

Est.
1841

YORK
ST JOHN
UNIVERSITY

Smith, Adam James (2017) Property, Patriotism and Independence: The Figure of the Freeholder in Eighteenth-Century Partisan Print. *Journal for Eighteenth Century Studies*, 40 (3). pp. 345-362.

Downloaded from: <https://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/2371/>

The version presented here may differ from the published version or version of record. If you intend to cite from the work you are advised to consult the publisher's version:

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1754-0208.12463/abstract>

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form. Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms governing individual outputs. [Institutional Repositories Policy Statement](#)

RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at
ray@yorks.ac.uk

Property, Patriotism and Independence: The Figure of the Freeholder in Eighteenth-Century Partisan Print
Dr Adam James Smith

Accepted Author Manuscript Accepted for Publication in **The Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies**.

Manuscript no: JEVS12463

Publication: Forth-coming.

Article Accepted: 14 October 2016

---oOo---

O all ye Sussex Freeholders
 Come listen to my Story;
 Of a Gallant Whig Lord,
 I Scorn to Sing a Tory.¹

This refrain first appeared in the July of 1714 to the tune of ‘London is a fine town.’ Written to mark Lord Henry Pelham’s inheritance of his family’s Sussex estate, the panegyric ballad celebrates his successful graduation into a community of ‘Sussex Freeholders.’² The *Oxford English Dictionary* notes that when used in the eighteenth century the term ‘freeholder’ generally referred to a person in possession of an estate worth ‘forty-shillings or more.’ This article will demonstrate that as the century progressed the term ‘freeholder’ became increasingly burdened with a multiplicity of often contradictory significations. The figure of the freeholder was sometimes canvassed by rival party-writers as the dependably conservative ‘political blood of the nation.’³ At others, the freeholder was transformed from disinterested landowner, to proactive partisan, to political activist. That the meanings and applications of common political terms underwent significant semantic change throughout the eighteenth century is an observation foregrounded in recent studies of such terms as ‘loyalty’ and ‘patriot’, revealing variation in both general and specific meaning across different groups.⁴ As Matthew McCormack deduces, these shifts offer an opportunity to track shifting relationships between individuals and the state.⁵ Beginning with a survey of how the property-owning gentleman has been cast by recent historiography this article will then chart

how it is that this role was represented in a range of contemporary political texts. These texts have been selected for their titular interest in the freeholder, with Joseph Addison's periodical, *The Freeholder* (1715-1716), providing the most sustained treatment of the figure's character and responsibilities. This article will foreground the continuities and contradictions that betray the term's instability throughout the eighteenth century. In plotting adjustments made to the freeholder's representation alongside parallel concepts whose meaning also shifted across the eighteenth century, this article will assert the freeholder's centrality to discourses of property, patriotism and independence.

The 'Ballad on Lord Pelham's Birthday' synthesises a great deal of information about the freeholder's full significance at the outset of the eighteenth century.⁶ It captures well the figure's convergent interests in property and politics. As noted by James Leheny, the prerequisite income required to be a freeholder was shared by another celebrated position: 'The property qualification for the country voter had been fixed at property which yielded forty shillings per annum in 1429, and inflation, particularly during the sixteenth century, had enlarged these electorates considerably.'⁷ The pamphlets and periodicals discussed in this article instruct such gentleman on how to vote, from Francis Atterbury's *Advice to the Freeholders of England* (1714) and John Oldmixon's *Advice to the Freeholders of Britain* (1715) to Joseph Addison's *Freeholder* (1715-1716) and Henry St John's *Craftsman* (1726-36). Even this ballad to Lord Henry Pelham addressed itself to a propertied community of voting gentleman.

The ballad casts Lord Pelham's promotion to the rank of Freeholder as a jubilant coming of age, reflecting the role that property acquisition played as a site of masculine development.⁸ Historians of both the value systems and life experiences associated with the attainment of elite gentlemanly status have identified the inheritance of property as the end of adolescence and the passage to an adulthood of dynastic and financial responsibility.⁹ With

this newly acquired masculine status came also a set of gender expectations and, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, a conflation of civic and patriotic duties. As Henry French and Mark Rothery stress at the outset of their comprehensive discussion of both the practical transition to adulthood for elite men during the 18th century and its conceptualisation in both public and private writings: ‘the position of the landed gentry as the “natural rulers” of the country depended on the formation of a male gender identity that stressed personal autonomy, independent judgement and self-command.’¹⁰ The inference here that such men were seen as the ascendant ‘rulers’ of their own estate is well-founded, and as this article will later explore the metaphorical analogy between the freeholder’s estate and the monarch’s kingdom was one often exploited. To ensure the preservation and conservation of his inherited estate the successful freeholder must be as the good King: well-informed, responsible and decisive. Anna Bryson lists self-restraint and sound moral judgement as key gentlemanly criteria identified by contemporary commentators, whilst Steven Shapin also adds ‘independence and integrity relevant to other social categories.’¹¹ The question of gentlemanly independence is one treated in extensive detail by Matthew McCormack. Discussing the classical-republican emphasis on the ‘independent householder citizen’, or freeholder, McCormack foregrounds the arguments made by reformers during the second half of the eighteenth century that ‘[o]nly the “independent” male householder [...] could and should represent the rest of society in the public world.’¹² Their independence was as essential a prerequisite as their ownership of property, since “only persons free from political obligations could act for the general good.”¹³

As McCormack also notes, however, “independence” was a multifaceted and common culture [whose] meaning and application shifted over a long period.’¹⁴ These shifts are evident in both the continuities and contradictions in how the freeholder figure was presented in political print across the century. For instance, both Atterbury and Addison were

openly indebted to an earlier seventeenth-century model that both McCormack and J. G. A. Pocock see distilled in James Harrington's 1656 work *The Common Wealth of Oceana*.¹⁵ According to McCormack, Harrington introduced 'the notion that freehold land confers independence, and that the distribution of property in the state – and this the distribution of its armed independent citizens – should reflect the balance of political power.'¹⁶ Throughout his *Freeholder* Addison proves indebted to Civil War arguments demanding that propertied gentleman remained informed of all actions of government and always used their vote, their 'remote voice in parliament.'¹⁷ However, as this article will highlight, Addison's was an independence that should only ever be exercised in tandem with the will of government in power.

This is clearly illustrated in the *Freeholder*'s fifth instalment, which prescribes the necessity for all landed gentleman to promote a public spiritedness which is in turn derived from a 'love of one's nation.'¹⁸ Evoking Roman law Addison explains that 'no nation was ever famous for its morals, which was not at the same time remarkable for its public spirit. Patriots naturally rise out of a Spartan or Roman virtue.'¹⁹ This public spirit is bound up not only in a love of the nation but a love of its established leaders, namely George I and his government. As the essay draws to a close Addison hopes that his reader will go onto consider new ways to support his country rather than 'throw away his time in deciding the rights of princes, or the like speculations, which are so far beyond his reach.'²⁰ He concludes that Britain should 'leave these great points to the wisdom of our legislature, and to the determination of those who are the proper judges of our constitution.'²¹

By conflating patriotism with gentlemanly duty and awkwardly painting any government opposition as a form of rebellion Addison's *Freeholder* went on to brand its partisan rivals as a palpable threat to British sovereignty. Appearing in the immediate aftermath of the abortive Jacobite Risings of 1715, rebellion was a very real concern for

Addison, his readers and his Whig sponsors. The threat posed by these risings bore very serious implications, posing questions last asked during the English civil wars. Faced with the proposition of such a rebellion, Alexander Pope wrote to warn anyone with Jacobite sympathies what it was that they were suggesting, painting a picture of London harrowed by the destruction and devastation of war: '[y]ou may soon have your wish to enjoy the gallant sights of armies, encampments, standards waving over your brother's cornfields, and the pretty windings of Thames stained with the blood of men.'²² Addison capitalised on these fears to equate party opposition with the actions of such a rebellion. Indeed, in February 1716 Addison described those in opposition as not only unpatriotic but opposed to nature, characterising them as showing 'a particular indulgence for unnatural insurrection.'²³ This would later prove a challenge for Henry St John, Viscount Bolingbroke, who in the *Craftsman* made the case for a patriotic opposition to the party in power whilst appealing to the same readership of responsible, politically-engaged propertied gentleman. Whilst Addison had insisted on patriotism as a rationale for supporting government, Bolingbroke argued that a love of one's nation did not necessarily need to translate into a love of one's government. This change is consistent with previously identified trends pertaining to the transmission and transformation of patriotic language, with David Armitage noting that the use of patriotic language in late eighteenth-century radical writing had a surprising origin in 'the highly conservative ideology of the Country party tradition.'²⁴ According to Margot C. Finn it is this repurposing of patriotism that accounts for the eclecticism of those later radicals, who Armitage describes as drawing 'as freely on traditional constitutionalism, patriotism and parliamentarism as they did on Paineite republicanism.'²⁵ Quentin Skinner has even foregrounded Bolingbroke's writing as a key site upon which this transition can be witnessed.²⁶ In attempting this, though, Bolingbroke sought to not only adapt traditional

assertions of patriotism but also the figure of the property-owning patriot. The central role played here by his conceptualisation of the freeholder is one hitherto un-noted.

Imagining such a landed opposition required Bolingbroke to reconfigure the freeholder as found at the outset of the eighteenth century, advancing it towards a later model well characterised by Christopher Wyvill's *Yorkshire Freeholder* of 1780.²⁷ As this article will later demonstrate, in Wyvill's paper we find an independent collective of propertied gentleman more than ready to challenge government authority. These changes are indicative of the gradual erosion of those earlier assertions, exemplified by Addison's *Freeholder*, that opposition to government constituted unnatural rebellion. Instead, the ability to interrogate government policy and rally oppositional action when necessary came to be seen as central to the freeholder identity by the time that Wyvill went to print. This maps onto an observation made by a number of historians that the late eighteenth century saw masculine independence become an integral part of gentlemanly status.²⁸ Evoking Peter Lassett's earlier work on this topic, French and Rothery assert that this notion of independence served to propagate such gentlemen's self-image as 'the kingdom's natural rules, those who were truly free of the society of England and constrained only by their own consciences.'²⁹ This shift can be seen in the change from Atterbury's insistence on innate ability, to Addison's assertion that opposition is rebellion, through to Bolingbroke's manly opposition and beyond.

Returning then to the ballad to Lord Pelham we see an indication of the qualities most commonly associated with the freeholder in the early decades of the eighteenth century. Though not an overly common figure in ballad culture, 1714 saw a renewed interest in the freeholder, likely due to the high profile reaction to Francis Atterbury's deeply inflammatory *English Advice to the Freeholders of England*.³⁰ The ballad blazons the virtues Pelham acquires along with the rank of freeholder, stressing that 'although he has a great Estate, he has a greater Soul.'³¹ As seen here, the power of property (illustrated by the related power to

vote) made the freeholder a ‘considerable man’ of worth.³² The term freeholder was already an antiquated term in 1714, with the *OED* dating its usage as far back as the parliamentary rolls of 1414. The freeholder connoted inheritance, property and power. When introducing the titular editorial voice of his periodical, *The Freeholder*, Joseph Addison writes that a ‘freeholder may be either a voter, or a knight of the shire; a wit, or a fox-hunter; a scholar, or a soldier; an alderman, or a courtier; a patriot, a stock-jobber.’³³ However, he chooses to be known primarily as a freeholder as this proves ‘the basis of other titles. Dignities may be grafted upon it; but this is the substantial stock that conveys to them their life, taste, beauty; and without which they are no more than blossoms that would fall away with each shake of wind.’³⁴ Without this property men such as Addison’s freeholder would be fleeting and inconsequential.

The same language and imagery can be seen in Francis Atterbury’s *Address to the Freeholders of England*. Throughout his *Advice* Atterbury addresses and defends the familiar ‘landed interest’ of the country gentlemen who for generations ‘have stood the heat of day.’³⁵ These men are resilient, consistent and dependable. It is when seeking a personification of this hereditary ‘landed interest’ that Atterbury introduces the figure of the freeholder, declaring that ‘there is not in their way a better sort of men, generally speaking, than the Freeholders of *England*. They are a brave, open, plain and direct people, and when fairly left to themselves to choose their representatives, always chose such as are, or appear to be, true friends to their country.’³⁶ As Leheny stresses, the figure of the freeholder was primarily identified as being a voter. Referred to throughout Atterbury’s essay as the honest part of the nation, the freeholder also comes to signify the good Englishman whose property physically invests him in the nation. Property is seen to offer such gentleman an untainted connection back to England’s mythical origins, here investing him with an instinctive awareness of what is best for his country.

With his property, wealth and reluctance to subscribe to ‘Whiggish moderation [which] like death, sooner or later strikes all that come in its way’ Atterbury’s freeholder is also intrinsically Tory.³⁷ Atterbury’s tract first appeared upon the collapse of the Tory ministry in 1714. D. W. Hayton reads Atterbury’s *Address* as the High Tory author’s distraught attempt ‘to rally the party faithful, both privately and in print.’³⁸ In making the freeholder Tory Atterbury, by extension, also renders the voter Tory. This is entirely in fitting with Mark Knights’ assertion that in the early decades of the eighteenth century both the Whigs and Tories would attempt to redefine those words and concepts central to their rival’s campaign. It was often the case that ‘property’ was targeted in such a way. As Knights notes, ‘both sides, ironically, recognized that a good deal of the partisan struggle involved disputing the meaning of key words and phrases. Contemporaries even listed them for us. “Monarchy, Prerogative, Liberty, *Property*, the Church, Popery and Fanaticism are words that in this kingdom enchant and enflame and almost bereave us of our senses”, observed Charlwood Lawton.’³⁹ The same proved true during the backlash that Atterbury’s innately Tory vision of the propertied gentleman provoked.

Atterbury’s intensely partisan tract prompted a series of alternate addresses to a freeholder audience, prefaced with the explicit intention of discrediting Atterbury’s ‘reasonable libel.’⁴⁰ An anonymous pamphlet published in 1715 stated on its title-page that Atterbury’s advice is the ‘last effort of the *Jacobite* faction, who have nothing left ‘em now, but by calumnies to alienate the heart of his majesty’s subjects.’⁴¹ For Whig pamphleteer and historian John Oldmixon, the ‘faction’ behind *English Advice* was both Jacobite and Tory: ‘there has been in every new parliament, Advice to Freeholders, of various kinds, but surely the most insolent and seditious libel of that sort, which ever was made public in England, is a pamphlet lately dispersed by the Jacobites and Tories, under the Title of, *England’s Advice to the Freeholders of England*. In which [...] there are almost as many false things as words said

with the greatest spite and inveteracy against the present ministers, who are so worthily in possession of his majesty's and the nation's favour.'⁴² Oldmixon's pamphlet situates Atterbury's tract within a tradition of such writing, revealing that with each new parliament there is always an 'advice to freeholders of various kinds.'⁴³ However, Oldmixon suggests that Atterbury's *English Advice* is a 'most insolent and seditious libel', which he is now duty-bound to contend. The anonymous author of *British Advice to the Freeholders of Great Britain* adopts a similar pose, discrediting Atterbury by hoping to demonstrate that 'his Jacobitism gets the better of his judgement.'⁴⁴ Each response systematically disputes the complaints listed in Atterbury's *English Advice*. Striking a tone deliberately distinct from this kind of tit-for-tat party invective, Joseph Addison responded to Atterbury's tract (and the pamphlet war that it induced) with his own subversively Whiggish periodical, the *Freeholder*.

Running for fifty-five numbers, from December 1715 to June 1716, Addison's *Freeholder* cuts a strikingly different figure when read amidst the stark and vitriolic polemic of Atterbury and Oldmixon. This was no mistake. By taking a title which implicated his paper in a notoriously fierce pamphlet war Addison's approach instantly registered as a cooling balm to the otherwise heated rage of party. The *Freeholder*'s opening essay was dedicated to discussing the term that it takes to be its title, painting as is it did so a vivid picture of its intended readership. The paper's intentions are buried within a discussion of the 'defence of property' and the aspirational character of the freeholder: again a 'considerable man' with no 'less than forty shillings a year.'⁴⁵ In recent decades the role of property throughout the long eighteenth century has been subjected to scrutiny and complication in the work of such scholars as Paul Langford and Laurence Klein. Klein, for instance, hints at the significance that perceptions of property (and the propertied gentleman) played in Whiggish conceptualisations of politeness.⁴⁶ Langford, meanwhile, adopts a broader approach, considering the subject of property from a range of perspectives: political, religious, and

cultural.⁴⁷ In doing so Langford emphasises well the centrality of property to eighteenth-century life: '[a] world without property was almost inconceivable to eighteenth-century Englishmen. The most divisive thinkers shared the assumption that law and government alike must be based on propertied foundations. There was a notable tendency to remove all other evidence of alternative ways of looking at social and political relations. [...] It became almost impossible to conceive of rights and liberties except in terms of implied individual proprietorship.'⁴⁸ Addison not only deliberately associated himself with a topic of universal import to his prospective readers, but the centrality of property to everyday discourses justified his exploration of a wide range of related subjects. Whilst property was obviously central to any discussion of the character and position of the propertied gentleman, it is the gentleman rather than the property that Addison was interested in. He suggested that the 'quality' and 'security' of such gentlemen were not qualities that were innate to the ownership of land but instead benefits revealed to him through the good management of state and government by the King and his parliament.⁴⁹ These may be the 'privileges of an English Freeholder' but they are not inherited. Instead they are 'blessing secured to us by his Majesty's title, his administration, and his personal character.'⁵⁰ The ramifications of this are profound and far reaching, with the majority of the subsequent essays appearing in Addison's *Freeholder* dedicated to teasing them out and thinking them through.

Addison presented readers with the apparently egalitarian suggestion that there were no essential pre-requisites for one to become a freeholder other than the need for forty-shillings. Furthermore, all such virtues were permitted at the discretion of the monarchy, regardless of how they were acquired. This first distinction immediately puts Addison's paper at odds with Atterbury's *Advice*, which remained the most recent and widely acknowledged utilisation of the freeholder figure. As seen, Atterbury asserted that property should continue to reside with the most ancient families of England. Not only did Addison dispute these long

held notions, his periodical also actively encouraged the dissemination of property, claiming that it would bolster investment in the broader community. He positively reflected upon ‘the increase of this happy tribe of men, [who] by the wisdom of the present parliament, I find the race of freeholders spreading into the remotest corners of the island.’⁵¹ Addison argued that when men are issued with property they take ownership over part of the nation. To protect their property is to protect the constitution. Of the ownership of property Addison wrote that ‘there is an unspeakable pleasure in calling anything one’s own. A freehold, tho’ it be but in ice and snow, will make the owner pleased in the possession, and stout in defense of it.’⁵² Already the Tory emphasis on property as a permanent fixture is absent, this notional freehold can be made of ‘ice and snow.’ These properties may be far from permanent but they are still important and they can still be enjoyed. Addison’s *Freeholder* is not troubled by the paradoxical nature of one’s becoming part of the constitution (of the whole) by becoming more independent (residing in the property of one’s own). By having their own individual property Addison’s freeholders have in fact entered into an interdependent collective. This theme was further explored in the *Freeholder*’s fifth instalment, which described (and prescribed) the duties stemming from a freeholder’s investment in the community. Such men must commit to ‘the practice of that virtue, for which their ancestors were particularly famous, and which is called, the love of one’s nation.’⁵³ The *Freeholder* explains that this is the ‘obligation’ and ‘great duty’ of every man of property: ‘this love to our country as a moral virtue is a fixed disposition of the mind to promote the safety, welfare, and reputation of the community in which we are born, and of the constitution under which we are protected.’⁵⁴ Once again for these freeholders, to promote and protect this community was to promote and protect themselves. Atterbury’s insistence that country gentleman knew instinctively what was best for their nation has been usurped by an emphasis on learned behaviour, proactive civic duty and public spiritedness.

Where Atterbury's gentlemen had derived their authority from England's mythic origin, Addison's freeholders were cast as descendants of an older order: Roman law. Addison's periodical regularly invoked Solon, noting for instance that it 'was a remarkable law of *Solon*, the great legislator of the *Athenians*, that any person who in the civil tumults and commotions of the republic remained neutral, or an indifferent spectator of the contending parties, should, after the re-establishment of the public peace, forfeit all his possessions, and be condemned to perpetual banishment.'⁵⁵ Here, Addison leant heavily on Solon to reassert the *Freeholder's* stated ambition: demonstrating that the partisan reader must take an active interest in his party and the policies it produces. By drawing authority from the ancient world, Addison contributed to a Whig tradition well documented by T. J. Hochstrasser, appealing to a Roman law built largely on reason rather than systemic arguments grounded in privilege and primogeniture.⁵⁶ By discussing property within this Roman framework, Addison is slowly beginning to divorce it from Tory arguments of hereditary right.

Addison's *Freeholder* presented a vision of property apparently familiar to Tory readers, even described in the same terms. Property ownership in the *Freeholder* remained an exceptional condition and Addison claimed to defend the interests of the landed gentry. The fundamental difference between Addison's vision and that articulated so emphatically in Atterbury's tract is that his 'happy tribe of men' have not necessarily attained their property by hereditary means. Instead Addison is keen to suggest that any man with forty shillings can join these ranks of freeholding gentleman and that people continue to do so. For Addison's *Freeholder* this did not detract anything from the importance or legitimacy of the country gentleman. The inclusion of non-hereditary freeholders amidst the landed gentry did not, for Addison, detract anything from Britain's exceptional status. His *Freeholder* remained proud of its national history and identity, predicting future glories still to come. Its own model of an

increasing body of freeholders was not only consistent with previous traditions of English greatness but found a rival genealogy within Roman law rather than ancient English history. There remained an exceptional tradition of English essentialism in Addison's imagining of the freeholder, but it was no longer one guarded by a hereditary gate-keeper. Instead it is the cost of entry, forty-shillings, that determines who can enter. Once a person joined this company of noble and virtuous gentleman they would come to embody all of the virtues necessitated by the ownership of property. Crucially, Addison's was also a system in which the King of England need not be of Stuart decent. His *Freeholder* presented a model in which, if they were to join, Tory readers could still enjoy all of same benefits of property but were freed from any hereditary concerns or the implicit Jacobite endorsement that these might contain. Addison used the freeholder figure to present an attractive justification for the Hanoverian monarchy.

Knights has argued that to wrestle words from the rhetoric of the rival party was not only commonplace in early eighteenth-century political culture but a central facet of the partisan struggle. Knights claims that 'party produced a pressure, akin to that of casuistry, by which the meaning of words and terms became subject to specialized and even private meanings. [P]arty conferred different meanings on the same words and thus created not just sectional but also competing languages.'⁵⁷ Rather than redefining property, however, Addison presented a vision of property that a Tory reader would recognise whilst revealing its consistency with the Whig perspective.

Whilst clearly contrasting with prior utilisations of the freeholder figure this recommendation is not singularly unique, and indeed became increasingly commonplace in the latter half of the eighteenth century. Writing in 1769 Frances Brooke is seen to make similarly egalitarian claims, observing what she generously describes as the 'democratic freedom and equal distribution of property.'⁵⁸ Brooke clarified that 'When I mention equal

property, I would not be understood to mean such a quality as never existed, nor can exist but in idea, but that general, that comparative equality, which leaves to everyman the absolute safe possession of the fruits of his labours; which softens offensive distinctions, and curbs pride, by leaving every order of men in some degree dependent upon the other.’⁵⁹ Whilst Brooke takes more care than Addison to stress that the equality prescribed is not for all she is making the same assertion that the possession of property leads to investment in the community. Again, the public interest is directly related to the freeholder’s own private interests.

Brooke’s acknowledgement of dependence brings into focus a second implication of Addison’s assertion that the virtues of the propertied gentleman are not innate but rather the ‘blessings of the King’. Though for Addison the ownership of property was no longer an inherited right, neither was it arbitrarily determined. It was the will of the King. This was implicit throughout the first *Freeholder* essay, which celebrated the position of its property owning readers whilst also recurrently asserting the reader’s subordinate position: ‘for such is the nature of our happy constitution, that the bulk of people virtually give their approbation to everything they are bound to obey, and prescribe to themselves those rules by which they walk.’⁶⁰ Towards the end of the eighteenth century John Jebb described property as ‘the grand enchantress of the world’ and it is certainly the case that by foregrounding it as his titular interest Addison provided himself strong camouflage for prescribing a highly subversive model of partisan behaviour which might otherwise have attracted more controversy than it initially did.⁶¹ The brand of property ownership perpetuated by Addison’s periodical is more clearly discernible when compared to an earlier text upon the same topic, the anonymous *Letter from a Freeholder of the County of Norfolk, to one of the Knights of the Shire* (1710).⁶² This printed letter championed the existing status-quo, warning against the dangers that might arise from the involvement of freeholders in politics. This stance initially

bears startling contrast to Addison's insistence that every freeholder has a role to play in the governance of Great Britain. Comparison of the two, however, reveals that they were not as diametrically opposed as they might first appear, helpfully illustrating the vision of active citizenship that Addison's periodical was actually championing.

A Letter from a Freeholder began with an explicit resistance to the suggestion that the landed gentry should be required to take an interest in political matters: 'I have always disapproved of freeholders pretending to direct their representatives what they should do, and what they should not do: 'tis assuming a power not ever practised in England til of late years; it seems fitter to be practised in a popular state than a monarchy: my present design is quite otherwise, humbly to beg my representative's opinion to clear doubts I now labour under.'⁶³ The letter's anonymous author, the self-titled Norfolk freeholder, is happy to be told what to do by his MP, an elite and qualified figure elected by the people. This is manifest in the pamphlet's paratexts which affirm the vertical flow of influence from citizen to government, channelling power through representation. The frontispiece pitched the pamphlet as a 'letter' written by a freeholder of Norfolk, used here to signify a remote and provincial space far removed from the capital. This rural gentleman is addressing a 'knight of the shire', a figure signifying country establishment. In his introduction to Addison's *Freeholder* Leheny defines the relationship between freeholders and knights, reaching as he does so for the words of Jonathan Swift: 'It is agreed, that the truest way of judging the dispositions of the people in the choice of their representatives, is by computing the country elections.'⁶⁴ Swift, writing here in 1711, is seen legitimising the previous Tory victory by suggesting that the current model of representative government served as a genuine and fool-proof reflection of public opinion. Whilst this is unlikely, Leheny uses it to explain the faith that the public had in this system, acknowledging the role of Knights like the one addressed here in *A Letter from a Freeholder*: '[Swift's] readers might have agreed with him since the country electorates,

composed of forty-shilling freeholders, were responsible for sending Knights of the shire to the House of Commons, and these voters were so numerous and geographically scattered that it was difficult for either party or for the court to buy votes or to use coercive measures which were certain to persuade voters.⁶⁵ In *A Letter from a Freeholder* we find the Norfolk freeholder appealing, in print, to his local knight for instruction and in doing so revealing his own opinions about how this representative system should work so that he ‘may not be any longer groping in the dark.’⁶⁶

The letter’s position was directly contradicted in Addison’s first number, which, as seen, claimed that through his vote the freeholder has a ‘remote voice’ in parliament: ‘the House of Commons is the representative of men in my condition. I consider myself as one who gives my consent to every law that passes.’⁶⁷ For Addison active engagement was the basis of liberty. Whilst the Norfolk freeholder is using the same system as Addison’s *Freeholder*, the former’s belief that he has voted in order to ensure that his choice of MP can make decisions *on his behalf* renders him a less active figure. Instead, the Norfolk freeholder cited the urge to stand up for a belief held by the individual that is not shared by ruling power or government as a problematic impulse that should not be acted upon.

This was not as dissimilar from Addison’s *Freeholder* as it might first appear. Addison also discouraged any action that takes place outside of the ‘frame of the Laws, which is established in every community for the protection of the innocent and the punishment of the guilty.’⁶⁸ The endorsements given of the governmental system by both the Norfolk freeholder and Addison’s *Freeholder* are almost identical, each drawing their language from the lexis of the ancient Roman republic. However, the reason given by the Norfolk freeholder is notably different to the *Freeholder*’s. Addison’s resistance came from a faith in the system of government and a concern for the greater community should it be negated. The Norfolk freeholder proved more concerned with limiting the jurisdiction of the

individual freeholder, arguing that such fellow subjects do not have the faculty or understanding to formulate and perpetuate a belief that has not been disseminated by the establishment. In total contrast to Addison's *Freeholder*, the Norfolk freeholder asserted that his readers should know their place and do as they are told 'to be satisfied when to obey and when to resist seems to me a point not yet fully settled and determined; and I being inclined to behave myself as in duty I ought, desire to know what act of our Prince will absolve me from my allegiance and justify my resistance.'⁶⁹ Addison took the freeholder figure and added further characteristics, suggesting that entitlement to 'the privileges of an English Freeholder' came with a responsibility to be personally aware and involved in the processes of politics. It was no longer acceptable to allow your MP to act on your behalf, you needed also to be aware of the decisions he was making.

Addison tells us that the figure of the freeholder should not be a 'mock-patriot', disengaged and uninvolved, but one of a group of persons recognisable from history 'whose characters are the most amiable, and strike us with the highest veneration: those who stood up manfully against the invasions of civil liberty.'⁷⁰ However, whilst Addison's freeholder was involved and aware, he was only ever to act in accordance with the government and the monarchy and only ever to articulate his beliefs through the established protocols, procedures and mechanics of government. Dissent enacted on any level (other than rhetorical) was categorised as rebellion or oath-breaking and neither were ever to be celebrated. The periodical stated, unambiguously, that 'rebellion is one of the most heinous crimes which it is in the power of man to commit [...] as it destroys the end of all government, and the benefits of civil society, [it] is as great an evil to society, as government itself is a blessing.'⁷¹ Addison took care not to endorse the 'raising of power in opposition to [government]; that authority which has been established among a people for their mutual welfare and defence.'⁷² Despite its encouragements of active partisanship, Addison's *Freeholder* was surprisingly

conservative when dictating how this action be manifested. Whilst his readers were to be involved in politics, their liberty was not infringed by the existence of their superiors, both in parliament and in the palace. Crucially, Addison endorsed partisanship, but only if it were in support of the party in power at the time. Any alternative constitutes the ‘heinous crime’ of rebellion. The question of what would happen if Addison’s model of citizenship were applied to the cause of a party not currently in power is foregrounded by later appropriations of the freeholder figure.

As the eighteenth century progressed the freeholder came to be used not only to articulate the positions of the Whig and Tory ministries, but that of the dissenting Whig, Lord Bolingbroke. When discussing Bolingbroke’s position in eighteenth-century contemporary thought, apparently oscillating between radicalism and conservatism, David Armitage has echoed Issac Kramnick’s influential reading of his subject’s prose works in describing him as ‘a spokesperson for a nostalgic, and fundamentally anti-modern, country ideology, which was hostile to a shift away from consensual aristocratic politics and an agrarian economy and toward party government and the burgeoning growth of a fiscal-military state based on public credit and insecure financial institutions.’⁷³ In the *Craftsman* (a periodical openly acknowledged as ‘unofficial mouth piece of the opposition during the Walpole era’) Bolingbroke made a series of addresses to ‘the freeholders of Britain’, again identifying them primarily in their capacity as voters.⁷⁴ Bolingbroke appealed to the civil duty of every freeholder in Britain to act in the best interest of the public weal as justification for opposition to the government. He identified with Addison’s arguments regarding citizenship and liberty and attempted to align his organised opposition with Addison’s suggestions that citizens must be active. For Bolingbroke, however, Addison’s active participant had become a political activist, forming the exact type of opposition the original *Freeholder* discouraged. The participation that Addison recommended was always in support of the party in power,

proving Jeremy Black's observation that 'support for government policies could be just as significant and valid an expression of public opinion as opposition to them.'⁷⁵ In the majority of cases partisanship was considered 'morally dangerous [and] aesthetically unappealing.'⁷⁶ Quentin Skinner even suggests it was seen as 'unpatriotic.'⁷⁷ To engage in the sort of 'formed opposition' conducted by Bolingbroke and his party between 1728 and 1734 was to engage in an activity regarded at the time as 'immoral' and 'tainted with disloyalty.'⁷⁸ Associating his oppositional writing with the patriotic duty of the freeholder was then, for Bolingbroke, a shrewd move.

Writing in 1733 Bolingbroke explicitly countered concerns that opposition and patriotism were mutually exclusively and, tellingly, in doing so he again used the freeholder figure to mount this defence. In *The Freeholder's Political Catechism* Bolingbroke writes that the only true safe-guard of liberty was the preservation of independence, with the people making choices free from 'threatening, promises, punishments and rewards by the open force of government'⁷⁹ Opposition, for Bolingbroke, was vital to the propagation of independence. He states that 'the people ought to have more security for all that is valuable in the world than the will of a mortal of fallible man: a King of Britain may make as many peers, and such, as he pleaseth; therefore the last and best security for the liberties of the people, is a House of Commons genuine and independent.'⁸⁰ In Bolingbroke's *Craftsman* we find an earlier attempt to synthesise this vision of the freeholder as a synecdoche for independent opposition with Addison's patriotic gentleman motivated by civic duty and national pride. In doing so Bolingbroke dragged the freeholder away from earlier conceptualisations galvanised by Civil War rhetoric into a post-Sacheverell arena where party politics had a direct, discernible and publically visible impact on constitutional action.

In the fifty-seventh number of Bolingbroke's *Craftsman* he cited the first essay of Addison's *Freeholder* at length by way of justification for the political advice he was about

to proffer, presenting guidance on how to vote whilst warning readers to exercise a degree of scepticism when supporting the party in power. He admitted that he had yet to discover evidence of corruption amidst ‘our present most incomparable ministers’ but ended by foregrounding the dangers inherent in partisan persuasion: ‘I think a neighbouring gentleman, of a moderate income but a middle-sized understanding, (if he be withal a man of known integrity) is much preferable to the most artful, insinuating flatterer, who comes to you from London with an insolent recommendation from men in power and a great bag of ill-gotten guineas.’⁸¹ Bolingbroke’s conclusion recommended the propertied and informed gentleman as the ideal role model. This figure bears a striking resemblance to the romanticised vision of the freeholder promoted by Addison, an influence foreshadowed in the opening lines of Bolingbroke’s essay which stresses an intellectual indebtedness to ‘the late ingenious Mr. Addison [who] was pleased to begin his paper, called the *Freeholder*, with an introduction concerning the importance of your denomination, and the particular privileges of a *British Freeholder*, which he sets forth in this just and beautiful manner.’⁸²

By the time that the fifty-ninth *Craftsman* appeared in print Bolingbroke was attempting to rouse fellow citizens to reclaim their liberty at all costs. To do this he again addressed his essay to the ‘freeholders of Great Britain’ and encouraged them to take action with ‘unwearied diligence and incorruptible fidelity.’⁸³ It was only when introducing the problems that brought him to press that the stark differences between the freeholders of Bolingbroke and Addison becomes clear. At this point Bolingbroke introduced a new polarising threat, revealing that the land-owning gentry were allegedly anxious about the emergence of a new class of moneyed men, stating that: ‘it is to be hoped, gentlemen, that you, who have the honour of being British freeholders, and have any property in land, will have the candour to remember how unalterably attached the last house of Commons (that is to say, the majority of them) were to your interest; with what unwearied diligence and

incorruptible fidelity they maintained your cause against the continual attempts of your new rivals, the moneyed men; and with what remarkable caution and difficulty they came into any measures, which could possibly affect your declining interest, in the minutest article.’⁸⁴ Rather than fearing this new demographic Addison’s periodical had always instead celebrated their arrival. Bolingbroke’s words here also foreground the fundamental difference between his periodical and Addison’s *Freeholder*. The *Craftsman* was attached to the last House of Commons, favouring it over the current administration. It wrote against the government in power, opposing their ‘extraordinary duties and taxes’ which Bolingbroke did not believe were justified by ‘the pretended reason’ of the ‘grievous debt of the nation.’⁸⁵ In contrast, Addison celebrated and defended his government, attacking only the hypothetical future government that might follow it. The ramifications of this difference were extensive, severely convoluting any deliberate attempts that Bolingbroke made to genuinely employ Addison’s vision of the freeholder.

Bolingbroke capitalised on Addison’s fashioning of his freeholder readers as diligent and politically active citizens. However, Bolingbroke’s freeholders were more than active partisans who support the current administration. They were a landed elite prepared to defend their liberty regardless of who happened to be in government. Bolingbroke’s own politics stood in marked contrast to Addison’s, revealing the problematic nature of the *Freeholder*’s advice when applied in opposition. Bolingbroke tried to take action against a government he did not agree with. In doing so he appeared to satisfy Addison’s charge that ‘omission’ is as serious a crime as ‘commission.’ The problem that arose is that Addison’s *Freeholder* also states clearly and repeatedly that opposition is akin to rebellion. Therefore, Addison’s advice cannot work as a justification for opposition. This shift in what it is that the *Freeholder* is perceived as recommending, seen here in the *Craftsman*, is amplified in later addressed to the freeholder community. Increasingly freeholders were fashioned as a distinct community

within Britain that when called upon can join together and take action on behalf of the public good.

In 1780 this image of an independent British community of propertied gentlemen, prepared to resist if oppressed, found itself newly engendered with credibility and urgency by the unprecedented events taking place across the Atlantic Ocean. On 25 May Bolingbroke's hypothetical freeholder resistance were rendered overt, as a West-Riding Freeholder had a letter published in Christopher Wyvill's *Yorkshire Freeholder* stating that men in his condition are subject to the same tyranny as those fighting for freedom and independence in the American Revolution: 'I am heartily glad that whilst our ministers are scalping, burning, plundering, and murdering the Americans, because they won't submit to taxation without representation, the more enlightened part of the nation has found out (and will, I trust, communicate the important Information to their fellow-citizens) that we ourselves are taxed without being represented: If this greatest of our national grievances be not speedily redressed by those whose Duty it is to redress it, I most sincerely wish, that in this and in every country under the sun, the same oppressions may find the same resistance.'⁸⁶ In championing the possibility of resistance against government, it is significant that this letter calls to a body of fellow freeholders. This is no longer Addison's imagined community of proactive partisans who are careful to never stand in opposition, but an exaggeration of Bolingbroke's freeholders, fully prepared to stand up for the public weal if faced with unfair oppression. It is telling that when looking to title a periodical designed to promote solidarity and resistance in the face of parliamentary oppression Christopher Wyvill named his paper the *Yorkshire Freeholder*. Indeed, this letter provided the closing words of the paper's final issue, prefaced with the editor's declaration that the 'letter so exactly coincides with my own sentiments, and so well expresses them.'⁸⁷ The West-Riding Freeholder surmises well Wyvill's ambition over the preceding nineteen numbers. Read as a complete body of writing

Wyvill's *Yorkshire Freeholder* is seen explicitly to stake a claim to the figure of the freeholder and complicate Addison's assertions that rebellion is always synonymous with opposition, proving that not only are the two distinct but that an awareness and willingness to commit to the latter is a fundamental duty of the freeholder.

Wyvill concluded that rather than there being any shame in the former, if truthfully enacted, a citizen could gain the respect of the very hierarchy he finds himself acting against: 'No man that has appeared for a certain space of time to promote the public good by a uniform series of well-meant and disinterested actions, will not in the end obtain the esteem and honest popularity, of which even Kings may envy him the possession.'⁸⁸ In that letter from a West-Riding Freeholder, not only was opposition seen to be distinct from rebellion, it was stated that government itself can be charged with rebellion if it failed to act in the best interests of those people it represents: 'this resistance to usurpation is not Rebellion, as venal slaves would persuade us, but a just, virtuous, and honourable self-defence, as well as a patriotic defence of the public. Rebellion is a hostile attack upon government lawfully administered, an attempt to subvert the rights and embellished order of community, and therefore the greatest rebellion is that of government itself against the community, for whom, and for whose preservation it was instituted and established.'⁸⁹ In such instances it is the duty of the proactive freeholder to identify the subversion of the government's prime function and organise action for its repair. The propertied gentleman, invested as he is in the nation, is responsible not only for his own protection, but that of his fellow freeholders; an interdependent community of partisans.

Throughout the eighteenth century partisan print witnessed a series of shifts in the significance of the freeholder figure. Within this print there was not only a struggle to appropriate the figure of the freeholder (and by extension a struggle to own the vote) but in some cases a struggle to protect it. For Addison in particular, problems began to arise when

voters imagined themselves as being beyond the systems of government in which their vote would be used. Addison's quest to empower the propertied gentleman was therefore tempered by a constant restatement of the limits of that empowerment. However, for many of his successors it was precisely the necessity to transcend these limits that compelled them to pick up their pen. Contrasting views on what the freeholder's role should and could be developed alongside concomitant debates over the differences between opposition and rebellion as political acts. From Addison to Bolingbroke we see a vivid demonstration of how malleable conceptualisations of 'independence' were throughout the eighteenth century, in terms of both its meaning and its perceived significance. Indeed, shifts in how the figure of the freeholder was perceived and conceived happened in tandem with documented changes in notions of patriotism and independence. The seventeenth-century conservative gentleman whose public duty saw him strive to preserve existing authorities and established hierarchies gave way to a new vision, this time of a dynamic group of gentleman who derived power from their own community and felt their own independence a credible check against government corruption. When Wyvill's final issue of the *Yorkshire Freeholder* reached print the property-owning gentleman can clearly be identified as having that 'anti-aristocratic ideological edge' singled out by French and Rothery as a trait associated with the later eighteenth-century gentleman.⁹⁰ By 1780 the freeholder community was no longer perceived as the embodiment of established systems, authorities and political hierarchies, but as something that could be evoked to transcend government bureaucracy: the spirit of the nation. For Bolingbroke and Wyvill this dependably undefinable spirit remained distinct from crown or court and could be relied upon to rally against such systems for the good of the nation.

From Atterbury to Addison, through to Bolingbroke and Wyvill, the freeholder's prescribed interests swayed dramatically from the metropolitan to the provincial, from the profoundly elite to the tentatively egalitarian, and ultimately from politically inert, to

politically engaged, to politically active. The freeholder has signified for Atterbury the old Tory powered by hereditary right, for Addison a new (but perhaps no less conservative) race of moneyed men intent of defending a triumphant Whig ministry from the dangers of dissent and rebellion and for Bolingbroke a proactive community of independent gentleman prepared to resist the government in power in the name of the public weal. As has been regularly stated, the rival appropriation of language that often characterised eighteenth-century partisan print begot a fluidity (and destabilisation) of meaning, foregrounding the extent to which we need to be aware of both the politicisation and historicisation of language when re-reading these texts. The freeholder, as Addison was quick to realise, was a figure through which pulsed questions of property, patriotism and independence. As such, attention to how the term is used in political print allows us a new perspective when considering the interconnectedness of these social patterns and attitudes.

This article opened, however, not with an extract from the privileged site of periodical print but from an anonymous ballad printed in 1714 to mark Lord Pelham's birthday, offering a glimpse in to the word's utilisation free from the ink of party writers like Atterbury and Addison. Here we find a far more instinctively inclusive characterisation of the freeholder, hinting even at Bolingbroke's later suggestion that such men should be prepared to defend the public good at all costs. The ballad's opening line, 'O all ye Sussex freeholders' is repeated with slight variation in each new verse. With every refrain the community of freeholders addressed changes, moving from the southern band of 'Sussex freeholders', to the 'Northern freeholders' and then finally 'all ye British freeholders.' The ballad's appeal becomes an increasingly open invitation as more and more listeners are encouraged to pay attention to the ballad and, perhaps more significantly, to vote:

Then all ye Northern Freeholders
 Come Harken to my story
 And vote for this brave Whig Lord,

Who'll like Tory Rory

As the ballad addresses itself to the North it pre-emptively the development of the freeholder's evolution into a proactive political activist in the hands of men like Bolingbroke. Robin Hood, we are told, would admire this ballad's subject and might even be enticed to return to the land of the living to further its ambitions: 'In Noble Sherwood Forest/ Such a Racket we shall have,/ That Robin Hood, to see this Lord,/ Will Bounce out of his Grave.' Despite the numerous competing myths of origin circulating the legend of Robin Hood, a core facet of his characterisation remained his identification as a one-time landowner later outlawed, who challenged the nation's legal, governmental and administrative infrastructure on behalf of his fellow suffering citizens. Robin Hood, it seems, bore some striking freeholder credentials, sharing life blood with those later visions of independent freeholdership in particular. Ultimately the ballad opens its address up to freeholders across the nation, summarising well the evolution of the freeholder figure in periodical print throughout the eighteenth century with a universal appeal addressed to the future, intended to far outlive the moment of utterance:

And when he's Dead, I have taken care
He shall live in this Son.
O all ye British Freeholders
Come listen to my Story.

¹ Anon, 'A Ballad on Lord Pelham's Birthday, (London, 1714)', *Early Broadsheet Ballads Archive* (2016). Accessed February 28, 2016, url: <http://ebba.english.ucsb.edu/ballad/33295/image>.

² P. J. Kulischek, "Pelham, Henry (1694–1754)", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2008). Accessed 23 November 2015, url: <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21789?docPos=2>.

³ Francis Atterbury, *English Advice to the Freeholders of England* (London: 1714), p. 4.

⁴ For a discussion of the changing meanings and applications of 'loyalty' between 1688 and 1815 see Matthew McCormack's 'Rethinking "Loyalty" in Eighteenth-Century Britain', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 35.4 (2012) p. 407-421. The figure of the 'Patriot' has long been a reoccurring subject of British history. See, for example, Linda Colley's 'The Apotheosis of George III: Loyalty, Royalty and the British Nation, 1760-

1820,' *Past and Present*, 102 (1984) p. 94-129; Hugh Cunningham, 'The Language of Patriotism', in *Patriotism: The Making and Unmaking of British National Identity*, ed. by Raphael Samuel, vol. I. (London: Routledge, 1986) p. 57-66; David Eastwood, 'Robert Southey and the Meanings of Patriotism', *Journal of British Studies* 31 (1992) p. 963-84; John Sainsbury, *Disaffected Patriots: London Supporters of Revolutionary America, 1769-1782* (Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1982).

⁵ McCormack, 'Rethinking Loyalty,' p. 407.

⁶ Anon, *Ballad on Lord Pelham's Birthday*.

⁷ James Leheny, introduction to *The Freeholder*, by Joseph Addison (London: Clarendon Press, 1979), p. 1.

⁸ For recent discussions of this space sensitive to issues of gender and material culture see: Henry French and Mark Rothery, *Man's Estate: Landed Gentry Masculinities, 1600-1900* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); Karen Harvey, *The Little Republic: Masculinity and Domestic Authority in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

⁹ For example, this is noted in the following works: A. Shepard, 'From anxious patriarchs to refined gentleman? Manhood in Britain, circa 1500-1700', *Journal of British Studies*, 44 (2005), p. 281-95; Karen Harvey, 'The History of Masculinity, circa 1650-1800', *Journal of British Studies*, 44 (2005), p. 296-311; Michèle Cohen, *Fashioning Masculinity: National Identity and Language in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Routledge, 1996).

¹⁰ Henry French and Mark Rothery, "'Upon Your Entry in the World": Masculine Values and the Threshold of Adulthood Among the Landed Elites in England, 1680-1800', *Social History*, 33. 4 (2008), p. 402-422 (403).

¹¹ Anna Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 132-4; Steven Shapin, *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Early Modern England* (London and Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), p. 49.

¹² Matthew McCormack, *The Independent Man: Citizenship and Politics in Georgian England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), p. 13.

¹³ McCormack, *Independent Man*, p. 13.

¹⁴ McCormack, *Independent Man*, p. 6.

¹⁵ James Harrington, *The Commonwealth of Oceana*, ed. by J. G. A Pocock (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); McCormack, *Independent Man*, p. 59.

¹⁶ McCormack, *Independent Man*, p. 60.

¹⁷ Addison, *The Freeholder* 1 (23 December 1715), p. 1.

¹⁸ Addison, *The Freeholder* 5 (6 January 1716), p. 1.

¹⁹ Addison, *Freeholder* 5, p. 1.

²⁰ Addison, *Freeholder* 5, p. 2.

²¹ Addison, *Freeholder* 5, p. 2.

²² Cited in Christopher Sinclair-Steven, *Inglorious Rebellion: The Jacobite Risings of 1708, 1715 and 1719* (London: Hamish Hamilton Ltd., 1971), p. 73.

²³ Addison, *The Freeholder* 20 (27 February 1716), p. 1.

²⁴ David Armitage, 'A Patriot for Whom? The Afterlives of Bolingbroke's Patriot King', *Journal of British Studies*, 36. 4 (1997), p. 397-418 (p. 398).

²⁵ See: Margot C. Finn, *After Chartism: Class and Nation in English Radical Politics, 1848-1874* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 14; David Armitage, 'A Patriot for Whom? The Afterlives of Bolingbroke's Patriot King', *Journal of British Studies*, 36. 4 (1997), pp. 397-418 (p. 399).

²⁶ Quentin Skinner, 'The Principles and Practice of Opposition: The Case of Bolingbroke versus Walpole,' in *Historical Perspectives: Studies in English Thought and Society in Honour of J. H. Plumb*, ed. by Neil McKendrick (London: Europa, 1974), p. 113-21.

²⁷ Christopher Wyvill, *The Yorkshire Freeholder* (1780). This periodical, printed in York by Ann Ward, appeared for 19 numbers in 1780.

²⁸ For example, see: Philip Carter, *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society. Britain 1600-1800* (Harlow: Routledge, 2001) p. 76-87; John Tosh, 'Gentlemanly politeness and manly simplicity in Victorian England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 12 (2002), pp. 455-72.

²⁹ French and Rothery, 'Masculine Values' p. 406; Peter Lassett, *The World We Have Lost* (London: Routledge, 1965), p. 27-8.

³⁰ Atterbury, *English Advice*, p. 4.

³¹ Anon, "A Ballad on Lord Pelham's Birthday", p. 1.

³² Addison, *Freeholder* 1, p. 1.

³³ Addison, *Freeholder* 1, p. 1.

³⁴ Addison, *Freeholder* 1, p. 1.

- ³⁵ Atterbury, *English Advice*, p. 4.
- ³⁶ Atterbury, *English Advice*, p. 1.
- ³⁷ Atterbury, *English Advice*, p. 4.
- ³⁸ D. W. Hayton, "Atterbury, Francis (1663–1732)", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2012). Accessed 23 November 2015, url: <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/871>.
- ³⁹ Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 286.
- ⁴⁰ Anon, *British Advice to the Freeholders of Great-Britain: Being an answer to a Treasonable Libel, entitled, English Advice to the Freeholders of England* (London, 1715), p. 1.
- ⁴¹ Anon, *British Advice*, p. 1.
- ⁴² John Oldmixon, *Remarks on a Late Libel Privately Dispersed by the Tories, Entitled English Advice to the Freeholders of England* (London: J. Roberts, 1715), p. 2.
- ⁴³ Oldmixon, *Remarks*, p. 2.
- ⁴⁴ Anon, *British Advice*, p. 7.
- ⁴⁵ Addison, *Freeholder* 5, p. 1.
- ⁴⁶ Lawrence Klein, "Property and Politeness in the Early Eighteenth-Century Whig Moralists: The Case of the Spectator," in *Early Modern Conceptions of Property* (London: Routledge, 1995), p. 221-233.
- ⁴⁷ Paul Langford, *Public Life and the Propertied Englishman 1689-1798* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), p. 1.
- ⁴⁸ Langford, *Public Life*, p. 1.
- ⁴⁹ Addison, *Freeholder* 1, p. 1.
- ⁵⁰ Addison, *Freeholder* 1, p. 1.
- ⁵¹ Addison, *Freeholder* 1, p. 1.
- ⁵² Addison, *Freeholder* 1, p. 2.
- ⁵³ Addison, *Freeholder* 5, p. 1.
- ⁵⁴ Addison, *Freeholder* 5, p. 2.
- ⁵⁵ Addison, *The Freeholder* 13 (3 February 1716), p. 2.
- ⁵⁶ T. J. Hochstrasser, *Natural Law and the Early Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- ⁵⁷ Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, p. 296.
- ⁵⁸ Frances Brooke, *The History of Emily Montague*, 4 vols (London: J. Dodsley, 1769), vol. iii, p. 20-21.
- ⁵⁹ Quoted by Langford in *Public Life and the Propertied English Gentleman 1689-1798* (Oxford: Clarendon press, 1991), p. 9; *The History of Emily Montague* (London, 1769), iii, pp. 20-21.
- ⁶⁰ Addison, *Freeholder* 1, p. 1.
- ⁶¹ J. Disney, *The Works Theological, Medical, Political and Miscellaneous, of John Jebb*, 3 vols (London, 1787), vol. iii, p. 412.
- ⁶² Anon, *A Letter from a Freeholder of the County of Norfolk, to one of the Knights of the Shire, Occasioned by Dr. Sachervall's Tryal* (London: John Morphew, 1710).
- ⁶³ Anon, *Letter from a Freeholder*, p. 1.
- ⁶⁴ Jonathan Swift, *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, ed. by H. Davis, 14 vols (Oxford: Clarendon press, 1939-62), vol. iii, p. 66.
- ⁶⁵ Leheny, introduction to *The Freeholder*, p. 1.
- ⁶⁶ Anon, *Letter from a Freeholder*, p. 4.
- ⁶⁷ Anon, *Letter from a Freeholder*, p. 2.
- ⁶⁸ Addison, *The Freeholder* 11, (13 January 1716), p. 1.
- ⁶⁹ Anon, *Letter from a Freeholder*, p. 5.
- ⁷⁰ Addison, *Freeholder* 1, p. 1.
- ⁷¹ Addison, *The Freeholder* 12 (30 January 1716), p. 1.
- ⁷² Addison, *Freeholder* 12, p. 1.
- ⁷³ David Armitage, 'A Patriot for Whom? The Afterlives of Bolingbroke's Patriot King', *Journal of British Studies*, 36. 4 (1997), p. 397-418 (399); Isaac Kramnick, (1968) *Bolingbroke and His Circle: The Politics of Nostalgia in the Age of Walpole* (London: Cornell University Press, 1992).
- ⁷⁴ Simon Varey, "The Craftsman", in *Telling People What to Think: Early Eighteenth-Century Periodicals from The Review to The Rambler*, ed. by J. A. Downie and Thomas N. Corns (London: F. Cass, 1993), pp. 58-78 (p. 58).
- ⁷⁵ Jeremy Black, 'Politicisation and the Press in Hanoverian England', in *Serials and their Readers, 1620-1914*, ed. by Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Newcastle: Oak Knoll Press, 1993), p. 63-82 (72).

⁷⁶ Gianfranco Poggi, 'Citizens and the State: Retrospect and Prospect', *States and Citizens*, ed. by Quentin Skinner and Bo Stråth (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 39-48 (43) and Quentin Skinner, 'Augustan Party Politics and Renaissance Constitutional Thought', *Visions of Politics, vol. 2: Renaissance Virtues* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 344-367 (354).

⁷⁷ Skinner, "Augustan Party Politics", p. 354.

⁷⁸ Skinner, "Augustan Party Politics", p. 354.

⁷⁹ Henry St John, *The Freeholder's Political Catechism* (Dublin: T. Moore, 1733) p. 18.

⁸⁰ St John, *Political Catechism*, p. 18.

⁸¹ Henry St John, *The Craftsman; Being a Critique upon the Times*, 14 vols. (London: R. Franklin, 1731), ii, p. 123. In its original format *The Craftsman* was printed in London over 511 numbers, 1726-1736.

⁸² Henry St John, *The Craftsman*, (1731), ii, p. 129.

⁸³ St John, *Craftsman*, p. 101.

⁸⁴ St John, *Craftsman*, p. 102.

⁸⁵ St John, *Craftsman*, p. 104.

⁸⁶ Christopher Wyvill, *The Yorkshire Freeholder* 19 (25 May 1780), p. 6.

⁸⁷ Wyvill, *Yorkshire Freeholder* 19, p. 6.

⁸⁸ Wyvill, *The Yorkshire Freeholder* 1 (20 January 1780), p. 3.

⁸⁹ Wyvill, *Yorkshire Freeholder* 19, p. 6.

⁹⁰ French and Rothery, 'Masculine Values', p. 406).