending his states from the French.

Seemingly recognizing the weakness of that argument, Defoe produces "the following Abstract of a Letter," which, he says, "I have very good assurance is genuine and true in Fact." Anyone, he suggests, "who is ignorant now, must be so willfully." The letter is from "a young Gentleman, the Son of a French Refugee now in England, to his Father," and in the part quoted by Defoe the young man explains how, while serving in the Polish army, he was taken prisoner by the Swedes, whereupon he was taken before the French ambassador to the Swedish court and given the choice of imprisonment or service in the French army on the Danube, the Bavarian army, or the Hungarian army. Being a loyal soldier he refused, but he received such intolerable treatment in prison that he was forced to change his mind. He was, therefore, sent to Prince Ragocksi, leader of the Hungarian forces and there he discovered that the Hungarians were being supplied by the French. At the end of the passage, he asks his father to direct him how to send money home; the Hungarians are paid so well by the French that he has plenty of money (I, 330).

Since the letter is an "Abstract" Defoe does not have to deny its style, which incidentally seems to be clearly his own. But the letter is suspect in other ways. For one thing it verifies the collusion of the Swedes and the French, something that Defoe charges on several occasions. But the main point is that it too conveniently ties the Hungarian revolt to the French and, consequently, makes the Hungarians the enemies of the Confederacy. It is perhaps possible that the story may be true, but it is too romantic and, most of all, too convenient

to be credible. Also, as is usually the case with letters, Defoe neither divulges his source nor identifies the recipient except to clearly label him as a protestant—i.e., a French-refugee. Finally, it is also suspicious that the son was, before his capture, fighting for the Poles, whom Defoe persistently defends in the Review, against the Swedes, whom Defoe regularly criticizes.

During the negotiations for a treaty of union between Scotland and England Defoe sometimes has to be dishonest in persuading both the Scots and the English that each country will benefit without disadvantage to the other. In the issue for December 21, 1706, he takes up the charges of one Mr. Hodges that the original right of the Scottish freeholders will be given up with the union because English interest will have the majority in Parliament. Defoe's rebuttal of that argument is a masterful example of begging the question and misleading the audience. First of all, he chooses to interpret the notion of the freeholders' losing their rights as freeholders to mean their loss of the power to be represented. Of course, Parliament cannot take away a freeholder's right to be represented, but it does, he asserts, have the right to take away the rights of towns and corporations, just as it has the right to determine the number of representatives for each town or borough. From these assumptions he concludes that, although a whole town may lose its representatives for a period of time or have many fewer representatives than a town with an equal number of freeholders, the freeholders in either circumstance are not disenfranchised. As Defoe states the case "'Tis not the Fewness of Persons Chosen which denominate a Representative,

but the Freedom of Choice: If every Freeholder has his voice in the Election, he is duely represented in two, as two hundred; and Yorkshire which is twenty times as large as Rutlandshire, chooses but two knights of the Shire, and is as compleatly represented as the other" (III, 606). For the eighteenth-century Scotsman who might not be used to the idea of "one man, one vote" such logic would perhaps not appear so fallacious, but clearly Defoe is misleading the audience: in the very example that he uses to make his case the freemen of Yorkshire obviously have only 1/20 the power of the freemen of Rutlandshire. Secondly he has really begged the question because Scotland, which now handles its own affairs in its own interest, will certainly be greatly in the minority in the British Parliament. The value of the individual Freeman's vote in Scotland, as an expression of his desires, will be greatly lessened with the union. Thus, Defoe rebuts an argument that the Scottish freemen will lose their right to be represented, an argument that Hodges never apparently forwarded. Defoe concludes: "All the Error therefore of these People arises from this Notion, that the Original Right of the Freeholders to be represented is given up, which is manifestly false, it being retain'd in all its Exercise, only the Circumstances of the Representative is alter'd . . ." (III, 607). Yet the question of "Circumstances" is the whole issue.[3]

---

[3]In III, 606, Defoe summarizes Hodges' case: "Mr H____s affirms in a Multitude of Places, and with mutual Assurance, that for Scotland to incorporate with England, is a compleat resigning up her National Freedom. . . ."

Truly political contradictions and complexities caused Defoe an inordinate number of forensic difficulties. A short time after his questionable rebuttal of Hodges' argument on the national freedom of Scotland, Defoe answers Hodges' charges that there are thirty-one different conflicts of interest between Scotland and England that make union impossible. Defoe's tact is to argue that individual interests are not national interests, noting that the individual parts of England have different interests but the same national interest (a questionable point, considering the widespread Jacobite interest). One of Hodges' "Interests" concerns his fear that the London lawyers will cause cases to be brought from Scotland to London so that they can get the legal business. Defoe points out the absurdity of this idea: "'Tis plain, the Law in England is not brought to the Lawyers, but the Lawyers are fain to turn Itenerant, and ride a Cause-jobbing over the whole Nation; the judges go Circuits, and Justice is carried Home to every Man's Door; no Man is found to sue or be sued, plead or be impleaded, but in the Country where he lives . . ." (III, 618). Without question Defoe is on firm ground in his answer, but two years later the reader finds the same Daniel Defoe defending the government's removal of a number of Catholics and Jacobites from Scotland to London (at their own expense) to be tried for their part in the pretender's abortive invasion at Edinburgh. How can Defoe, who so confidently argued that Scotsmen would never be tried in London, defend the government's action?

Actually the case of the suspected traitors involves two very thorny questions. First of all, in order to arrest all the people who might

have supported or taken part in the invasion, the Parliament suspended the Habeas Corpus Act. In short, the government arrested a number of people without having any evidence against them. Secondly, those people arrested without evidence were forced to come to London at their own expense. Can Defoe defend putting innocent people in jail and forcing them to travel hundreds of miles from their homes for trial?

Any constant follower of the Review would not doubt in the least Defoe's ability to turn black into white or, to use his favorite phrase, wash an Ethiopian. Regarding the holding of innocent people when there is no evidence for suspicion, he supplies an argument of two general parts: (1) the government had reason to arrest these people, even though there is no evidence against them; and (2) if they are not guilty the judges will free them. These Scotsmen, he suggests, are rightly suspected because of their family ties and their past behavior, and because they are the ones who would have benefitted most by the invasion. It is not cruel to hold these people prisoners, he surmises, because as a group they are guilty of much greater cruelty for planning the overthrow of the Queen and British liberty. There would not be so much dissatisfaction, according to Defoe, if people would imagine the horrible result, had they succeeded. In any case, he rationalizes, the government is not judging them guilty—the law does that. The government is only holding them to prevent any more mischief. Ultimately only the guilty will be punished, hard evidence being necessary to convict (V, 65-67). Surely even Defoe must have been bothered by these arguments.

The problem of their removal to London is handled in two issues (May 11 and May 13, 1708). The first of these, which argues that the transfer of prisoners is neither cruel nor unjust, depends upon the assumption that, though many may be innocent, as a group Jacobites are guilty. If there were no further danger of revolt or invasion, Defoe offers, imprisonment would be unjust (VI, 69-71). Then, in a virtual repetition of the argument in the May 11th issue, he argues that their imprisonment and transfer would be cruel and unjust if there had been no landing or if Jacobites had not so openly given support to it. Finally, at the end of the essay, he repeats the argument again by suggesting that these people would have reason to complain if the government had no reason to suspect them (V, 73-75). Thus, although the focus of the government is supposed to be on their incarceration and removal, the reasons are the same as for their arrest without evidence—the government has cause to suspect all Jacobites or suspected Jacobites.

The third segment of the argument, which deals directly with the matter of locating the trial in London (although Defoe had earlier assured the Scots that the court would always be brought to the accused), is here quoted in its entirety in order to illustrate how Defoe pretends to be totally logical and unbiased at the very moment he is purposely begging the question.

> I Am directing this Paper to the Gentlemen who are in Custody, upon Suspicion of ill Practices with the French, and particularly to those who in their Behalf make much louder Complaints, than the Gentlemen do themselves.
>
> And first as to the Gentlemen themselves, as they are all Persons of Distinction, some of them of the first Quality, and some whom I have the Honour particularly to be known to, it

cannot be expected, I should treat them according to our common Method of hard words, neither would I do so, if they had none of the Circumstances above-nam'd on their side; as they are Prisoners, as they are in the Hands of Justice, as they are Men in Trouble, it would be ungenerous to insult them, it would want Christianity, and it would want Manners, in both which I desire to make no Breach.

Be it, that the Jacobites, as a Party, would have shown us no Favour; be it, that it is the common Method to trample on them that are down; be it, that the Design, they are suspected about, was barbarous, had in it a Complication of Miseries and Mischiefs to their Country, and is in its self, to me at least, execrable and to be abhorr'd.

But hold, Gentlemen, I am upon Terms of Justice; no Man is in the Terms of the Law a Criminal, till he has had a Trial, and stands convicted; and Suspicions give me no Authority to censure—Wherefore, as I have already alledg'd, the Government has had good Reason to secure them, in order to a Trial; so till that Trial, I cannot fairly discourse of them, but as Innocent.

Having thus stated their Case therefore, I shall henceforward treat them as Persons only under the Jealousie of their Government; Persons who have by some way or other, no matter here by what way, given the Government Reason to suspect their Conduct, in tending towards assisting the Enemy in their late Attempt upon this Island, to find out who are or are not Guilty, to bring the Guilty, if possible, to Justice; and withal to prevent the Disaffection of any they suspect as aforesaid, being an Encouragement to future Attempts, the Governments has thought fit to take these Gentlemen into Custody, as by an Act of Parliament, made this last Session of Parliament, her Majesty is empower'd to do—Thus there is 1st. the Reason of it, and 2dly. the Legallity of it make out; as to the Expediency of it the Government is Judge of that, and it admitts no Dispute.

Now, supposing these Gentlemen, tho' justly suspected, yet innocent of the Charge, and entirely clear of the treasonable Practices we talk of, for 'tis on these Terms only that I shall speak of them: In this Case, I say it is, they have great Cause to thank GOD for the Union, whether they think fit to do so or no, is not to my Purpose; but I say, they have great Reason to do it, and in the next Place as I hinted in my last, they have abundant Cause to be satisfy'd with the Directions given by the Government for their being brought to London.

I have nothing to say to the Circumstances of particular Persons, as to their Families or Affairs, the Expence or the Fatigue of Travelling, I am speaking with Relation to the Equity of Proceedings in Criminal Cases, the Difficulty of

Evidence, the Justice of our Law in trying Per Pares, and the Priviledge of Peerage, things which before the Union they had no Recourst to; if any Man will in a Case like this set the Hazard or Expence of their Journey against the Safety of their Persons, that is nothing in the Case.

Nor do I reflect on the Justice of Scotland, in saying the Peers of Britain are not so easily and lightly convicted, as they were there; former Times may be a convincing Proof of this, in the Case of the Earl of Argyle on one hand, and hand, and Lord Delameer on the other; the former in Scotland was voted guilty of High-Treason on the most trivial Affair imaginable, viz. offering an Explanation to the Oath of Allegiance; the latter was acquitted in open Court, the King present, after all the Endeavours the Court-Party had made use of to entrap him, and yet for a Fact, which it was well known, his Lordship was concern'd enough in, and that no Industry or Mallice was wanting to destroy him.

> And here by the Way it is worth noting, that a Nobleman of Scotland was adjudg'd Guilty of High-Treason for refusing an Oath without an Explication.—While at this Day refusing to swear to the Government, is so far from being Criminal in Law, that in Defiance of the Government, those that receive the Protection of the Government, refuse their Allegiance to the Government, and value themselves upon it; this may serve to show us the Differenc between Days of Liberty and Days of Bondage; between rightly constituted, Legally Ruling Governments, and Tyrannical Arbitrary Rulers; but that by the by.

I return to the case of the present Gentleman, who, I say I think, have Cause to give GOD Thanks for the Union; and first for the Noblemen, who by Vertue of this Union have obtained a Share of the English Peerage, and the Priviledge of being to be judg'd by the greatest and most illustrious Body of Men in the World; without the Suffrage of these, not a Nobleman of Scotland can be judg'd.

These as they are Men of Birth, Men of Honour and of Estates, so they pass, and in a most solemn Manner with their Hands upon their Hearts, signifying their Having duly ponder'd the Case before them, they One by One pronounce the Person Guilty or Innocent—It is no more, my Lords, in the Power of Arbitrary Councils, Tyrannical Princes, or partial Judicatories, to hurry you to Gaols and Executions; your Enemies can no more be your Judges, nor can Personal Quarrels be reveng'd in Form of Justice; you will have an open, full, a fair, and an uninterrupted Hearing; all you can urge in your own Defence will be heard with Patience, weigh'd with Prudence, and judged with Truth; Evidences on either side shall have no Discouragements, or be aw'd by the Greatness or Awfulness of Authority, but shall have Room to

> speak as well to acquit as accuse: In short, my Lords, nothing but real Guilt can give you the least Cause to apprehend any thing here; nay, even real Guilt, unless clearly and legally prov'd, or voluntarily confess'd, shall do you no Injury here; you have all the Ways possible of being deliver'd, and but one Way of bring sentenc'd, viz. by plain Evidence.
>
> For this Reason, I say, you have Cause to rejoyce in the Union, and I make no Question, but many a noble Family in Scotland, as their Circumstances shall in Future Time come to appeal to this Bar for Justice, will have Reason to look back on the Union as the Foundation of their Safety, and bless GOD that ever it was made.
>
> From the Whole, also this farther is to be said, that the sending for the Prisoners from Edinburgh and Sterling to London, is, as to their being try'd, their Safety, not their Hazard, and is what they ought to rejoyce in, not be concern'd at, and I perswade my self, they either are or will be all of them pleas'd with it, and the Clamour, that we have rais'd upon that Head, is from such as do not understand the Gentlemen'd Interest.
>
> Nay, if I were to suppose them to be Guilty, I should say the same thing; for Guilt its self has the Advantage here, in that it is requir'd to be more plainly prov'd that in other Places, no Innuendoes, Similitudes of Hands, Constructive or Presumptive Treasons will here serve the Turn; it is below such a Court of Justice to stoop to such mean and low Methods for the Ruin of a Prisoner; but if there be one End of the Staff better than the Other, it is given to the Defendant, that if possible with Satisfaction to Justice he may be acquitted.
>
> I shall reserve the Remainder of this Subject till Time gives an Issue to this Affair, and till the Gentlemen concern'd have pass'd the Rubicon that is before them; when I doubt not, whether they appear Innocent or Guilty, they shall all acknowledge the Honour, Justice and Freedom of their Treatment in England; and then that they obtain'd it by the Union, will be own'd by Consequence. (V, 77-79)

Recognizing the difficulty in explaining why people should be removed a long distance from their homes at their own expense to face trial, in many cases, on unsupported charges, Defoe here decides to whitewash the whole affair. First he pledges complete fairness; he will not even assume them guilty. Secondly, he assumes as true the previous

conclusion that the government had a perfect right to arrest them. Thus, he is ready for his "proof" that those arrested should be glad that the union is in effect so that they have the privilege of being brought to London. At this point is the crux of the argument, but it does not answer directly the principal complaint—i.e., that they should have been brought out of Scotland after the union. His argument is that these people will have a fairer trial in London than they might have received in Scotland before the union, but he dodges the obvious point that the union is the very cause of their being removed. He never argues that a trial could not be arranged in Scotland and never proves the legality of removing the accused to London.

Secondly, it should be noted that the argument turns on two totally unsupported assumptions: (1) these suspected traitors would never have gotten a fair trial in Scotland (he offers one case as an example); (2) they are assured of getting more than a fair trial in London. Surely Defoe must have wondered that he could so blithely claim that the Lords would be utterly fair, that no prejudice could possibly influence their decision in this very explosive political question.

That Defoe delights in difficulty can hardly be questioned. We have observed him arguing against the protestant Hungarians in a revolt that has religious persecution for its shibboleth. We have watched him persuading Scotland that to give up its own government to become a minority element in British Parliament is in no way disenfranchizing the Scottish freemen. We have seen him assuring the Scots on the one hand that they will never be removed to London for trial and arguing, just as

smoothly, that the suspected revolutionaries should be happy that they have been forced to come to London for their trials. Indeed the more improbable or impossible the position in which Defoe finds himself, the more his dexterity in argument shines and the more incredible his premises and conclusions. The foregoing arguments show Defoe in relatively mild predicaments. The job of political apologist can be considerably more difficult.

For example, in 1709 Defoe is faced with the problem of explaining the refusal of the Scottish Church to allow the English liturgy in Scotland. Defoe's opponents seem to have a very good case: to suppress Presbyterians or other dissenting groups in England would certainly be considered persecution and against the law of the nation as well as against the principles of the Church of England. Why should Presbyterians be tolerated in England but Anglicans not tolerated in Scotland? Such an argument would certainly appeal to both High and Low Churchmen and certainly might have seemed, to the ordinary Dissenter, an inescapable argument. Defoe, however, may contend with anyone and defend any position. When he begins the argument, he outlines the points of contention, each of which he promises to take up in turn. The first of his points is, of all his arguments, of the most interest here because it is the most acrobatic and employs a method that frequently allows Defoe to argue his case, no matter how indefensible.

The first question is "whether the Scots in these Prosecutions are Persecutors for Conscience or no?". Immediately his scheme materializes

he plans to deny that preventing the use of the Anglican liturgy is persecution, while maintaining that to prevent Presbyterians from holding meetings in England would be persecution. How can he do that? Simply by advantageously defining the word persecution and making a few minor assumptions:

> In taking Notice of the first of these Queries, Whether the Scots in these Prosecutions are not Persecutors for Conscience? It may be alledg'd, that all Persecutions of Law, where the Offender pleads Conscience against his Obedience, are Persecutions for Conscience—And if this be brought by Way of Argument in this Case, then my Answer is brief; the Scots, and with them, all the Christian Nations in the World, but especially the Church of England, are Persecutors, and without question ought to be so.
>
> But if you will restrict the Term Persecution to the generally receiv'd Sense of it viz. Disturbing, prosecution, and pursuing the peaceable Exercise of Religious Worship, perform'd meerly in Obedience to the Dictates and Commands of Conscience—Then I may safely challenge all the World, in Behalf of the People of Scotland, to show the least Vestige or Appearance of Persecution among them. (VI, 383)

Actually, upon examination, it appears that Defoe has made a false distinction. Is there any difference between "Persecutions of Law, where the Offender pleads Conscience against his Obedience" and "Disturbing, Prosecuting, and pursuing the peaceable Exercise of Religious worship, perform'd meerly in Obedience to the Dictates and Commands of Conscience?" Of course, the diction implies a difference. In the first the "offender pleads," so that the emphasis is on the person running afoul of the law; furthermore, the implication of "pleads" is pretty clearly that the "offender" claims conscience simply to avoid the law. In other words, the case is not a true matter of conscience for, one may assume, it concerns something wicked or evil, since law

in the first definition appears to be something good. In the second definition, however, the emphasis shifts to the party which punishes the offense, and the words used to describe the actions of the establishment are "Disturbing, prosecution, and pursuing," the first and third of which imply unjustifiable interference with or hounding of the innocent victims of conscience. Note also that what is being prosecuted is "the peaceable Exercise of Religious Worship, perform'd meerly in Obedience to the Dictates and Commands of Conscience." Clearly if the law forbids the kind of worship described so advantageously in the second definition, there is no distinction between the two definitions. Nevertheless Defoe makes the distinction with a great show of logic, for there must be a definition of terms before an argument with the opponent is possible. At the same time, as Defoe well knows, he is preparing for his assumption that the while issue has arisen because the Jacobites are trying to destroy the Union. Those Anglicans in Scotland who insist upon the English prayer book are only Jacobites; and, with them, their motivations are political, not religious.

Defoe wants to avoid the more dangerous question of the persecution of religious minorities. Therefore he concludes his first point with a dilemma that arises out of a comparison between how the English government treated these Scottish Anglicans and how the Church of Scotland has treated them:

> I think, while I am in this Argument, addressing my self principally to the People of England, and among them to the Church of England—I can do nothing better, than bring their own Practice to a Parallel with the Church of Scotland, as a strong and convincing Way of arguing to them, especially in

> the Case I am upon. And first, I take the Authority of the Parliament of England against Persecution in the Great Act for Settlement of the Toleration, where it is said, "Whereas it is reasonable, that all just Tenderness should be shown to tender Conscience, &c.["] Then in the Preamble of the late famous Occasional Bill, are these Words, "Whereas Persecution for Conscience Sake is contrary to the Principles of the Christian Religion, and the Doctrine of the Church of England.["] Take these two, and compare them with the Act of William and Mary, Cap. . . . By which all those Ecclesiasticks, who would not take the Oaths, are Depos'd and Depriv'd ab Officio & Beneficio, and it will necessarily follow, at least in my Opinion, that either the Church of England, in Deposing the Non-Jurant Clergy in England, acts contrary to her own Doctrine, and the Principles of the Christian Religion ut supra, or that Deposing and Depriving the Non-jurant Bishops, &c. is not Persecution for Conscience.
>
> I humbly refer this to the Determination of all that shall read impartially, if it be not clear and fairly stated.
>
> If then Deposing and Depriving the Clergy of the Church of England, who refuse to take the Oaths to the Government, be not Persecution; it remains for the other Party to prove, that the same Thing in Scotland can be call'd Persecution, and in England no Persecution. (VI, 38)

The references to the "Settlement of the Toleration" and the Occasional Bill function largely to cloud the main issue, which is to identify the present Scottish Anglicans with these earlier nonjurors, who clearly fall under Defoe's definition of just persecution. Apparently, in Defoe's reasoning, deposing the nonjurors cannot be understood as persecution, an assumption which equates William's political action with the action taken by the Church of Scotland so that he can conclude that "it remains for the other Party to prove, that the same thing in Scotland can be call'd Persecution, and in England no Persecution." He has managed to turn the argument back upon his opponents, but he has achieved the reversal by rather dishonest means.

Trying to offset the arguments of Tories, Highflyers and Jacobites can be difficult, but nothing in Defoe's Review career demanded more

finesse in illogical argument and rational sleight-of-hand than the Queen's removal of Godolphin and a primarily Whig ministry in the summer of 1710 and the appointment of Robert Harley (later to become Treasurer and Lord Oxford) and a group of gentlemen of distinct Tory stripe. For the previous two years Defoe had been viciously attacking Tories and had really outdone Henry Sacheverell in inflammatory oratory. Now, suddenly, he found his old comrade in office again and supported by the very people he had been abusing. He could not very well continue in this vein, yet he could not manage to maintain any credibility if he made a sudden shift in policy. For anyone else this might have proved an insurmountable problem, but Defoe, as usual, showed his great instinct for self-preservation. The solution was to be very simple: he would simply have to bind up the party differences that he had been working so hard to create and convince his Whig readers that nothing had really changed. He would have to make them believe that, after all, the terms Whig and Tory were only names; the real distinction, he had to convince them, was between the supporters of the revolution and the traitors.

In order to make his readers completely rethink their political concepts and put aside their party prejudices, he must first convince them that the new ministry was actually composed of Whigs and, in order to do this, Defoe had to create a new definition of Whig.

Defoe begins his assault on August 19, 1710, intensely pursuing it for the next three weeks, and intermittently renewing it until the end of the Review. What is a Whig?

1. Negatively, I do not mean they must turn Presbyterians, or Dissenters, there can be no more absolute Necessity of that, then of their learning the Alcharan, and turning Mohametans.
2. But Positively, I mean they must recognize the Revolution, and pursue all the Principles that were the Occasion of it, and have been necessary Adjuncts to it—And these I take to be such as Constitute, or Denominate a Whigg, viz.
    1. A Whigg, is one that adheres entirely to the Legal Right of the Queen to these Crowns, the Establishment of the Protestant Succession, and for ever excluding the Pretender.
    2. A Whigg must be one, that acknowledges the People of England have a Right to be Govern'd by their own Laws, to have their Taxes Levied by their own Consent, and the Succession of the Crown, be limitted and settled by Parliament.
    3. A Whigg is a hearty Enemy to the Usurpation, and Exorbitant Power of France, and therefore joins heartily in carrying on the present War, till France may be reduc'd to Terms of Peace, which may be safe, Lasting, and Honorable to all the Allies.
    4. A Whigg is a true Friend to the Union of Great-Britain, and will assist to the preserving it entire, and to prevent any Invasions upon the Liberties and Privileges of Scotland, contrary to that Treaty whether Ecclesiastic or Civil.
    5. A Whigg is one that abhors Persecution for conscience under pretence of Wholesome Severities, (as Dr. Sacheverell calls them) and therefore willingly, heartily, and in meer Sense of Religion, as well as in Justice, argue to preserve Inviolably the Toleration. (VII, 246)

So far most Whigs would probably agree with Defoe—Whigs are generally very good, Christian, freedom-loving, honest, patriotic people. Now "logic" becomes a factor: "Now as these are Things which Denominate a Whigg, then the present Government, is at present a Whigg Government, and all the Ministers of State, that are, or shall be put into the Administration of the publick Affairs, if they will not overturn the Constitution, and overthrow the Foundations we now stand upon, must be Whiggs, speaking of their Administering Capacity, what ever they were

before, or are yet, in their private reserv'd Principles." How can Defoe make such an assumption? He simply would have his readers accept (1) that Britain is governed by Whig principles and (2) that any minister of the government must uphold these principles; ergo, (3) all ministers must be Whig;

> Should any Man have the Impudence to ask a Minister of State, newly Advanc'd, this bold Question, SIR, or MY LORD—Your Lordship is now put into the Administration, and are, under the Queen, the great manager of the Nation's Business, pray will you be pleas'd to let us know—
>
> Are you resolv'd to Defend and Maintain the Queen, in the Possession of her Crown and Dignity, and to exclude the Pretender and his Adherents?—My Lord Answers Honestly, I am for the Queen against all the World—Why then, my Lord, you are a Whig
>
> Are you resolv'd to carry on the War till France is Reduc'd, till an Honourable Peace is gain'd till the Queen's Title is Recogniz'd, the Pretender Banish'd France, and the Spanish Monarchy Restor'd? YES; Why then, my Lord, you are a Whigg.
>
> In short, the Government is in its Nature, a Whigg Government, that is, 'tis a Revolution Government; 'tis a Government Founded upon Liberty, built up by the Laws, Settled and Established by Parliament, and Limited by the Ancient Constitution—All that acknowledge these Things, are Whiggs; and all that Administer this Government, must come under such Restraints, submit in such a manner to the Laws, so Patronize and Protect the Subjects Liberties, so pursue the Revolution, so oppose the Pretender, that they must be Whiggs, the Nature of the thing carries them by necessary Consequences to it—And let them, or any for them, pretend to what they please, it will all Center there.
>
> If others therefore, such as Jacobites, Non-Jurors, Perjur'd Abjurers, Mad High-Flyers and the like, promise themselves any great Matters from this Alteration—They may find themselves deceiv'd, and will be disappointed—The Constitution is of such a Nature, that whoever come to Act in it, if they will be faithful, if they will do their Duty, it will either find them Whiggs, or make them so, it can be no otherwise. (VII, 247)

What Defoe would have the reader forget, however, is that this conclusion is based on false premises. First, he defines Whig in such a way that

the term polarizes the political world into Whigs and Jacobites. Secondly, by his own definition and logic he would have to assume Nottingham and his High-Church followers to have been Whigs when they were ministers. Godolphin and Harley may be made Whigs but not Nottingham.[4] Despite the weaknesses in his position, Defoe continues the subject through the next several issues (August 22-29, 1710; VII, 249-264) repeating much the same argument given in the first version. He needs only to verify his point, that the Highflyers are very disturbed by the new ministry because, though they expected them to behave according to Jacobite principles, they find the new ministers unable or unwilling to carry out those designs. The assertion of the high-flying attitude is supported by several fictional dialogues with several gentlemen of that ilk.

Once Defoe has established that the ministry must be Whig, whatever their secret desires might be, he continues to try to mitigate the shock and gather support for the new ministers by proving to Whigs that, even if these men may be designated Tories, there really is no difference between Whigs and Tories. According to Defoe the principal conflict between these two parties arises out of two pairs of terms,
(1) "Hereditary Right" and "Parliamentary Limitation" and
(2) "Resistance" and "Non-Resistance." If Defoe can prove, as he

---

[4]The assumptions of Defoe's argument came back to haunt him over the next three years. In 1711 the Whigs joined with Nottingham and the High-Church element to strike down occasional conformity in return for Nottingham's support of the war effort. The ministry also managed to effect a separate peace with France, something that Defoe had a very hard time explaining to his Whig readers.

asserts he can (VII, 266), that there is really no difference between the terms in each pair, he can, he believes, conclude that there is really no difference between Whigs and Tories. It would therefore follow that Whigs should not be perturbed over the appointment of ministers that they consider to be Tories. He has tried to show his readers that the ministers must be Whig, but should they not be persuaded, he will prove that the words Whig and Tory do not signify different philosophies. Considering the party animosities of the times, Defoe must be given credit for having a considerable amount of impudence, or confidence, in his ability to wash Ethiopians.

In the issue for August 31, he introduces his argument by explaining that he must try to bring peace between the Whigs and Tories, although he realizes how difficult and how thankless the task will be:

> I know I am going about a very difficult work, yet the difficulty lies not so much in the Argument, as in the Temper of the People I am arguing with, to whom it is neither grateful, nor as they think, for their Convenience, to be undeluded.
>
> However, I shall set about the Work, and with this Assurance, that if it miscarry, it shall not be for want of Demonstration—and if you will not receive it, the Negative shall not be for want of Obstinate Blindness.
>
> I know I am to struggle with, 1. Your Pride, from whence flow strong streams of Opinion-Wisdom, 2. Your Politicks, from whence proceeds the Maxim, that 'tis your Interest to disagree; and 3. Your Inclination, visibly pleas'd with Strife, and fond of Contention—
>
> As my difficulties from hence will be the greater, it behoves me to lay down every Thing so plain, that if possible, it may leave no room for those to take hold, who are fondest of Contradiction.
>
> If my Stile therefore, appears a little more Laconick; if my Periods are shorter than usual, and I seem to affect being Sententious; you will bear with my being less Polite, for the sake of my being less Impertinent. (VII, 265-66)

Defoe knows that some people are such obstinate fools that they can never be shown the truth. Nevertheless,

> Sed dil desperandum, it must have some good Effect, to set Things in a clear View, must first or last, be a benefit to some Body; if a Hand be set up at a Cross-Way, pointing out the right Road; tho' 'tis of no use to him, that makes no use of it, yet 'twill for ever remain of use to him, that is not willing to go out of the Way
>
> At the worst, it shall divest the hardned Age of all excuses for their Errors, and Posterity shall never say, in defence of their Fathers, that they were not told it, or that they knew no better. (VII, 266)

With such a righteous, idealistic, open manner Defoe begins one of the most questionable and convoluted arguments in the Review. The very tone of this introduction—half a gesture to persuade readers that he is a calm, rational, disinterested person whose only desire is to do what is best for his country, and half an attack on the now two extremes of the Whig and Tory parties—clearly suggests Mr. Review's split personality and serves to underline the irony of his claims of clear and truthful argument.

The argument that no difference exists between Whigs and Tories begins by begging a very great question—i.e., that the throne of Britain, so declared by the Deed of Settlement of the Revolution, is the hereditary right of the Royal Family but the ruler is to be determined by authority of Parliament. The model for this arrangement comes from the hereditary process by which God designated the Kings of Israel. The right to rule was given by God to only one of the tribes, and then, as the Old Testament relates, He proceeded to pass over the eldest of the various families to pick such people as David, the

youngest son of Jesse (VII, 267). Thus Defoe, using the Bible as a precedent, proceeds to argue that the Queen does indeed rule by hereditary right as well as by Parliamentary right. The argument does not, however, answer an important question: What gives the Parliament the right to limit the succession? Notice the way Defoe, who in the midtwentieth century might have made a fortune selling life insurance or used cars, explains the lack of difference between Whigs and Tories:

> You Tories say, the Queen has an Hereditary Right to the Crown—Well, we Whigs say, the Queen has a Parliamentary Hereditary Right to the Crown—Vice Versa.
>
> We Whigs say, the Parliament has a Right of Limiting the Succession of the Crown, and therefore we own the Settlement of the House of Hannover: You Tories say, you acknowledge and adhere to the Succession of the House of Hannover, and therefore you own the Right of Parliament to limit the Succession. (VII, 271)

The reader may not believe his eyes at first because there is something very wrong with the reasoning here. Although the issue is the Tory refusal to accept the power of Parliament to limit the succession, Defoe argues that Tory acceptance of the Hanover line to succeed Anne proves that they do accept Parliamentary right as hereditary right. The conclusion drawn by Defoe is a classic fallacy: The Whigs believe in A, and therefore they accept B; the Tories accept B, and therefore they believe in A.

The second part to the paradoxical argument that Whigs and Tories are the same depends just as heavily on logical gymnastics. Defoe promises to prove that "Resistance and Non-Resistance are likewise the same Thing; that the Mistake is only about the Terms, not at all that we have the least difference among us, about the Things themselves"

(VII, 281). His argument rests on two points: (1) there is a difference represented by the word government and what is represented by the word governor; (2) the London clergy have called the Queen's power "Irresistable" while reminding her of their historical determination to withstand arbitrary power. This argument is much tighter than the previous one, but the flaws in reasoning, though well hidden, still exist.

If the reader accepts Defoe's major distinction between government and governors, he is immediately lost because Defoe's point is that people may resist the governor but never the government. The "government," according to Defoe, should be equated with the government erected by God for the Israelites through the Mosaic Law. As such it is always good and holy. As long as the monarch, who, but God's directives, was set up by the Jewish people, carries out the Law, he may rule without resistance, because he is identical with the law. If he proves to be a tyrant, however, the people are to resist him, because the ruler would be in conflict with the law and the law may not be resisted. The London clergy themselves have acquiesced to this reasoning in calling the Queen irresistable but, at the same time, reminding her that they also withstood arbitrary power. Indeed the High Churchmen cannot deny that they fought against James. Therefore, it is proved, according to Defoe's reasoning that the Tory concept of nonresistance is really no different from the Whig concept of resistance (VII, 281-288).

The argument is smooth—too smooth. It is actually addressed more to the Whigs, although Defoe speaks as a Whig to Tories in both the

essays. If Whigs can be made to believe that there really is not any difference between themselves and the new ministry, then Defoe will have achieved his end. The fact remains that Tories still believe in nonresistance because the Queen is the Queen. Defoe has tried to show that Tories and Whigs believe in the same dichotomy, but to prove it he has only one quotation from an address to the Queen by the London clergy. Moreover the basic idea of the dichotomy itself is open to question because it depends on identification of British law with Judaic law. Tories who believe in divine right, hereditary right, or the religious stature of the monarch cannot possibly be convinced, but some Whigs may accept the idea and the new ministry at the same time.

Thus far, examples of the argumentative method in the Review have demonstrated what might be called the direct method. Mr. Review presents himself as a logical, sane, unbiased, but concerned citizen who is, if nothing else, a martyr for truth and reason. His arguments are often contingent on faulty reasoning, apparently either because his own position cannot be logically forwarded or because he believes that an illogical argument attractively presented may be effective, especially if it manages to reach a shocking conclusion. In any case, the reader knows that he is supposed to take Mr. Review seriously. Thus, the argument may be said to be direct.

Defoe does not always use these direct methods of argument, however. In the issue for June 22, 1708, Mr. Review is accosted by a madman offers him the key to the madman's apartment in Bedlam because he believes Mr. Review to be as mad as himself. A debate develops and

continues in almost every issue until mid-November, 1708, when the madman drops out of sight forever. The projected effects of a debate between a madman and a person of Mr. Review's reputation are obvious: the madman, it may be supposed, would simply take the position of Mr. Review's opponents so that those arguments might be called mad. But such a simple scheme cannot suit the elusive Defoe. Quite frequently it is the madman, through some bright flash of irrational insight, who defeats Mr. Review. For example, let us suppose that Defoe wants to make a very dangerous point about some powerful person or persons. To manage the attack without involving Mr. Review, he simply has Mr. Review take an ordinary, conservative attitude toward the whole affair. Then Defoe lets the madman drub him soundly. Mr. Review loses the argument but Defoe has made his argument indirectly. By turning madness into truth and reason into error, Defoe's shocking conclusions to the arguments are perhaps more effective and more amenable to the readers than a direct argument would have been. Also, the argument becomes so confused by the mad logic of the lunatic that a reader has a difficult time sifting through it. The ultimate effect is subtle misdirection: while the audience watches the pretty girl, the magician performs his trick.

An examination of certain essays will explain Defoe's method of argument with the madman. First, the issue for October 23 shows Mr. Review and Madman in their simplest relationship. Madman forwards the arguments of the newspapers and the Whig men of heat who would have the Emperor move into the papal states on the strength that, should the Pope be defeated, it would hurt Catholicism:

Mad Man. YES, yes, Mr. Review, you bespoke me in your last Review, and you might have spar'd your Labour; I should have been upon you without the Trouble of a formal Challenge.

Review. You take Arms at the first Alarm; what is the Matter?

M. Matter, you shall hear that with both your Ears; why you are turn'd Papist—

Rev. Or Mahometan, or any thing, go on.

M. No, no, nothing but Papist; and you are writing as hard as you can against the War in Italy, for Fear the Pope should be pull'd down.

Rev. For Fear he should not be pull'd down you mean. I suppose?

M. Not at all; I mean what I say, for Fear the Emperor should pull down the Pope; you are for the Confederates refusing to assist him in his new Quarrel with the Pope—Are not you a Papist now?—

Rev. What Reason have you for calling me a Papist for that?

M. Why every Protestant would be for pulling down Popery by Head and Shoulders.

Rev. And I as soon as any Body; but this mad Discourse of yours brings me back to where I ended in my last, viz. That pulling down the Pope, and pulling down Popery, are two Things—I have given my Opinion about the Emperor's Quarrel with the Pope; all the World knows, the Emperor does not Quarrel at Popery—It is not his Design to pull down the Pontificate; if he had the Pope in his Power, Prisoner in St. Angelo, he would offer not the least Violence to him, as Head of the Church, or Representative and Successor of S. Peter; if he slew him in Battle, he would immediately set up another Ecclesiastical Idol in his Place. But the Quarrel at the Pope is, as he is Possessor of several Places, which they call Fiefs and Vassals to the Empire, temporally consider'd, detains these Governments from, and defends them against the Emperor; and in this Capacity it is, the Emperor differs with his Holiness, and what's all this to Popery?

M. You are all for Distinctions; but we will not take it that way, pulling down Pope, and pulling down Popery must be a Kin; it cannot be, but pulling down the Power of the Pope will have some Influence upon Popery—And let me but see the Pope come down, whom we call Antichrist, we shall think Popery will follow.

Rev. If there was no other Pope to be set up in his Room, somewhat might be; but you are all wrong, if this Pope were depos'd for his Partiality to France, as I think it were well enough if he were; yet he would immediately be succeeded by another, the State of Popery would be the same, and the deposing the Pope would have no other Signification, as to pulling down Popery, that the Death of a Pope has, which

> terminates only in this, viz. The Assembling the Conclave to choose a new Pope—Who, when he is errected, is just the same Ecclesiastick old Gentleman as his Predecessor—. (V, 357-8)

But clearly the Madman is only a straw man; his argument is wrongheaded and Mr. Review easily quashes his feeble case because Madman has no Reason to support him. He has only his blind hatred for Catholicism.[5]

It is more common, however, to find Madman arguing a point which, at first, appears absurd but soon shows a mad wisdom. In these arguments Mr. Review plays the "straight man," i.e., supporting the position which seems to be the valid one. For example, the Review for September 18 begins a debate, lasting for several installments, concerning the practice of public thanksgivings and prayers, which are strongly supported by the Queen. Often Defoe has preached sermons to encourage the people to thank God for victories and offer prayers when important battles hang in the balance or when the war is going badly. He has repeatedly chided them for not observing these public ceremonies of worship and warned them, in his best prophetic voice, that God would turn his favor to the French if they did not mend their ways. At first it appears that this will be a commonplace argument—Madman falling victim to Mr. Review. Mr. Review argues, as expected, that the French, in praying for deliverance during the Confederate seige of Lille, are being truly Christian; Madman is confident, after reading the newswriters that the seige is so easy that

---

[5]Notably one finds Mr. Review taking the other side in an earlier debate and being soundly thrashed by Madman, who recognizes the Emperor's motives as sheer madness. The Emperor's old debts and jealousies, he suggests, will be the ruin of the Confederacy.

prayers are not necessary. Thereupon, Mr. Review ascertains that "you are talking like a true Bedlamite; or that if you are sober, you talk by Irony, and expect to be understood so" (V, 299). Of course, he is talking "by Irony": he is in this case an ironic persona who in his very argument is made to attack those who put such mad notions into people's heads.

By the next issue, however, the tables have turned; now Madman and Mr. Review agree that public celebrations of thanksgiving are good, but Madman defeats Mr. Review, who perhaps too closely follows government policy by attacking the method of thanksgiving in practice. From the beginning of the debate it appears that Defoe simply wants to let Mr. Review repeat the case for public worship. Mr. Review first secures a promise from the madman not to attack the Queen for leading the processing to the cathedral. Then, upon the lunatic's request, he provides a lecture upon models of public thanksgiving in the Bible. All goes well and the madman remains subdued until Mr. Review mentions public feasting. Then the madman begins his attack on the method of thanksgiving in England.

> M. Ay, ay, their Feasts, their Feasts, there I shall have it—And there I suppose, the Magistrates were always drunk, and sung, and swore, and sp..d, saving your Worship's Presence, to the Honour of the Occasion.
>
> Rev. Nothing like it.
>
> M. Well, but to be sure they drank Healths to their great Captains and Generals, such as Moses and Joshuah, and some times to the Immortal Memory of Abraham, Issac and Jacob, no question they did that.
>
> Rev. You are raving now indeed; those Things were not known then; the D___l had not carry'd on his Kingdom to such a Height.

M. How! Nor did they not drink a Health to the Tabernacle, or to the Urim and Thummim, to the Ark, or afterwards to the Temple?

Rev. It would have been notorious Blasphemy, and have been punish'd with immediate Death.

M. Why, do not some of our Magistrates do all these Things? Do not they roar, and be drunk, and swear, and blaspheme, and drink Healths to the Church, and Healths to the Protestant Religion? Certainly, these Things must be found, either in Precept or Example, in the Scripture as a Work proper for a Day of Thanksgiving, or else our Rulers, Justices, &c. nay, and Spiritual Guides too, would never do so.

Rev. Certainly you must be mistaken, or else they ought to have their Gowns pull'd over their Ears, and be made Examples. Do not be too positive, are you sure of the Fact?

M. Have you a Mind to have a black List? If you'll come to my Chamber in Bedlam, I'll show you a Catalogue of Names pasted up against my Wall; there I can read you the Men and the Crimes; there you have the Mayor of . . . . and Five of his Brethren, the very last Thanksgiving-Day at Night, so drunk, they could not find their Way home; there you have . . . and two Men of a Cloth drinking Healths to the Church of England, till they could be known to be of no Church but by their Out-sides, Devil Tavern, No. (. . . . .) There I can give you a list of some City Clubs of our first Rate Gentlemen, who having lately very worthily suppress'd Vice in Bartholomew-Fair, were giving Thanks in Claret for the Victory of Audenard, till the Wine got the Victory over their Understandings, and they left us a sad Pattern of City Sobriety—And indeed, my Catalogue is so long, that it is not One, or Two, or Ten of your Papers will hold it—There you have all the Thunder of their Oaths, the Irruptions of Blasphemy, and the Noise of Damnation, SO LOUD, the Canon at the Siege of Lisle is a Fool to it, for it reaches up to Heaven, and pierces not the Ears, but the Souls of honest Men.

Rev. This is a sad Story, and I doubt has too much Truth in it.

M. Now, since this is the general Method of our Thanksgiving, I appeal to all the world out of Bedlam to judge—And if it be really true, that this was not the Method, of giving Thanks in former Days, if there is no such Practice allow'd of in the Scripture, I cannot imagine, what you think of your selves; as to your publick Thanksgivings, the QUEEN leads you to the Church, there you mock GOD a little with a Song, and pretend to praise him, and from thence you adjourn to the Taverns or to Feastings, and there in your more sincere Manner, you fly in his Face with all Manner of Excesses, insulting the Majesty of Heaven by Way of Thanksgiving, and calling upon him to damn you, instead of delivering you—What

> Drunkenness! What Revelling! What Deformity of Manners and Debauching of Morals, are the Practices of our Rejoycings, as if GOD were to be prais'd by the Help of the Devil, and to be wicked to Excess was the best Acknowledgment of his Goodness! If this be to give Thanks, if this be the Return you make to Heaven for his Mercies, and for delivering you, for disappointing Invasions, and giving you Victory, I know not what you say to it, Mr. Review, But I assure you we in Bedlam think, 'tis the only Way to cause Heaven, in meer Mercy to you, to take away the Occasions of such Mockery, that such horrid Hypocrisie, and monstrous Affronts of his Majesty may not provoke him to turn your Joy into Sorrow, and see, whether you can be more sincere in your Days of Humiliation, than you are in your Thanksgiving.
>
> Rev. You are gotten into a sad Story, O I care not to hear it—
>
> M. Have I made out my Charge, am I as good as my Word?
>
> Rev. Ay, ay, I acknowledge it—I beseech you give me Quarter, I am perfectly conquer'd, it is all true, too true—Publish it not in Gath—The whole Nation ought to blush and be asham'd; but in Pity let us not enter into Particulars. (V, 302-303)

The effect of the argument results from surprise; the readers, knowing that the Review has strongly advocated public prayer and thanksgiving in order to win God's favor and help in carrying on the war with France, are certainly with Mr. Review at the beginning of the argument and probably expect Madman to provide a Jacobite argument. But the audience soon discovers the mad reversal in the mind of Madman: the argument is not against the theory of thanksgivings but against the practice. Madman points out the irony of blaspheming God while trying to win His favor, and Mr. Review, who laughed at Madman at the beginning, is forced soberly to acquiesce to his mad insight.[6]

---

[6]This argument between Madman and Mr. Review is characteristic of the earliest concepts of irony—dissimilation, or saying one thing and meaning another. In one sense Defoe pretends, through Mr. Review, to argue for public thanksgiving when he is actually attacking the method

In Madman's argument against thanksgiving, Defoe's moral indignation shines through the veneer of his character, so that anyone who wants to stress that Madman is only a mouthpiece for Defoe may do so with some security. When danger is a greater factor in the argument however, Mr. Review does not so easily accept Madman's position and Madman takes on more independent qualities. Regarding, for example, an earlier assertion that some English noblemen had been guilty of treason at the siege of Lille, Madman (November 18) makes a show of retracting his accusation and proving them innocent, ironically by proving that no noblemen of England were at the siege at all and, consequently, by suggesting cowardice and treason of another kind. Mr. Review is incredulous at first but madman logic soon prevails:

> Review. MY Mad-man, I am very sorry for you.
> Mad Man. For me, Sir, Pray, what am I to be pity'd for, I never knew a mad Man seek any Body's Pity?
> Rev. Why they say, you are to be had up for scandalizing the English Nobility.
> M. When did I scandalize them, I beseech you, I value them as much as any Man in my College?
> Rev. But you told us a rude Story, insinuating, that the Siege of Lisle was retarded and kept back by the Treachery of some of the Nobility of England, who were General Officers in the Camp, and betray'd Things to the French; and is not this a scandalous Thing of you?
> M. You are a strange Man, you would not be serv'd so your self, I never reported it as my own; I only said it as a Thing talk'd of abroad among Foreigners.
> Rev. Well, but you are satisfy'd, I hope, it was a scandalous Report, are you not?
> M. Ay, ay, I am satisfied it is not true, and yet I never heard a Word to contradict it in my life.

---

of public thanksgiving through Madman. Also, the audience is led to believe that the argument is to be about the desirability of thanksgiving when it really is about the morality of the method. See Norman Knox, The Word Irony and Its Context, 1500-1755 (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1961), pp. 11-12.

Rev. This is another Mystery; pray, how come you to be satisfy'd of that, and yet heard nothing to contradict it?

M. Why, what cannot be true, may easily be contradicted, and I am satisfied this cannot be true.

Rev. Why so?

M. Because all the General Officers in the Army, that were English Noblemen, were absent from the Siege, and how could they betray the Designs when they were not there?

After this sharp turn of madman logic Mr. Review tries to get Madman to name the noblemen who were not there and, therefore, not guilty, but Madman is too wise to fall into such a dangerous trap. Instead he challenges Mr. Review to name them, and, when Mr. Review, sensitive to the danger of accusing the nobility of cowardice, says that he does not know them, the madman has won his case:

M. No nor I neither, nor e're a Man alive; for except the Duke of Marlborough, the whole Peerage of England does not afford one of their Body, that I ever heard of, that troubles their Head with Trenches or Sieges, at least now—

Rev. You a great R...e I tell you, and you will be trounsed for it some time or other; have we not several Noblemen that are Generals and Lieutenant Generals.

M. They are all at home then, I believe, for I meet with none of them in the Attacks of Lisle, or relieving the Trenches at the Coffee-Houses, Chocolate-Houses, Gaming Ordnaries, and the like, I have nothing to do with; I am only examining where they are not, and this in order to do them Service.

Rev. What Service do you pretend to do them, I wonder, they will expect but little Service from you, I believe; if you please to let them alone, it's the best Service you can do them.

M. You mistake very much; I think, it is a Service sufficient to them to vindicate them from such a Scandal as this of betraying Things to the Enemy, and there can be no better Way to prove they were not guilty, than to prove they were not there.

Rev. Ay, but you do it by Way of Banter and Slander.

M. You cannot distinguish; Truth may be a Scandal, but Truth cannot be a Slander; and that the Thing is but too true, I leave to you to judge. . . .

The madman now argues that the nobility of other European nations have fought bravely in the war while the English nobility

> make their Campaigns in Chocolate and cold Tea, they fight at home, and talk of Things abroad, they can pass Censures, rave at and damn the Heroes that act abroad, challenge every Man's Conduct, and find Fault with what they cannot mend; but as for Campaigns, ask an English Nobleman, my Lord. where did your Lordship make your last Campaign? Campaign, Sir, d__n, ye Sir, I never make Campaigns, I am a Person of Quality, Sir, it's below my Dignity to make Campaigns, let the Mercenaries go abroad that fight for Pay, I scorn the Drudgery of the War; let any Man but examine our Gentry and Nobility, Arms and Letters are their Aversion, the Pulpit and the Campaign are only for younger Brothers, they scorn those Employments, and it is below them—It is not to the Purpose to tell them, that in this it is below them to serve their Country, below them to qualifie themselves for the publick Service of GOD, that Learning is below them, Honour their Aversion, and the Character of Great and Brave, a Sham they have no Occasion for—That this is a slander, let any Body prove, by telling me how many of the English Nobility appear'd in the Field, even when their King was at the Head of their Armies; and except O.....d, R...s, Ess..x, and a few more Youths of War and Courage; few, if any, of the English Nobility have shewn their Faces, either with King William or the Duke of Marlborough in the greatest and most honourable War that ever England had; Scotland shames them, and One is apt to blush when we read the Gazetts, how the Duke of Arg..le the Earl of Stai...s and other Noblemen were as Volunteirs storming the Counterscarp of Lisle, and not an English Man of Quality to be seen there—It must needs be a Slander, that English Noblemen betray'd us, when not an English Man of the upper Rank has shown his Face on that side this Summer, neither to honour their Generals, or the Nation. (V, 401-403)

The double-edged irony of Madman's argument in favor of the five noblemen accused of treason at Lille emphasizes how Defoe uses Mr. Review and Madman as masks. Normally Mr. Review is Daniel Defoe, author of the Review, but here his argument comes through the mouth of Madman, while Mr. Review berates it. Thus Defoe, through the madman, appears to belittle his own position. At the same time, if what Madman

says can be considered Defoe's voice, the argument is ironic because in pretending to clear these five men of treason he condemns the whole of English nobility of a crime worse than treason.[7] The madman, however, is not being ironic because this is only his mad way of reasoning; he cannot be assumed to be purposely contradicting his expressed aim in the argument.

Several years after the madman dialogues Defoe uses a peculiarly similar method of ironically hiding his identity to promote a slight volume of predictions called The British Visions: Or Isaac Bickerstaff, Sen. Being Twelve Prophesies for the Year 1711. The author of the work, of course, is Defoe himself, but he pretends to know nothing of the work except that it came out of Scotland, was printed first in Newcastle several months prior to its London appearance, and is now being sold, by great coincidence, at the shop of John Baker, Defoe's printer for the Review.

Defoe's treatment of British Visions is ironic from the beginning.[8] First of all, the validity or credibility of the predictions depends

---

[7]This is what Knox calls blame-by-praise irony. It is the most common form of irony in the eighteenth century (pp. 58-9).

[8]Defoe's discussion of British Visions must certainly be considered a kind of personal irony: he knew that it was a hoax; he knew that many of the readers would suspect that it was a hoax. Therefore, he deliberately overpraises the very predictions that most clearly indicate the hoax. Also the evidence of the authenticity of British Visions is so flimsy that Defoe's insistence upon that evidence further insures the irony. He pretends to argue for the work's authenticity but his argument serves to assure the readers that he is not serious. See Knox's discussion of praising the thing for what it really is (p. 145), audience recognition of irony (p. 147) and the elaborations of fictions (pp. 84-5).

upon a specific prediction—the death of the Dauphin—which has already taken place when Defoe offers the pamphlet for sale. Naturally people are going to believe that this miraculous prophesy was made after the fact, as indeed it was, but Defoe steadfastly maintains the authenticity of the prophesy by arging that it was earlier published in Newcastle (should anyone want to travel to Newcastle to check his story) before the prediction had come to pass. Surely Defoe did not expect anyone to believe his fabrication about the work's origin and history, especially since its unknown author published it under the name of Isaac Bickerstaff. Furthermore, although the prediction of the Dauphin's death is very specific in naming the person and the time of death, most of the other prophesies are not nearly so specific. In fact, they are more in line with predictions by palm readers and crystal-ball gazers—i.e., they are so general and so obvious that they can always be construed as correct. Some of them are little more than repetitions of what Defoe has already repeatedly warned. For example, the prophet predicts that France will "[consult] how to support Spain, Embroil the Emperor, bring Home the Swede, restore Bavaria, doze Savoy, fright the Dutch, and divide the English, and he will, in some Measure, accomplish them all" (VII, 55). Regarding the prediction that "Many Bloody skirmishes happen between the Tartars and the Cossacks," Defoe is totally overcome with awe despite the generality and predictability of the prophecy: "Two of these we have an Account of last Post, wherein the Tartars and the Cossacks are the only People that Fought—Bless us! Where was this man born? Or who could tell him these Things?" Several weeks later in an "Advertisement

about the late PROPHECY" he even concludes that "A Great Minister of State dies in the Month of March" has foretold the death of the Earl of Rochester in April.

To sweeten the hoax, Defoe prints a "letter" from the friend in Newcastle who first introduced him to the work, and in the letter it is revealed that an even more surprising prediction occurred in the manuscript of the work that further substantiates the prophet's fantastic powers. Defoe quotes the letter in part:

> What think you now of the Book of Prophesies I gave you? I doubt not but you will be startled, when you hear of the Dauphin of France being Dead; which he positively Names—But you will be more Startled when I shall tell you, That in the Original Manuscript which I have by me, and shall shew you, if I live to see you in Scotland, it was also expressly said, the Emperor should die in the Month of April; but the Publishers fearing they might be brought into some Danger, refus'd to Print that Paragraph—This I assure you, startles me very much since we have Advice by this Post, that the Emperor is Sick—And I am persuaded upon this Prophesie that he will die. (VIII, 48)

Of course by April 21, 1711, the date on which the "letter" was printed the Emperor had been long dead, but by pretending that the letter had been written prior to his death and just as reports were beginning to suggest the truth of the prophesy, Defoe manages another twist in his irony. Certainly this "letter," especially coming at such a fortuitous moment, must have convinced even the dullest reader that Defoe was being ironic, and with the irony established, he is free to carry it as far as he can. Therefore, the reader finds him several weeks later indignantly and with a very straight face answering apparent charges that there is some fraud involved in the publication of British Visions. How some of

his less respectful readers devised such an absurd notion is a mystery to Defoe because he has bountiful proof of the work's authenticity—from everyone who is in on the plot:

> WHEN I lately made some Remarks in this Paper, upon a little Book Entitled BRITISH VISIONS, &c. I little thought any Man would have been so unjust to me, as to suggest either that I gave a Weight to the Particulars there, beyond, what I express'd; That I concluded them the serious Produce of Immediate Inspiration, and the like, and as such recommended them to the World. . . .
>
> Much less did I suspect, that any (judging, as I must needs Guess, by some seeds of Fraud and Forgery they find within themselves) could be so unjust and uncharitable, as to suggest, that this Book was Written and Printed here since the Death of the Emperor and the Dauphin, and that all the Notion of being seen six Months ago, was a Forgery to get a Peny—These People really need no Answer from me, but what the Daughter is said to give to her mother, that look'd for her in the Oven—But to make these People a little asham'd, if they can blush; for as the first Suggestion was unjust so really this is Villinous and Malicious—But I say, to let them know this Thing was not put upon them on the bare word of a Print, or that I espected they, that are so apt to be Jealous of all Men, should take it on my single Assertion—I give them this Direction to inform themselves.
>
> The Book was Printed in Newcastle at a Publick Printing-House—where Mr. Button, the Master of the said Work, a Man known in this City, and of good Reputation here as well as there, may be enquir'd of; Three Servants, whose Names are J. Saywell, ... Kid, and James Goodall, are all witnesses and Workmen, in the setting or Composing and Printing it off, and these are all ready to testifie that it was Printed and Finished, the same that is now, without any Alteration, the latter end of January last or the beginning of Fery [sic].
>
> The whole Country thereabouts are Witnesses, that in February and beginning of March, they were cried and publickly sold in the streets there, and Mr. Baker, the Publisher here offers to make Oath, that he had them offer'd to him to sell here, at least 2 months before the Death of the Dauphin.
>
> And if all this will not convince them, the Review offers to produce them more. (VIII, 72)

Defoe's handling of British Visions almost unquestionably arises, in part, from his enjoyment of personal irony. When he begins his praise of the work and manufactures an elaborate story about its origin and history in order to contradict the obvious, only he knows that Daniel Defoe wrote it. But because of his concern for showing the validity of the prophesies and his use of such an obvious name as Isaac Bickerstaff surely his audience must have recognized the harmless joke, so that in arguing for its authenticity Defoe manages to reveal the hoax.

Yet, at the same time, the ironic argument serves to draw attention to British Visions, and, if Defoe may be believed, the little book became an overnight success. He reports on April 26, 1711, that there is great "Alarm" about the town over the book and that it is "in every Body's Hand, and in every Body's Mouth" (VIII, 53). As a result of its popularity, Defoe is therefore able to expound the more serious of the predictions, some of which, such as the prophesied plague to spread over Europe and Britain, become important themes in later Reviews. Other predictions, such as the warning of internal turmoil and strife had long been Defoe's favorite subjects. Thus his argument serves both to entertain and to persuade readers to take a closer look at his own prognostications.[9]

---

[9] British Visions of 1711 was apparently so successful, either as a money maker or a platform to spread his views, that Defoe brought out another version in 1712 called The Highland Visions, or the Scots New Prophecy: Declaring in Twelve Visions what strange Things shall come to pass in the Year 1712. See VIII, 645-648 and VIII, 745. In the latter passage the reader finds him again gleefully and ironically praising his prophet: "sure no Man ever gave so true an account of Things, before the Circumstances gave the least light to know them by, As this Man has

Irony in the Review is often a more serious matter than in Mr. Review's comic dialogues with Madman or his playful argument and proofs of the authenticity and virtues of British Visions. Nevertheless, in such serious matters as assaults on Tories and Jacobites the methods are much the same as in his more humerous irony. As noted, the creation of the protean and man allows Defoe to set him up as advocate of widely differing and contrasting causes while associating those causes with madness or natural wisdom as the circumstances and politics demand. Thus, although Madman appears serious and mouths the arguments of Tories, for example, those arguments are discredited because they come from a lunatic who, in these instances, readily admits his own madness and the insanity of his arguments. On the other hand, Mr. Review, who should be sane, often finds himself outflanked because his arguments lack the imaginative powers of madness. But whatever the case, the irony arises out of the characters themselves.

Such is also true in his treatment of the British Visions. He first creates a mystic hidden away in the Highlands of Scotland, then fabricates a history of the work, along with a friend who sends a letter to corroborate the story. Finally he has Mr. Review introduce the work as miraculous and ardently maintain that no fraud is involved in a work penned by an author who calls himself Isaac Bickerstaff.

Done; since the Spirit of Prophecy departed from the World—If this Man has not the Second Sight, I can hardly think there is any such Thing in the World. . . ." Another version was published in 1713 under the title The Second-Sighted Highlander: Or, Predictions and Foretold Events: Especially about the Peace. See John Robert Moore, A Checklist of the Writings of Daniel Defoe, 2d ed. (Hamden, Conn.: Anchor Books, 1971), p. 101.

In his ironies on more serious issues the effect is almost always achieved by creating characters or by making Mr. Review take on a personality or advocate an idea that goes totally against the position of the Review. Thus there is never any doubt that the arguments are intended to be ludicrous. Defoe had gotten into trouble with the Shortest Way with the Dissenters because the irony was not apparent, and for much the same reason he later found himself in trouble again with his Reasons against the Succession of the House of Hanover and What if the Pretender should come? In explaining his ironic method in the latter two works, he claims that any impartial reader who reads the whole of the works will recognize the irony; those who have attacked him as a Jacobite have quoted only parts. Defoe explains that "being written Ironically, all the first Part, if taken asunder from the last Part, will read, as in all Ironical speaking must be, just contrary: But taken complexly, taken whole, and of a Piece, can leave no room to doubt, but that they are written to Ridicule and Expose the very Notions of bringing in the Pretender" ([IX], 167). He really had no such problems in the Review because when his Tories or Jacobites speak no one can construe their opinions to be those of the Review. Similarly, when Mr. Review embraces some position contrary to that usually espoused by the Review, the reader should suspect that Mr. Review is being ironic. And should suspicion not be enough, the ironic arguments are usually so ludicrous that no one could mistake their meaning.

At the beginning of Volume III, which is supposed to deal mostly with matters of trade, Defoe argues at length for the protection of the

honest debtor who has, Defoe can personally attest, been ruined on one hand by dishonest debtors and on the other by malicious creditors who would rather have their pound of flesh than their money. But as a bill called an Act for Preventing Frauds Committed by Bankrupts is being passed in Parliament Defoe, for one essay (March 21, 1706), suddenly pretends that he has been won over by the more vicious tradesmen. He devotes most of the issue to explaining his sudden conversion:

> What tho' I have no particular Debtor who I have squeez'd too hard, and that I have got more from than all the rest of his Creditors, which if this Act passes, I must refund. I hope, I may as well justifie my being against the Bill with no reason, as M. G... B....can, for a Reason he is asham'd to tell.

He proceeds then to summarize the arguments given by creditors, which, had he heard them earlier, would have prevented him from every arguing for the bill:

> 1. That Bankrupts and Insolvents grow Rich by lying in Prison, and are frequently enabled by the Confinement of a Gaol to Pay their Debts; for that this being an Age, particularly Compassionate to the Miserable, Friends and Relations often raise Funds for delivering them, and not only Pay their Debts, but leave them Rich, very Rich when it is done.
>
> What, tho' sometimes here and there a few are Starv'd, and Perish with Want and Misery, in Newgate, the Fleet, Queen's Bench and Rules, their Number is inconsiderable, and put all together, they cannot prove, that above 500 Families have been Starv'd so, for almost a WHOLE YEAR—Whereas the Number that daily are deliver'd, by the Generosity of Mankind, is hardly to be reckon'd up.
>
> 2. That the Great Outcry, of the Cruelty of Creditors, is a Scare Crow, a meer Rawhead and Bloody Bones, a Priapus, set up to fright Fools, and Amuse the World; the thing is quite contrary, and whenever Debtors are Honest, and will but come and Surrender MORE THAN THEY HAVE, the Creditors are always kind, and give them back part of it, and Encourage them to

> begin the World again WITH NOTHING to the manifest Relief of them and their Families, and this is so frequent, that there are unquestion'd Instances of it, particularly in the Linnen-Draper in Covent Garden, about which, a certain Gentleman—told some forg'd Stories at the Bar of the House of Lords—For these Gentlemen have us'd that poor Man so tenderly, that having got all he has in the World' and dispos'd of it most Compassionately, at about half the Value, Charitably turn'd him and his Wife out of Doors, and not left him a Shilling to buy Bread; they Generously now offer him his Liberty, and the Honour of a Journeysman's Office, if he will but quit his Hopes of Ten Pound a Year, that is not yet in his Possession, nor never may be.
>
> However, as the Compassions of these Gentlemen require a larger Description, in order to Confute the Allegations of those, that Cry out of Cruelty; there is a large History, of the several Remarkable Instances, of the Mercy of Creditors in England, preparing for the Press, in which those Person's, now Scandaliz'd that way, may be Vindicated, as far as Matter of Fact will do it, from these sort of Aspersions, particularly of a certain Tender Hearted Gentleman-Creditor to his own Father, two or three Compassionate Brothers, and some other decent Examples to Clear the Nation of this Scandal.[10] (III, 138-39)

The arguments of the "Opposers of the Bill" are classic examples of contradiction and absurdity because their case for the creditors' kindness shows them to be instead, inhuman monsters. The first point of their argument is presented by Mr. Review with considerable understatement so that what the opposers consider a valid argument

---

[10]Mr. Review cites the other arguments that would have convinced him to oppose the bill, but I omit them because the irony in them disintegrates into sarcasm. The third argument is that the bill was kept secret but Defoe points out the absurdity of this position by noting the long debate before Parliament on the bill, the publication of the votes on the bill, and his own arguments on it. He then drifts into abuse of the linen drapers and stock jobbers. The fourth asserts that the merchants are against the bill but Defoe denies this and ridicules that claim as nothing but lies. The kind of irony employed in repeating these arguments is what Knox calls "concession," i.e., the author concedes another point of view in order to ridicule or attack that point of view (p. 115). The fictitious indictment and the fake letters to be discussed later seem to be in the same category.

against the bill is, in reality, a condemnation of creditors. No one, they say, can prove that "above 500 Families" have starved because of creditor greed and revenge. Thus Mr. Review implies in his statement of their argument that, for these gentlemen, five hundred is not a great number at all. Moreover, the opposers claim for their case that the number includes all the families starved "for almost a WHOLE YEAR," apparently a lengthy period. Thus Mr. Review has been persuaded, the reader infers, by these "weighty" statistics that pretend that families are not being starved by creditors at an unusual rate. That families are being starved at all does not seem to be an important issue.

The second point of their argument is that creditors have been particularly kind to debtors and the irony arises out of these expressions of kindness which are used to explain the most abominable of brutalities. According to the opposers (via Mr. Review), the creditors are "always kind" when the debtors give up "MORE THAN THEY HAVE"; they open up their hearts to return some of the debtors' money so that he can begin again "WITH NOTHING." Such kindness is described by opponents to the bill as a "manifest Relief" to families of debtors, and so frequent are these kindnesses that they will serve to vindicate creditors "as far as Matter of Fact will do it." Examples of their sympathy, of course, create quite the opposite impression. The linen draper was used so "tenderly," so "Compassionately," and so "Charitably" that he lost his business and was forced to become a journeyman again. There are examples of the same kind of treatment extended to fathers and brothers of creditors. Apparently capitalists were the same in Defoe's time as they were in that of Dickens.

Several years later Mr. Review undergoes a remarkably similar conversion when he is convinced to become a Highflyer by an address of the town of Banbury to the Queen. The address, of which Defoe prints an "Abstract," is full of Sacheverell's nonresistance sentiment:

> WE Your Majesty's most Dutiful and Loyal Subjects, being always truly sensible of your Majesty's pious Care of, and Zeal for the Welfare and Prosperity of our most holy Religion, and happy Constitution, crave leave to renew our Assurances of our inviable Duty and Loyalty to Your Majesty, by testifying our just Detestation and Abhorrence of the Seditious Principles of those, who under the specious pretence of securing the Rights, Liberties, and Properties of the People, have, of late, openly professed, and endeavour'd to propagate the Doctrine of Resistance; a Doctrine equally destructive of your just Prerogative, and of (what it would seem to secure to us) the Well-being of your people; contrary to the Law of God, and the Practices both of the Apostles, and Primitive Christians, even in the most Perilous Times; and the more Abominable, at this Juncture, (as it is a Sin without Temptation) under the best and mildest of Governments.
>
> The Sense of our Duty to God, Your Majesty, and our most happy Constitution, shall always keep us firm to our old English Principles of Loyalty to our Sovereign, and teach us to transmit the Same to our latest Posterity; that if God Almighty shall deny us the Blessing of Issue from your Majesty, to reign over us, After Ages may enjoy, under the Government establish'd by Law in the Illustrious House of Hanover, the same Blessings we now and long may we, enjoy, under your Majesty's most serene and auspicious Reign. (VII, 82)

The loyalty and sincerity of this address has so softened the rebellious Mr. Review that he proposes that all people be instructed by it and carry its principles to their logical conclusion--i.e., to complete Jacobitism. The address of the Banbury men seems so sincere, so full of loyalty that Mr. Review himself is inspired to present his own address—an address which proves to be a parody of the Banbury one and manages through its similarity of style and approach to accuse the Banbury gentlemen of being nothing other than Jacobites:

To the Queen's De Facto's most Excellent Majesty
The Humble Address of, &c. _____ [Defoe would have the reader fill in the names of the Banburby men.]

We your Majesty's Dutiful and Loyal Subjects, being deeply sensible of the just Anger of Heaven, against this whole Nation, as well your Majesty as your People, for the many Hainous Sins, Wherefore we are all avowedly Guilty, and for which we have great Reason to fear, thus some imminent Judgment shall suddenly befall us; and being more particularly affected, with the great Guilt that lies on the Nation, for Traiterously espousing that Abominable Doctrine of Resistance; a Sin without a Temptation, and a Sin we were never so much as now, truly sensible of; do most humbly Address your Majesty, That you will be pleased to Issue out your Royal Proclamation, appointing a Solemn Day of Fasting and Humiliation, throughout Your Majesty's Dominions, on such certain Day or Days, as to your Majesty shall seem meet—In order to Deprecate the just Anger of Heaven, and to avert the Judgments we have so just Reason to fear, are Impending over us, for being Nationally Guilty of Resisting, and living in Rebellion, against our Lawful and Annointed King, your Majesty's Royal Father, who we unrighteously Oppos'd, and Depos'd, as we to our great Grief and Sorrow, now understand; Resistance of the Sovereign being utterly unlawful, upon any pretence whatsoever; and that humble Prayers may at the same time be made, by All Your Majesty's good Subjects, that the Heir Male of our said Sovereign, and your Majesty's Royal Father, and his adherents, may be prosper'd in all their Righeous Endeavours, to restore him to the Throne of his Ancestors, from which he was thus Illegally thrust out by an ungodly Resistance, and of which Your Majesty by Virtue of that ungodly Resistance, is possess'd.

God preserve your Majesty's Royal Person, and give your Majesty as long, as prosperous, and as glorious a Reign, as may consist—with our just Sense of the Hainous Sins abovesaid, and with that Repentence which we desire to express, for our said Resistance and Rebellion, against our Lawful King, whose Diveine Right we are since instructed, no Humane Power could supersede.[11] (VII, 82-83)

As Defoe made what he considered to be a logical extension of High-flying doctrine in his The Shortest Way with the Dissenters, here Mr. Review's address lifts the reference to resistance in the Banbury address and expands it to a statement of Jacobite doctrine. If it be

---

[11]This address was later published on a folio half-sheet under the title The Banbury Convert: Or, Daniel De Foe's Address to Her Majesty. See John Robert Moore's A Checklist of the Writings of Daniel Defoe, p. 71.

wrong to resist Queen Anne, Mr. Review reasons, it was just as wrong to resist King James. Thus the High-Church doctrine of passive obedience becomes simply Jacobite doctrine, once the sham of politeness and submission is torn away. Similarly the frequent expressing of loyalty to the Queen, her heir (should she have one), and the succession are almost deleted, becoming instead a lament for King James and a desire that his heir might take the throne. The original address tries to make the doctrine of resistance treason against the Queen, but Mr. Review's radical extension makes Queen Anne a traitor as well. References to the "Law of God" and the "Sense of our Duty to God" in the original become requests for public prayers so that God might forgive Englishmen for their resistance to James. The original, of course, is presented in abject humility to the Queen, but in Mr. Review's address, humility is markedly absent.

In explanation of his conversion and proposed address to the Queen, Mr. Review discourses upon God's displeasure, under which all England suffers, and predicts better times if England will only repent her former sin. God's punishment for the great "Sin of Rebellion and Resistance" consists of "the Curse of Liberty, the Plague of Parliaments, the Deformity of being Govern'd by Law, the new Distemper of Union, the King's Evil, called by a modern Name Protestant Succession, the Frenzy of Protestant religion, and the like." What joys will accrue from God's forgiveness? According to Mr. Review, "we might in time, come to enjoy the Invaluable Blessings, of Popish Devotion, Arbitrary Dominion, French Constitution, Golden Chains, most Beautiful Wooden-Shoes, Jure Divino

Princes, Passively-obedient Slavery, and, Universal Bondage of Subjects" (VII, 83).[12]

In the foregoing examples Defoe has directed his irony and ire against his natural enemies the Jacobites, Highflyers, and Tories, but when he must, he finds it just as easy to sting the Whigs. After Harley and the Tory ministers come to power in August, 1710, it becomes Defoe's task to try to persuade Whigs to accept these men and support them for the good of the country. The theme becomes moderation and unity again, after a fiery lapse of two years when Harley was out of office (1708-1710). Thus when Defoe is forced to protect the government after the disastrous defeats in Spain in January, 1711, his tack is to persuade the Whigs that they should not oppose the government, no matter how much they oppose carrying on the war in Spain. Englishmen cannot, he suggests, afford disunity over such matters; rather they must stand behind the war effort, no matter where the war is being fought (VII, 525-27).

Apparently there is talk among those dissatisfied with the war effort that the generals defeated in Spain—Staremberg and Stanhope are

---

[12]Examples of the very simple irony of the Banbury Address are sprinkled throughout the Review. On several occasions he calls for a French invasion or a victory by Tories or Jacobites to open the eyes of Englishmen. See, for example, the essays employing the spectacles metaphor in IV, 94, 675-6, 685-6; V, 44, 91; VII, 192. In a series of essays beginning on May 18, 1708, Mr. Review exhorts the voters to choose Tories in the upcoming Parliamentary elections because Tories will make peace with France (by total capitulation) and because choosing Tories means the utter destruction of their party. It is their habit, Defoe observes, to be such extremists when they get into power that they unit everyone against them and, thus, destroy themselves. See V, 85ff.

the ones mentioned by the Review—should be punished for mismanagement. Such punishment, of course, Defoe cannot allow because it would reflect upon Harley and the ministry and it would, most certainly, errode the ministry's precarious base of power should moderates become divided over the issue. Therefore, it falls upon Defoe to defend these defeated generals. In the issue for January 27, 1711, he makes a direct argument: the circumstances in Spain are so unfavorable to the allies that no general could have saved the situation. Spain is so far away but so easily accessible from France that a small army will be defeated by the French but a large one will starve (VII, 526-27). Then in a more pertinent and effective argument he deflates the discontented by ironically arguing that these generals should be punished.

The place from which Defoe takes most of his argument is history:

> Indeed, I have been thinking sometimes, whether the Method of the Ancients was not very just, at least very necessary in War, viz. always to Censure and Condemn the Unfortunate, whether Guilty or no; this was the Practice even among the Romans, for a long Time, who never Ransom'd their Prisoners, nor receiv'd them again into the Number of their Citizens, for many Years of their most Flourishing State; many of their Generals after a Defeat, died in an Ignominious Retreat, without any notice, only for being unfortunate, without Examining whether they had Committed any Mistake or no; Nor has this Practice ceas'd yet in many Nations of the World; the Turks use their Generals thus to this Hour; If a Bassa loses a Battle, he loses his Head, What signifies Examining into Particulars? The Swedes also have been much of this Mind, and Gustavus Horn, the best Man of Action and of Counsel together, that ever the King of Sweden had, was thus Treated; he lost the Battle of Nordlinger, overpower'd with Numbers, and being Surrounded, he fought like Count Starembergh at Villa Vitiosa, and would give or take no Quarter, till at last, in meer Compassion to his Men, who would not take any Quarter without their General, but would all have been cut to pieces on the Spot; to save these, he yielded himself Prisoner—No Man could charge him with the least ill Conduct,

> nothing was ever laid to his Charge—Yet the Swedish Government entirely neglected him, as a Man lost, never offer'd Ransome or Exchange for him, and he died in Confinement, after Languishing fourteen Years in Prison; not Stanhope, not Starembergh, not the greater Galloway himself, could deserve better from a Nation than he did, as well for his Gallantry in the Field, as for Honour, Wisdom and Modesty when out of Employ; and at last, for Patience under the Ingratitude of his Country-men, of whom he would never complain, but would often say, it was a Crime sufficient, to be Unfortunate. (VII, 530)[13]

Yet, though history is one of the places for developing an argument, these three examples or pieces of evidence are clearly not designed to persuade anyone. Playing upon the battle between ancients and moderns, Defoe takes his first evidence from the Romans, who treated their generals just as the enemies of the ministry propose to treat Confederate generals. What could be better precedent, Defoe seems sardonically to imply, than that the Romans did it first? It should matter not to the worshippers of the ancients that the same thing happened to all defeated generals "whether Guilty or No." Next, when he mentiones the Turks as examples, every reader, even the ones who had missed the first irony, must have recognized that punishment of the Confederate generals would make the English and their Christian allies no better than the Turks. Finally, his use of Gustavus Horn as a precedent for ill treatment of unfortunate generals is even clearer as irony because he makes Horn's case truly pitiful, while at the same time directly associating him with the generals out of favor.

---

[13]Cf. in the issue for December 11, 1707 (IV, 519), the ironic argument for casting out the ministry.

Notably the irony in the passage almost dissipates with the example of Gustavus Horn, yet with the next two paragraphs Mr. Review revitalizes the playful thrust of his irony by appealing to the "common Sense" of his readers:

> I make no Application, nor does our Case need it; I know the great Commanders that now Appear in the World, are sure of Victory, command Success, and can never miscarry, because they can never be mistaken, and therefore, it is but just, that all the Unhappy and Unfortunate should be insulted by them as Criminal and Incapable.
>
> For this Reason, and good Reason too, no Man should undertake great Actions, but he that knows he shall succeed, or that can resolve to fight at Home with. . . . as he did Abroad, with Fire and Shot: Besides, why should we argue against common Sense? Is any Man happy and Successful, but by the Assistance of Providence, and therefore, the Praise is not due to the Hero, but to his Maker: That I am sure is true. On the other Hand; Has it not been always a Spanish Proverb, That Heaven is always on the strongest Side? And is not he that is beaten, always the Cause of his own Disaster, and therefore ought to be punish'd? (VII, 530)

In these two paragraphs Mr. Review first makes two absurd assumptions that show how ridiculous it is to punish the generals in question for losing battles: (1) great generals never make mistakes and (2) only those who are sure of not making mistakes should undertake great actions. Then he offers a more subtle absurdity, one that is particularly effective because Defoe has, on occasion, seriously suggested that winning or losing a battle is somehow indicative of God's providence. But here, as in his first two points, logic breaks down totally. The "Spanish Proverb" that God is always on the strongest side is absurd to a reasonable person because it means that might is always right. At the same time it implies that the generals lost not because they were facing superior forces but because God is always against the weaker army. Mr. Review's equally

ridiculous corollary is that, since the generals lost, God was against them and they deserive punishment. Finally, Mr. Review offers the absurd enthymeme that a man is always the cause of his own defeat. It follows the mad logic arising from the "Spanish Proverb" and, again, by its absurdity makes the cry for punishment equally absurd.[14]

As noted earlier, the irony of such passages as Defoe's argument to punish the generals who lost battles in Spain can be more effective than his anonymous ironic tracts because the readers know the Review and they know who writes it. There can be no misunderstanding; all readers should recognize the irony. The same is true of the various false letters and speeches in the Review. Whenever, for example, Defoe publishes anonymously a letter or pamphlet supposedly written by a Jacobite, he must depend on exaggerations and absurdities to indicate the irony, but when Mr. Review prints a damning letter from a Jacobite or reports a self-condemning speech by a Highflyer, the reader should be automatically suspicious of its function and origin. Therefore, the evil plots and devices of these people, who ironically condemn their causes for Defoe's readers, stand out in bold relief because the reader

---

[14]The rest of the essay suddenly takes up what appears to be the dismissal of Marlborough (although no names are mentioned). Mr. Review argues that great men have no reason to expect reward for their services to the country because it has long been English custom to betray those that did most for the country. He provides examples beginning with Henry VIII's "degrading Cardinal Woolsey" and stopping, when he cannot bear to continue, with James II's imprisoning of the bishops for throwing out the Bill of Exclusion. He concludes that "He that loses a Hand for us to Day, must lose his Head to Morrow . . ." (VII, 530-31). In a telling parallel to his argument on behalf of the defeated generals, Defoe shows that Englishmen are just as ready to withhold gratitude for success as they are for meting out punishment for failure.

expects a hoax and can be fairly certain that his expectations are being met.

For example, the entire issue for April 6, 1710, is taken up by a violent Tory's address to the Whigs of the nation. There is no introduction by Mr. Review but, although much of what the speaker says is certainly close to High-Church politics, the ordinary readers of the Review should have had no trouble in recognizing the irony because they should know that Defoe was not in the habit of relinguishing the Review to other writers, especially not to such a fiery Jacobite as this gentleman proves to be. As a result, Defoe manages to avoid some of the problems that plagued him after The Shortest Way with the Dissenters. In the Review he is able to ridicule extremism without causing readers to believe that they are under attack.

The occasion for the address seems to be the recent trial of Dr. Sacheverell for his inflamatory sermons against the Dissenters and, indirectly, against the Whig party. The trial ended in late February 1709/10, and, although the Doctor was convicted by the Lords, he was given such a light sentence that it was apparent to many people that the Whigs, and not Dr. Sacheverell, had been censured. As a result the London mobs, which had been on the brink of rebellion during the trial, openly lighted bonfires and looted meeting houses in celebration of Sacheverell's escape.[15] The function of the address, therefore, seems to be to tell the Whigs that the Sacheverell affair is only the beginning:

---

[15]One may read a colorful account of the proceedings of the Sacheverell affair in the pages of the Review, beginning in October, 1709, and continuing for several months after the conclusion of the trial.

And first take Notice, that having given you a Taste of our Force in demolishing your Schismatical Meeting-houses in London, we resolve as soon as the Parliament is up. to go on with it all over England; as the Whiggish Interest depends upon a Conjunction between those Traytors to the Church, who they call Moderate Churchmen, and the Phanaticks; we will first deprive them of the Support of this Faction, and then we shall see, whether they will stand against us alone or no, or whether they will have Grace to return to the Support of the true Church of England or no—Which if they will, we shall soon overthrow these new Principles of Government that have thus debauch'd the Nation and pull down the Usurpations of popular Government and Revolution—If not they shall fall with them.

Wherefore we assure you, the agreement among all the honest High Church People of the Nation is so firm, and so universal, that it is not in the Power of the Government to prevent our Resolutions and you may take a Specimen of this from Wrexham, Warwick, Dartford, and other Places, where we have made some small beginnings, but shall soon give you a more ample Testimony to your Content; Nor can you doubt, but even the Magistrates; and the Gentlemen of the Army will concur with us, since you see, they have already testify'd their Good will in the first above-nam'd Places.—So that we shall not be insulted by Guards and Malitia, as we have been in London—And if the Magistrates shall in any Place be aw'd by the Government, from giving us due Encouragement and Assistance we shall not want Means to oblige them to it, or soon find Ways and Methods to get others into the Magistry, who will be more in our just Interest.

In the next Place you may take Notice, that we have taken a true Blacklist of all those False Brethren Representatives, who have so rudely treated our Proto-Martyr and Champion Dr. Sacheverell, the bright ornament of the High-Church Cause, and they shall soon find a Difference in the Countenances and Carriage or their Principles when they return—Such as shall let them easily see how likely they are to be chosen again—And we are now forming a general Combination, we hate the Word Association, or else we would call it so, in all the Counties in England against them; so that one and All shall be agreed, not One of them shall be chosen again: Nay we are not out of Hopes of inflaming our Freemen and Freeholders in such a Manner, that few of them shall dare come down, or show themselves at an Election; for if we can but keep the Mob on our Side, we shall give them such a Reception, as shall soon beat them out of the Field in the Counties and out of the Town-Halls in the Burroughs, and then the Day will be ours; and a Specimen of this Combination you may see in the Gloucestershire Address.

> Nor is it any Discouragement, that the QUEEN gave us a Cold Reception in the Affair of that Address, or that it could not obtain to be inserted in the Gazette, which indeed would have been some Service to us: We shall make it do for all that; and as to publishing it, we took Care to have it printed, before we let the QUEEN see it—or before we knew what Welcome it would have with her Majesty; and we have taken Care in all the Counties to report, that the QUEEN receiv'd it very graciously—Which contributes very much to that useful Pretence, which we have so successfully forg'd; viz. That the QUEEN is of our Side, and that all these Things are a Force upon her Majesty's Inclination—
>
> Nor can we doubt of this being successful, since the Country is dispos'd now to receive every thing we offer them. For Example, Have we not made whole Counties believe, that Dr. Sacheverell's Sermons and Collections were not burnt; and that tho' the Lords condemn'd one to the Fire and the Commons another, yet her Majesty would not suffer it to be done—And this we have a very happy Proof of, which greatly satisfies the People and does Cause infinite Service; viz. That there has been no Account of its being done, published in the Gazette, as in all such Cases was the Usage and Custom to have been done. We know, some wiser People are satisfy'd by having good Intelligence, that the said Books were actually burnt, according to the Order of the respetive Houses; and as to the not publishing it in the Gazette, they know, that the Gazette indeed does always take Notice of such Sentences being executed on Processes made by the Secretaries of State, but do not take Notice of such as are the Effect of Parliamentary Prosecutions—But this is nothing at all in the Countries, where such Distinctions do not reach, and if they do, are not understood, and therefore it is of wonderful Service at this time to us.

Finally the speaker, after listing some of the other goals of his party—destroying the present ministry, the Toleration, the Scottish Church, and the union treaty—ends his speech in characteristic treason. The Queen, he says will be allowed to rule until her death. Then "our Great Patron the King of France, shall be desir'd to send over the Chevalier De St. George, with a sufficient Force to defend us from Whigs and Presbyterians; and thus Universal Peace shall be restor'd among us—The Crown shall revolve to the right Line, all Parties shall

rejoyce in a second Restoration, and these Ages of Blood, quarreling of Parties, and raising endless Taxes shall be put to an End. Preposterous Liberty shall die and wither away, universal Property shall center in the Sovereign, and wholesome Tyranny be restor'd to these Kingdoms; Which GOD grant long to reign"[16] (VII, 17-19).

Defoe's High-Church spokesman and his address to the Whigs may justly be considered aspects of an ironic argument because, even though he is a typical High Churchman in many respects, he manages to incriminate his party by explaining how the Tories are going to destroy the Whig party and, ultimately, bring in the pretender. The speaker openly admits that the Sacheverell affair is part of a plot to turn the people against the Whigs and that there is a well-contrived plan of propaganda to mislead the naive country folk into thinking that the Queen is opposed to the Whigs and the punishment of Sacheverell. If they are successful in their lies and deceptions, as well as in their plan to intimidate the voters, they expect to take over the Parliament and ministry, destroy the dissenters, the union, the Scottish Church and the Protestant succession. It is an evil plan, the reader discovers, designed to dismantle liberty and reimplement tyranny. The very verbs

---

[16]Most of the plans and resolutions cited by the Tory speaker were realized. During the summer of 1710 Tories made gains in Parliament and a new ministry was formed under Robert Harley. The toleration of occasional conformity was rescended through a coalition of High Churchmen and Whigs, and the Scottish Presbyterians lost their case against Greenshields to keep the English Common Prayer out of Scotland. They were not able to destroy the Union, but it seems doubtful that many Tories actually wanted to do that. The war was brought to an end by the Harley ministry but the succession was maintained.

he uses to explain their fiendish scheme suggest the viciousness of the plot—terms such as "crushing," "purg'd," "dethrone," "pull down," "put an End to," and "demolish." Therefore, he and his movement represent everything a good Englishman should resent: lies, religious persecution, popery, and French rule.

As irony the address is effective because, as earlier suggested, in many ways the High Churchman is saying nothing that many people of his ilk would object to. The High Church wants to end occasional conformity and, thus, effectively end dissent, and in Dr. Sacheverell the party has a persuasive spokesman. Naturally, in order to extinguish dissent they must get their people into Parliament and replace the present Whig ministry under Godolphin with one that will be more amenable to their designs. But the interesting part, and the part that ties this piece with works like The Shortest Way with the Dissenters is that the speaker smoothly associates the justifiable aims of the party with a Jacobite plot. The destruction of the Whigs and Dissenters will, he foresees, make way for the restoration of the papist side of the Stuart line and, since the address ends with this subject, the reader must assume that Jacobitism is the Tories' paramount interest and enslaving the people their desire. Needless to say, few Tories or men of the High Church would voice their support of James, the pretender. Defoe has simply taken their legitimate and open political designs a few steps further than any of these High Churchmen would probably admit, and he manages to suggest what he has been saying intermittently over the foregoing seven years—that there is really no difference between Tories, Highflyers, and Jacobites.

Indeed it seems that the extremists among Whigs and Tories have an uncanny knack for exposing themselves in the Review. The reader of the Review notices that Defoe is frequently threatened and abused from all sides because he always maintains truth and objectivity, no matter who is hurt by his observations. And the reader should not forget the fatal beating of John Tutchin of the Observator by some bullies who apparently were not of Whig sentiment. Nevertheless, even considering the dangerous world of eighteenth-century politicks, some of the letters that Defoe claims to have received from unsympathetic readers arouse suspicion because they so graphically demonstrate the madness of the extremists and thus suggest untenable nature of their causes. In the issue for August 24, 1710, Defoe prints a "Letter sent me by Peny-Post" (the original of which "lies ready to be produc'd") from an outraged High Churchman who threatens to kill Defoe because he has argued that the new ministers must be called Whigs:

> Review
> IN your Impertinent Paper of Saturday, you have taken such a Liberty, as deserves not only the Correction of the Gallows, but the Personal Correction of every Man that meets you, and 'twill be no more Sin to cut your Throat, than to kill a Dog— You Saucily tell her Majesty, she has turn'd out honest Men— And then Villainously call all those that are put into their Places, Whiggs—Now, Sir, do you know that to be Whigg, and to be a Rouge, is the same thing, that the Terms are Synonimous, and that you have therefore told the Queen she has put R___s into the Office—Know, Sir, that the Ministry are all Loyal Subjects, true Churchmen; neither Presbyterian-Hipocrites, or Low-Church Betrayers of their Mother; and if they do not resent this Impudence of yours, and punish you severely, I will not fail to cut your Throat by G_d. (VII, 254)

As with the High-Church orator in the issue for April 6, 1710, the author of this "letter" shows his true colors without really intending to do

so. First of all, he has absolutely no case against Mr. Review because his only argument is the questionable premise that all Whigs are rogues, a premise that obviously has as its authority only his hatred for Whigs. Secondly, he supports the picture, drawn so often by Defoe, of the typical High Churchman: he is vicious, unreasonable and immoral. He threatens Defoe's life twice, resorts to name-calling, and ends the letter, significantly, with an oath. The oath as a final touch by Defoe must have tipped off his readers that the letter is not real.

In a later issue he plays the same game with a fictional letter from a Whig, occasioned, Defoe asserts, by his recent argument that the Parliament and the ministry would save the African Company. The letter is also related to the problem of credit or, in our terms, the national debt because Defoe has contributed much of his space in the Review since August, 1710, to persuading the Whigs to lend money to the Government. For many of the more radical Whigs, the solution to the decline of their political fortunes was to destroy the government by ruining credit and this Whig's letter brims over with the same mad sentiment—that is, it is better to destroy trade if it will destroy the present government and allow the Whigs to regain power. The letter, which Defoe claims to have "received Yesterday," is quite convenient for initiating another argument for saving the African Company:

> Review,
> YOU are a Damn'd Rascal; Do you think to persuade us that you are not writing for the Ministry, because you are writing upon Trade? —Don't we know it is the Ministries Interest to have the People persuaded that Trade shall flourish and encrease after the Peace? I tell you, it is the Interest of every honest Man to ruin Trade, and to hasten Things on to

> Confusion, which is now our only Remedy, and that the great Maxim of our Circumstances at this time is, the Worse the Better. For this Reason, your African Trade may go to the Devil; the Company were Fools they did not sell it to the Dutch, and I wish they had: Nothing can save us now but the Pretender, and he only by this one Thing; that his coming will set us all together by the Ears, and then we shall beat this New Gang of Rogues, not out of their Seats only, but out of the World too; and you shall be sure to be hang'd, you Dog you,
>
> Cicero. ([IX], 89 [87])

The irony of the letter, other than that it pretends to be from a Whig extremist when it is actually of Defoe's invention, lies in its incredible position and in the signature. As in the other letter, what the speaker says brands him, and those who agree with him, as mad. It is under any circumstances absurd to wish for economic ruin just to achieve political victory, yet that is what this wild Whig proposes. Such a position should suggest to most readers that something is very wrong; but should the reader swallow the author's reasoning, he should remember that Mr. Review himself has often ironically argued similar solutions for the political unrest in the nation. In these instances Mr. Review asserts that a French invasion, for example, will serve to pull the nation together to fight the common enemy or that, it would open people's eyes to what they stand to lose from Jacobite activities. Therefore, the reader ought to recognize the position here as too blatantly absurd to be voiced seriously by the maddest of party men, especially not by a capitalistic Whig. The irony becomes even more obvious when the reader discovers "Circero" to be the supposed author of a letter that begins "You are a Damn'd Rascal" and ends ". . . you shall be sure to be hang'd you Dog you." Thus the letter serves an

ironic argument: Because they are probably still his primary audience, he does not attack the Whigs as he did the High Church in The Shortest Way with the Dissenters, but by showing them the absurdity of their position through the letter he can perhaps persuade them to take a more moderate stand toward the ministry.

When he does use his ironic method for direct attack it is only appropriate that one of the targets should be his old friend, Lord Nottingham, the man perhaps most responsible for Defoe's imprisonment and economic ruin in 1702. In the issue for February 21, 1713, Defoe takes notice of a High-Church pamphlet called Observations on the State of the Nation, supposed to have been written by "L__d N_____," who is further identified as having the Whigs for "new Friends." Clearly Defoe believes the author to be Nottingham and in his discussion of the work playfully accuses the author of lying when he says that the Presbyterians support the Pretender while the Tories do not. Then Mr. Review humorously suggests that these "Fauz Pas" may all be forgiven because the author has also managed to do the Dissenters great service: he has, according to Mr. Review admitted dissenting preachers to be ministers by calling them so no less than seven times in the pamphlet; he has admitted that the Scottish Episcoples are really Jacobites; and he has proclaimed that the Church no longer need fear the Dissenters, while noting that the Low Church has made "SIGNAL ATONEMENT . . . to the High Church, by giving up the Dissenters to their Mercy" ([IX], 121). Of course, Nottingham had no intention of doing Dissenters any service and Defoe, in his irony, is certainly the only one to have discovered it.

The brief barb of February 21 results, in the next issue, in an indictment against Mr. Review by one of Lord Nottingham's defenders. The legal tract reads as follows:

> You, D. F. Author of the Review, not having the fear of Scan. Mag. before your Eyes; but being moved by the Instigation of a Satyrical Devil, have, first of all, Maliciously and Seditiously, Wittingly and Willingly, and to his noble Character very Scandalously (tho' true) suggested, that the noble Person, known by the Title of Ld ..... is Author and Publisher of a Libel call'd, Observations on the State of the Nation, &c. as if the late Ld. H..m being dead, and this Person resolving the H...e of L...s should not want a Pamphleteer, he had descended to that mean Employment. And Furthermore, That not contented to have thus wickedly traduced the said noble P...r, had also asserted Maliciously and Seditiously (tho' true, as aforesaid) That the said noble Pamphleteer, in the said noble Pamphlet, alias Libel, had openly, publickly, and scandalously declar'd, That he had no design to accuse the Ministry, p. 26.[17] And likewise has Maliciously, and Seditiously (tho' true again) affirm'd, That the said noble Person, in his said Libel, does publickly clear the present Ministry from being in the Interest of the Pretender:—Of which said Crimes, Misdemeanous and Offences, He, the said Author of the Review, stands indicted, &c. ([IX], 123)

This "Indictment" is the same kind of irony found in the letters examined earlier—i.e., the mysterious author manages to condemn his own cause while apparently attempting to condemn Defoe. The "document" makes three charges: Defoe has scandalously and satirically accused Nottingham of not having any design to accuse the Ministry; and, last, he has said that Nottingham cleared the ministry of being Jacobite. The author of

---

[17]This italicized clause and the one near the end of the passage are obviously quoted directly from the pamphlet so that the accuser is indicting Defoe for telling the truth. The only mention of the ministry in the previous issue is the brief remark that "My L__d N_____" is against those who say that the ministry works in the Pretender's interest ([IX], 122].

the indictment does not accuse Defoe of lying; indeed he even admits that Defoe is right about the author's identity. Defoe's sin is simply that he told the truth, a circumstance that the indictment's author considers malicious. Secondly, as to the charges and intentions that Defoe claimed were not in the pamphlet, the indictment again accuses him of malicious intent, a charge which clearly suggests that, when Nottingham printed those very words cited in the indictment, he was lying. How can Defoe be guilty of malicious intent by simply noting what Nottingham said, unless Nottingham was lying when he made the statement and actually intended very much to accuse the ministry.[18]

To the ironic indictment Defoe answers in kind by proposing to vindicate Nottingham of clearing the ministry of being Jacobite, for, unless this can be done, Whigs will be shown that a turncoat does not truly change. Only a portion of the answer is quoted here because it takes up the remainder of this issue and the whole of the next.

> 1st. It is well known that this noble Author, if he is the Author, does not clear the Ministry from the Crime of being in the Interest of the pretender, from any Respect he owes to their Persons, or Deference to their Character and Employments—And this, as it is humbly conceiv'd, is a most needful Acknowledgment to make those People think they have a bad Bargain, who lately bought him at so dear a Rate, since the whole Body of the Dissenters in England having been sacrificed to bring this most significant Person over, it would make some People regret too much the giving up their

---

[18]It is not clear where Defoe is supposed to have said that Nottingham said "he had no design to accuse the Ministry." The point is not made in the Review for February 21. The source of Defoe's crime is apparently his anonymous pamphlet Not[tingh]am Politicks Examin'd. Being An Answer To a Pamphlet lately Publish'd, Intitul'd, Observations Upon The State of the Nation (1713).

> best Friends for one, who, which side ever he turns his Coat, can keep his Pockets always standing the same way.
>
> 21y. By the same Rule I desire to clear the Reputation of this noble writer, from the Imputation of Writing, if he has written, his Apprehensions about the Succession, with any wicked Design against the Person of the Pretender; declaring that I have, and hope all good Christians will have, so much Charity for him; and am willing to do so much Justice to his former ex[c]ellent Conduct, as to believe, that had not he differed with the present Ministry about some more significant Points, or had he agreed with them about every thing else, they would never have parted about the Pretender.
>
> If my Charity is greater than I have ground for, I hope it is an Error on the right hand; however, as I built it upon a long Series of Actings, in which many People so often declar'd their Satisfaction in his Preserving himself Faithful and True to the Interest of the Young Gentleman all the while he was in publick Office, I hope I may be excused; and if it be a Mistake, it must follow, That the many Stories the Whigs formerly believ'd of blank Passes, French Men Landing, at Foulkstone, betraying his own Spies, . . . keeping private Correspondences, the Poem of the Golden Age, delaying fleets and discouraging the Revolution, for all which we made Bonefires, and gladded our Hearts in the News of his being laid aside; all these things, and many more in my Pouch, must have been Fictions and Fallacies; and a poor Author may well be deceiv'd, and make wrong Judgments of things, if it be so. ([IX], 123-24)

Defoe's first vindication proves to be an attack on both Nottingham and the Whigs in Parliament who agreed to vote for an end to occasional conformity in return for Nottingham's support of the war. The irony directed toward the Whigs is clear in the passage: by pretending to defend Nottingham before them, he attacks them for having sold their brothers and for blindly hating the ministry. It seems that many Whigs are angry at their new comrade because he has not called the ministry Jacobite and, because of this, believe that they have received a bad bargain for their betrayal of the dissenters. The irony regarding Nottingham is more subtle; Nottingham, himself a Jacobite, cannot be

pleased with the ministry, who have not surrendered the country directly to France as he would have done. Thus, when he says that the ministry is not in the Interest of the Pretender, he means it not as a compliment but as a condemnation. Thus Nottingham clears the ministry because he dislikes its policy and the Whigs dislike what Nottingham does in his pamphlet because they want to destroy the ministry too. For this reason Defoe assures the Whigs that Nottingham did it not because he loved the ministry.

In the second vindication, Defoe argues that Nottingham cannot be accused of being for the succession because he is and always has been a Jacobite. In fact there is so much evidence of his treasonous behavior that, Defoe suggests, to say that Nottingham is anything but a Jacobite and a traitor is to be absurd: "How would you have laught at me, and said, the Author of the Review was brib'd by my Ld. ....., and that I was writing for the Ministry, if during his Administration I should have but dared to say he was not in the Interest of the Pretender! How unjust then should I be to the former judgment of Things, and the Character of this Great Person, if I now should charge him with declaring his fears of the Succession, from any Disaffection to the Interest of St. Germans! Not I, Gentlemen! By no means! I hope I shall never be guilty of doing the worst Enemy in the World so much Wrong"([IX], 124). In short, to vindicate Nottingham means identifying him for what he is—a Jacobite traitor. Such a vindication should be pleasing to Jacobites who are not ashamed of being traitors; at the same time the same vindication should be an abomination to everyone else in Britain.

Thus Defoe dutifully clears Nottingham of the taint of Whiggery and patriotism.

In the Review, because Defoe is almost always trying to persuade his readers to change their minds or to intensify and reinforce what they already believe, there is usually some kind of argument being forwarded. Depending on the subject and Defoe's estimation of his readers, the argument may be direct or indirect, logical or illogical. He is both direct and strictly logical only when the subject has no emotional value or when the argument may depend upon his expert opinion or his philosophical position on a wide variety of political, economic, military, and religious matters. One usually discovers that Defoe has a strong, reasonable basis for his own beliefs. When, however, his footing is not so secure—when, that is, he is trying to perform a political service for the government which requires the sleight-of-hand artistry of a practiced magician or a confidence man, the reader finds him resorting to false premises, invalid conclusions, and begging the question. And, as his espoused positions require slippier performances, the more he extols the virtues of reason and attacks his enemies for their irrational arguments. Also if his position on the issues demands dangerous encounters with important people or will not otherwise stand very much public examination, one finds him making indirect arguments. As with Mr. Review's dialogues with the madman, Defoe may allow someone other than Mr. Review to present his case. Or, he may invent a character or have Mr. Review speak ironically to present the opposition's case so badly that the audience will accept Defoe's side of the argument without his having to offer it.

Finally, Defoe's arguments, whether ironic or seriously illogical and slanted, suggest, as does his formation of a moral setting and his use of pulpit oratory, his control of his audience and his insight into their hopes and fears. He could be strictly logical when circumstances did not demand that he be otherwise, but politics and religion are passionate issues, as anyone knows who has heard a political speech during the heat of an election campaign or listened to a fundamentalist preacher urging the sinners on to salvation. Thus we cannot condemn Defoe for doing what he had to do: his illogical arguments are necessary for persuasion and are strictly consistent with his pulpit style of writing and his moral coloring of temporal reality. Moreover, Defoe's apparent philosophy of truth explains his seemingly dishonest methods; for Defoe, truth, despite what he may say in the Review, is relative to the end for which it is expressed. This means that truth is of no value if it is not used toward a good end and, conversely, that whatever means are employed to achieve a good end are justifiable. For Defoe, the good end consists of the revolutionary principles of 1688 as Defoe, a rational Whig, defines them; and he will use any technique at his disposal to achieve those ends.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Defoe was a calculating, ingenious, capable rhetorician who understood the fears and prejudices of his audience and knew how to appeal to them. Perhaps to arrive at such a conclusion about Defoe's work in the Review should be significant enough because most students of Defoe do not recognize him as a rhetorician or orator. He is, it seems, for too many people a man with great natural ability as a writer who, sometimes by accident, managed some rather crude artistic effects in fiction.

Generally it has been shown that in his persuasive prose Defoe habitually tries to remove issues from the clear light of reason to which Mr. Review seems to give such unmitigated worship. As a preacher or prophet he is able subtly to invite his readers to accept his pronouncements as having vast significance, and he successfully bolsters his authority by climbing into the pulpit and ringing out oratorical sermons laced with Biblical allusions and quotations. One suspects that some of his readers must have heard the voice of God telling them to destroy Highflyers.

At the same time his persuasive sermons allegorize the national and clerical issue of the day. Everyone is familiar with the tendency of the Puritans to see themselves, personally or as a religious group, in God's providential plan for the universe. They, like the Jews, were

a persecuted people who had to believe themselves the chosen people of God in order to survive the persecution. Defoe simply transfers the tendency to politics, thereby making Biblical characters and events types and allegories for contemporary situations. As a result the contemporary events are examined via the coloration of the types and, naturally, are made to take on the same meanings. Therefore, in these moral treatments Defoe can avoid direct discussions of the issues and he can resort, instead, to abstractions and stereotypes. He can, then, reduce complexity and make choices and assumptions much easier to accept. And, since these assumptions are being handed down from above through God's agent in London, they tend to discourage question.

Defoe's emblems also function, as do traditional religious emblems, to encourage the readers to make patterned responses, to think less of the circumstances of the particular issue at stake than the set of assumptions and feelings associated with the metaphor. Therefore, just as the Jewish exodus or the plight of the Ninevites have certain typological meanings, so do storms, volcanoes, burning houses, wild animals, and monsters. Thus the metaphors actually are stock emblems with predictable meanings.

Defoe's pulpit style also works to discourage analytical response because it depends so heavily upon anaphora for its effect. As a result of the often complex patterns of rhythm and sound, the audience might possibly have become enthralled with those familiar patterns and concerned themselves less with what he was saying. Modern political orators commonly try to distract the audience from the sense of their words,

and Defoe uses much the same technique in the Review. When an orator speaks, his audience may beware, but should readers of a periodical expect the devices of an orator? Even when a particular Review is read aloud in a coffee house, the auditors have have no reason to expect they are being manipulated for the orator is not present. But the effect is in the style, not in the orator, so that listeners were likely to find themselves falling under the spell of that modern Demosthenes.

Defoe's arguments are often a form of manipulation too. Like the applications of Puritan sermons, Defoe's arguments are frequently emotional and usually highly repetitious. And in the maze of repetition, he often does not follow a logical and direct line of reasoning. Also digressions creep in. It is little wonder, then, that a false premise might pass unnoticed or that a false conclusion, in the heat of oratory, might go unchallenged. Also when Mr. Review finds himself attacked by his adversaries or enters into debate with them, it is usually so that the readers will accept Mr. Review's argument because they reject the absurd reasoning of Mr. Review's opponents. When, on the other hand, Mr. Review presents the absurd argument, he always clearly intends irony so that the readers will embrace the antipodal point of view without very much examination.

That Daniel Defoe should be so adept in rhetoric is, perhaps, a little surprising, especially since he had no university education, wrote for a relatively unsophisticated audience, and lived at a time when members of the Royal Society and theologians of all ranks were urging people to avoid rhetorical figures and schemes in their speech

and writing. But more important, it is apparent that by the time he was writing the Review he had already refined a number of fictive devices that would be important to him later as a writer of novels.

On the simplest level, he had devised a well-conceived plan of dealing with his audience. The speaker in the Review could never be Daniel Defoe, even after his identity as author became known. It is necessary that the speaker in the Review be eminently good, honest, objective and, at least on the surface, dissociated from any party or interest. Defoe, not in any sense a perfect man, was not wholly good and not at all honest, objective, or independent of party interest. He recognized, however, that he had to present this incredibly perfect character in order to gain and keep the trust of his audience. When Mr. Review speaks, it must be from authority and, except in his debates with the madman, he must always be right. All adversaries must be either knaves or fools. From the pulpit it is even easier to maintain the mask, but as Daniel Defoe he could never have managed it.

There are other characters. The madman is literally an embodiment of the extremist on any side, but from the moment that he stops Mr. Review on the street he becomes alive and remains alive in most of their encounters. Clearly his origin is the court jester and the comic fool of Renaissance and Jacobean drama. He is known to be a little daft, but on occasion and usually when people least expect it, great wisdom comes out of his mad babbling. Similarly, the madman sometimes shocks Mr. Review and the reader with his insight. Moreover, because he is mad, he is unafraid to tell the truth. He is a convenient tool,

but when he draws Mr. Review into open debate he takes on flesh and blood.

From time to time more shadowy characters appear. Some of these the reader hears shouting back at Mr. Review as he pauses in his oratory. Others, rather than face him openly, resort to anonymous letters or, on rare occasions, published tracts. They are generally a crude, cowardly lot and their ephemeral lives last long enough for them to blacken whatever party they represent.

For his characters Defoe often creates brief, little dramatic scenes. During the period when Mr. Review is regularly harassed by the madman, Mr. Review may be walking down a street, innocently talking to his readers, when suddenly Madman leaps out of the shadows of the page to interrupt him. Or sometimes Mr. Review will call out to him, for the madman is never far away. Once together they indulge in comic banter that helps to soften the reader's sense of Defoe's didactic purpose.

Also, when Mr. Review is in the pulpit Defoe, by having him directly address his auditors and sometimes having them answer, makes Mr. Review's sermons even more credible: the oratory does not seem out of place and the readers may forget for a moment that they are only reading a page from the Review. For a moment, perhaps, Mr. Review's fiery sermon actually echoes through the coffee house.

Defoe's handling of his material further evidences fictive techniques. When he turns Louis into Satan or Pharoah, Highflyers into allegorical monsters, Englishmen into Jews, the War of the Spanish Succession into a holy conflict, party strife into storms, party danger

into burning houses, and extremism into disease and insanity, Defoe is, like any artist, simply shaping his material so that it expresses his own vision of reality. When he wrote Journal of the Plague Year, he did his research and produced a nightmarish psychological study of fear and superstition. With Robinson Crusoe he combined various stories of castaways into a moral and psychological allegory. What Defoe does in the Review, actually, is not very different from what Hawthorne or Melville or Yeats or Stevens did. He simply recreates reality or, more appropriately, creates a fiction.

Other relationships between the Review and Defoe's fiction surface from two recent works on Defoe's novels. In one of these, John J. Richetti asserts that Defoe's novels "communicate by their arrangements and strategies an implicit grasp of the tangled relationships between the free self and the social and ideological realities which the self seems to require. What they show us as we read is character carefully separating itself from the unsatisfactory tangle of private and public, personal and social, and establishing an unimpeachable selfhood, at least in the privileged space of the narrative." More specifically, he finds Crusoe's definition of self arising out of being constantly pulled between two poles, capitalism and morality,[1] much as Wallace Stevens envisions the poet being constantly pulled between the starkness of his desire for absolute reality and the lushness of his imagination. Everett

---

[1]Defoe's Narratives: Situations and Structure (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), pp. 15-17. Richetti here provides a difficult summary of his position.

Zimmerman in Defoe and the Novel develops a similar idea. In general terms he believes (1) that there is no clear separation between Defoe and his narrators and (2) that there is in each of these characters a spiritual, or moral, crisis that the character seeks to resolve in telling the story. When H. F. in Journal of the Plague Year, for example, "attempts to find a coherent spiritual purpose governing the physical world, material reality presents itself to him so powerfully that he cannot reconcile it with his religious assumptions. The disorienting forces of the plague expose the tensions within him, and we see his conflicts and mounting anxiety."[2] In Robinson Crusoe Zimmerman sees the conflicts reflected in Defoe's constant use of the language of mental illness and disease and in his references to God's Providence and original sin. Then we find at the beginning of The Further Adventures of Robinson Crusoe that "the difficulty of applying his [Crusoe's] conception of Providence to his experience becomes apparent, and despairs of rational comprehension of the meaning of his life."[3] For Zimmerman, as for some other recent critics, the novels are spiritual biographies.[4]

---

[2]Zimmerman (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), p. 109.

[3]Zimmerman, p. 39.

[4]See particularly J. Paul Hunter, The Reluctant Pilgrim: Defoe's Emblematic Method and Quest for Form in "Robinson Crusoe" (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1966), passim. Hunter is primarily concerned with showing that Puritan beliefs and practices serve as the pattern for what happens in Robinson Crusoe. A similar treatment appears in G. A. Starr, Defoe & Spiritual Autobiography (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965).

In the Review the modern reader also finds a conflict not unlike that found by Richetti and Zimmerman in the novels. Defoe himself lived a life of subterfuge when Harley was in office and he operated in a world of complicated political intrigue. He is even known to have worked for both a Whig and a Tory journal at once. Against this murky background Defoe offers his readers a world in which reality can be interpreted according to religious patterns, a world in which reality is a simple conflict between good and evil, and in which both good and evil people can be recognized by what they say. Of course oversimplification is an ordinary technique of propaganda, but it also seems that Defoe is offering a world view that cannot really apply to the confused state of Augustan politics. One cannot readily determine if Defoe is drawn to the old Puritan concept despite his experience in an infinitely more complex world, or whether the whole scheme is simply for the benefit of his readers, but it at least seems likely that Defoe is aware of the clash between the religious and the natural worlds.

Moreover, the Review itself is riddled with contradictions: hardly anything is as it appears to be. There are many instances when Mr. Review's stance is ironic; his methods and motives are quite opposite to what he professes. Also his design throughout the Review is to make some causes appear worse than they really are and, conversely, make those he espouses appear in a very favorable light. His arguments are often purposely misleading and dishonest, his style designed to obliterate rather than clarify. Even the names of parties and factions are understood in such conflicting ways that they are useless for

identification. All the while Daniel Defoe the spy continues to blunt distinctions.

There are, of course, no conflicts within Mr. Review. There is no need to reconcile spiritual and material reality because, without doubt, Providence controls all. But Daniel Defoe knew that he was often concocting a fantasy in the Review. Therefore, if Richetti and Zimmerman are right about spiritual and moral crises in the novels, the Review may well be one of the sources of that motif.

The Review has never received very much critical attention, but perhaps scholars may find it much more fruitful than anyone has suspected. It shows us, for example, qualities in Daniel Defoe that few have realized. There are several recent works on Swift as a rhetorician, but, aside from some discussion of pamphlets in James' study, there is nothing of that kind on Defoe. Defoe, many seem to believe, was just not that sort of writer; he was simply too careless and under too much pressure to write quickly. The Review, however, shows us a master craftsman in persuasion and a man with more than a superficial knowledge of and talent for rhetorical schemes. A study of Mr. Review as a character and as an ironic mask for Defoe may prove important in an analysis of Defoe's first-person narrators, and consideration of his other uses of irony may make us more aware of his natural inclination toward it. His penchant of his pulpit oratory may prove to be more common in his fiction than scholars have heretofore recognized. In short, the Review not only more firmly establishes the craft of Defoe, it may also be a valuable tool in the analysis of his other writings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Percy G. "Pope's Concern with Assonance." TSLL, 9 (1967/68), 493-502.

_____. "Harmony of Numbers: Dryden's Alliteration, Consonance, Assonance." TSLL, 9 (1967/68), 333-343.

Adler, Jacob. The Reach of Art: A Study in the Prosody of Pope. University of Florida Monographs. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1964.

Cook, Richard I. "'Mr. Examiner' and 'Mr. Review': The Tory Apologetics of Swift and Defoe." Huntington Library Quarterly, 29 (1966), 127-146.

Croll, Morris W. Style, Rhetoric, and Rhythm: Essays by Morris W. Croll. Ed. J. Max Patrick and Robert O. Evans. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Davis, Thomas. "The Traditions of Puritan Typology." In Typology and Early American Literature. Ed. Sacvan Cercovitch. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1972.

Defoe, Daniel. Defoe's Review. 9 vols. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938.

Dill, Stephen Horton. "An Analysis of Some Aspects of Defoe's Prose Style." Diss. University of Arkansas, 1965.

Dobreé, Bonamy. English Literature in the Early Eighteenth Century 1700-1740. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

_____. "Some Aspects of Defoe's Prose." In Pope and His Contemporaries: Essays Presented to George Sherburn. Eds. James L. Clifford and Louis A. Landa. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949.

Dottin, Paul. The Life and Strange and Surprising Adventures of Daniel Defoe. Trans. Louise Ragan. New York: The Macaulay Company, 1929.

Feiling, Sir Keith. A History of the Tory Party. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924.

Gordon, Ian A. The Movement of English Prose. London: Longmans, 1966.

Haller, William. The Rise of Puritanism. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938.

Hill, Christopher. Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England. New York: Schocken Books, 1964.

Holmes, Geoffrey. British Politics in the Age of Anne. London: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin's Press, 1967.

_____. The Trial of Dr. Sacheverell. London: Eyre Methuen, 1973.

Hughes, Merritt Y., ed. John Milton: Complete Poems and Major Prose. New York: Odyssey Press, 1957.

Hunter, J. Paul. The Reluctant Pilgrim: Defoe's Emblematic Method and Quest for Form in "Robinson Crusoe." Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1966.

James, E. Anthony. Daniel Defoe's Many Voices: A Rhetorical Study of Prose Style and Literary Method. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1972.

Jones, Richard Foster, et al. The Seventeenth Century: Studies in the History of English Thought and Literature from Bacon to Pope. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1951.

Knappan, Marshall Mason. Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Knox, Norman. The Word Irony and Its Context, 1500-1755. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1961.

Miller, Perry. The New England Mind: From Colony to Provence. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953.

Mitchell, W. Fraser. English Pulpit Oratory from Andrews to Tillotson. New York: Russell & Russell Inc., 1962.

Moore, John Robert. A Checklist of the Writings of Daniel Defoe. 2nd ed. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1971.

_____. Daniel Defoe: Citizen of the Modern World. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Namier, Lewis. "Country Gentlemen in Parliament, 1750-84." In Crossroads of Power. New York: Macmillan, 1962.

Novak, Maximillian E. and Herbert J. Davis. The Uses of Irony: Papers on Defoe and Swift Read at a Clark Library Seminar, April 2, 1966.

Payne, William Lytton, ed. The Best of the "Review": An Anthology. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.

_____. Mr. Review: Daniel Defoe as Author of the "Review." Morningside Heights, N.Y.: King's Crown Press, 1947.

Plumb, J. H. The Origins of Political Stability: England, 1675-1725. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1967.

Richetti, John J. Defoe's Narratives: Situations and Structure. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

Ross, John F. Swift and Defoe. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1941.

Schneider, Herbert Wallace. The Puritan Mind. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1958.

Snyder, Henry L. "The Circulation of Newspapers in the Reign of Queen Anne." The Library, 5th ser., 23 (1968), 207-235.

Sonnino, Lee A. A Handbook to Sixteenth-Century Rhetoric. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1968.

Starr, George A. Defoe & Spiritual Autobiography. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Sutherland, James R. "The Circulation of Newspapers and Literary Periodicals 1700-1730." The Library, 4th ser., 15 (1934), 110-124.

_____. Daniel Defoe: A Critical Study. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971.

_____. Defoe. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1938.

_____. On English Prose. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957.

_____. "The Relation of Defoe's Finction to his Non-Fictional Writings." In Imagined Worlds: Essays on Some English Novels and Novelists in Honor of John Butt. Eds. Maynard Mack and Ian Gregor. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1968.

Walcott, Robert. English Politics in the Early Eighteenth Century. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Walzer, Michael. The Revolution of the Saints: A Study in the Origins of Radical Politics. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Wilson, Walter. Memoirs of the Life and Times of Daniel De Foe: Containing a Review of His Writings and His Opinions upon a Variety of Important Matters, Civil and Ecclesiastical. Vol. 2. London: Hurst, Chance, and Co., 1830; rpt. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1973.

Wright, Thomas. The Life of Daniel Defoe. London: C. G. Francombe & Sons, Ltd., 1931.

Zimmerman, Everett. Defoe and the Novel. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.

APPENDIX

The definitions for the following rhetorical terms, all of which appear in Chapter III, are taken from Lee A. Sonnino's A Handbook of Sixteenth-Century Rhetoric. Page numbers from Sonnino are cited parenthetically.

Adjunctio (Zeugma). Adjunctio is the completion of several clauses by one word. Cicero and Quintilian specify that the word be a verb, but George Puttenham does not. Puttenham calls it hypozeugma when one predicate has a number of parallel subjects (p. 22).

Admonitio (Paraenesis). Admonitio is a warning understood from a wise saying (p. 23).

Aversio (Apostrophe). Quintilian defines the term as a sudden change in the object of address. It may be an invocation "to a god, mute object, country etc." (pp. 33-34).

Commoratio (Epexergasia). Commoratio is the frequent but varied repetition of the central point of the discourse (pp. 40-41).

Communicatio (Anachinosis). This term refers to the orator's practice of directly conferring with his audience, usually by means of rhetorical questions (p. 141).

Compar (Parison). In compar successive phrases or clauses have the same grammatical structure and the words in their identical orders have the same rhythm. According to Scaliger "the sections of a passage are balanced by words or sounds always equal in number and length" (p. 43).

Complexio (Symploche). Complexio is the repetition of the first and last words in a succession of phrases or clauses (p. 47).

Congeries (Synathrismos). According to Quintilian congeries is "an accumulation of words and sentences with the same meaning." Renaissance rhetoricians do not, however, insist that the words or sentences have the same meaning (pp. 56-57).

Conversio (Antistrophe). Conversio means to end succeeding phrases or clauses with the same word (p. 63).

Copulatio (Ploche). Copulatio is the frequent repetition of a word with only one or two other words separating the repetitions (p. 64).

Dictu commoratio (Apomnemonsysis). Peacham defines it as "a form of speech by which the orator reciteth some saying or sentence of another wholly worthy of rememberance and observation" (p. 73).

Experentia (Apodixis). The term denotes a proverb, aphorism, or wise saying based on common experience used to support the orator's point of view (pp. 92-93).

Interpretatio (Synonymia). Interpretation is the use of several different words to express the same idea (pp. 116-117).

Interrogatio (Erotema). Interrogatio means simply to ask a question as a means to emphasize a point. No answer is expected from the audience (pp. 117-118).

Occupatio (Paralepsis). Occupatio is a form of irony in which the orator actually says or implies what he pretends to omit (p. 135).

Percontatio (Exetasis). This is a device by which the orator sets forth his own opinion by asking a question of the audience. It may be used as a means to chide the audience (p. 139).

Perserverantia (Epimone). Perserverantia is the repetition of a word, phrase, or clause in a discourse.

Quaestium (Pysma). Quaestium is the use of a number of questions in a series to underline emotion. The orator desires no answer from the audience (p. 153).

Reduplicatio (Anadiplosis). Reduplicatio is the repetition of the last word of one unit at the beginning of the next (p. 157).

Rogatio (Antipophora). The orator asks a question and, without waiting for a reply, answers the question (p. 165).

Subjectio (Hypophora). The orator anticipates objections to his arguments and answers these objections (pp. 173-174).

VITA

David Elba Matchen, son of Elba H. and Opal (Culberson) Matchen, was born in Sylacauga, Alabama, on November 22, 1946. He was graduated from Childersburg High School in May, 1965. He entered Auburn University in September, 1965, and received the Bachelor of Science in Education in June, 1969, and the Master of Arts degree in English in June, 1971. He began work in the doctoral program at The University of Tennessee in September, 1971, and received the Ph.D. degree in June, 1976. He married Jo A., daughter of Bruce and Myrtle (Leach) McDowell, in August, 1967. He has two sons, David Elba, Jr., who was born in July, 1970, and Paul, born in May, 1973.