CrossMark

The Historical Journal, 64, 5 (2021), pp. 1257–1280 © The Author(s), 2020. Published by Cambridge University Press.
doi:10.1017/S0018246X20000606

JOHN DARBY AND THE WHIG CANON*

JOSEPH HONE
Newcastle University

ABSTRACT. *Through a co-ordinated series of publications in the final years of the seventeenth century, a diverse set of commonwealth texts was entrenched into the canon of whig political thought. This article explores that canon through the lens of the history of the book. A key figure in the formation of this canon was the printer and bookseller John Darby. This article reconstructs Darby's role in the commonwealth opposition to the perceived failures of the Williamite revolution. Using bibliographical methods to establish his output, it shows that from the earliest days of the revolution Darby reprinted a broad range of historic whig texts, ranging from works of history and memoir to collections of poems. These texts provided a language, a rationale, and a model for opposition activity. He also manufactured pamphlets that adapted country principles to contemporary political circumstances. By shifting the focus from John Toland to his printer, the article suggests that the canonical whig texts were one part of a much broader and more ambitious programme to establish an historic canon of oppositional literature.*

I

A celebrated series of books by the English commonwealthmen of the seventeenth century was published between 1698 and 1700. The series included major editions of works by John Milton, Algernon Sidney, and James Harrington, and the Civil War memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, Denzil Holles, John Berkeley, and Thomas Fairfax. Collectively, these texts have become known as the 'whig canon'.[1] Over the following century, this set of writings would profoundly shape the development of republican thought on both sides of the Atlantic.[2] The texts of the whig canon would be cited approvingly

Percy Building, Newcastle University, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, NE1 7RU joseph.hone@ncl.ac.uk

* For comments and suggestions on earlier versions of this article, I would like to thank Rachel Hammersley, Max Skjönsberg, Ashley Walsh, and the two readers for the *Historical Journal*. The work also benefited from discussion with the late Justin Champion.

[1] Caroline Robbins, *The eighteenth-century commonwealthman* (Cambridge, MA, 1959), p. 32.

[2] J. G. A. Pocock, 'The varieties of whiggism from exclusion to reform: a history of ideology and discourse', in *Virtue, commerce, and history: essays on political thought and history, chiefly in the eighteenth century* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 215–310; Robbins, *Commonwealthman*; Blair Worden, *Roundhead reputations: the English Civil Wars and the passions of posterity* (London,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

by thinkers as diverse as Bolingbroke and the founding fathers of the American constitution.[3] At their original moment of publication, however, the series was designed to bolster opposition to the consolidation of power by the court whigs under William III. By reasserting 'true whig' principles against the corruption of the apostates who made their peace with the court, these historic works were made to chime with the political challenges faced by the opposition in the present moment: attacking the maintenance of standing armies by the state, inveighing against priestcraft, and asserting the primacy of the ancient constitution.

Historians have detected the guiding hand of a single figure behind these publications. The Irish deist John Toland put his name only to the edition of Harrington and his initials to the *Life* of Milton, but the entire series is covered with his fingerprints. More than forty years ago, in a terrific feat of historical detection, Blair Worden demonstrated how Toland doctored the original text of Ludlow's *Memoirs*, stripping the book of Ludlow's millenarian puritanism and enhancing aspects which served his immediate political ends.[4] More recently, Mark Goldie has illuminated the means by which Toland likely acquired the memoirs of Holles and Berkeley in manuscript.[5] Indeed, this collection of texts has been described by no less a historian than J. G. A. Pocock as 'Toland's canon'.[6] For Goldie, this 'hackneyed canon of political high virtue' was 'chiefly the work of the prolific Toland'.[7] Although Justin Champion clarifies that 'Toland's project was not solitary but collaborative', he remains convinced that the 'adventurous project of republishing the canonical works of the commonwealth tradition' was principally Toland's idea.[8]

2001); Alan Craig Houston, *Algernon Sidney and the republican heritage in England and America* (Princeton, NJ, 1991). Compare J. C. D. Clark, *The language of liberty, 1660–1832: political discourse and social dynamics in the Anglo-American world* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 20–9.

[3] Quentin Skinner, 'Augustan party politics and Renaissance constitutional thought', in *Visions of politics* (3 vols., Cambridge, 2002), II, pp. 344–67; J. G. A. Pocock, 'Machiavelli, Harrington and English political ideologies in the eighteenth century', in *Politics, language, and time: essays on political thought and history* (London, 1971), pp. 104–47.

[4] Edmund Ludlow, *A voyce from the watch tower*, ed. A. B. Worden (London, 1978); Blair Worden, 'Whig history and puritan politics: the *Memoirs* of Edmund Ludlow revisted', *Historical Research*, 75 (2002), pp. 209–37. Brian Fairfax likewise toned down the providentialism of Fairfax's *Short memorials* (1699): see Andrew Hopper, *'Black Tom': Sir Thomas Fairfax and the English revolution* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 226–9.

[5] Mark Goldie, *Roger Morrice and the puritan whigs* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 218–20.

[6] J. G. A. Pocock, *The ancient constitution and the feudal law: a study of English historical thought in the seventeenth century* (2nd edn, Cambridge, 1987), p. 365.

[7] Mark Goldie, 'The English system of liberty', in Mark Goldie and Robert Wokler, eds., *The Cambridge history of eighteenth-century political thought* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 40–78, at p. 67.

[8] Justin Champion, *Republican learning: John Toland and the crisis of Christian culture, 1696–1722* (Manchester, 2003), pp. 94–100; Rachel Hammersley, *James Harrington: an intellectual biography* (Oxford, 2020), pp. 5–7. For doubts, see Jonathan Duke-Evans, 'The political theory and practice of the English commonwealthsmen, 1695–1725' (D.Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1980), pp. 278–80.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

There was another person involved. All the principal texts of the whig canon came from the press of John Darby of Bartholomew Close. If Toland was the mastermind of the 'whig history factory', Darby was its engineer.[9] And yet the printer's role in the creation of the whig canon has always been considered subsidiary to that of its editor. Even though Goldie hints at 'the Darby–Toland partnership' and Worden refers to these books as 'the Darby series' and as 'Darby's creation', there has been no sustained attempt to situate these texts within the context of Darby's printing career.[10] Perhaps this is attributable to the assumption that, like other printers, Darby was a jobbing freelancer, albeit one with an ideological stake in the works he printed. And it is true that much of Darby's trade involved printing works to order for copyright-owning booksellers such as Richard Chiswell, for whom he covertly reprinted Hobbes's *Leviathan* at the turn of the century.[11] But Darby was also a printer-bookseller manufacturing books on his own behalf, usually to be distributed by the trade publisher Richard Baldwin or, after 1698, his widow Abigail.[12] With the exception of a pathbreaking Cambridge thesis by John S. T. Hetet, which shed some light on Darby's early activities, he is mostly a bit player, lurking in the footnotes of scholarship on Andrew Marvell, Toland, and Matthew Tindal, while the full extent of his activities remain hidden from view.[13] This is hardly surprising, because like other nonconformist printers of the time he covered his tracks to avoid legal censure.[14] Darby disguised books with false and misleading imprints.[15] More often than not, uncovering his handiwork requires sifting through the anonymous pamphlets of the later seventeenth century with an eye to typography,

[9] Worden, *Roundhead*, p. 147.

[10] Goldie, *Morrice*, p. 218; Worden, 'Whig history', p. 233; Worden, *Roundhead*, p. 87. Champion likewise assigns a lesser role to Darby (*Republican learning*, pp. 98–9).

[11] Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. Noel Malcolm (3 vols., Oxford, 2012), I, pp. 258–71; Noel Malcolm, 'The making of the ornaments: further thoughts on the printing of the third edition of *Leviathan*', *Hobbes Studies*, 21 (2008), pp. 3–37.

[12] D. F. McKenzie, 'The London book trade in the later seventeenth century' (Sandars Lectures, Univ. of Cambridge, 1976), pp. 27–9; Michael Treadwell, 'London trade publishers 1675–1750', *The Library*, 6th ser., 4 (1982), pp. 99–134.

[13] John S. T. Hetet, 'A literary underground in Restoration England: printers and dissenters in the context of constraints 1660–1689' (Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge, 1987), pp. 160–94.

[14] Martin Dzelzainis, 'Managing the later Stuart press, 1662–1696', in Lorna Hutson, ed., *The Oxford handbook of English law and literature, 1500–1700* (Oxford, 2017), pp. 529–47; Hetet, 'A literary underground'; N. H. Keeble, *The literary culture of nonconformity in later seventeenth-century England* (Leicester, 1987); Timothy Crist, 'Francis Smith and the opposition press in England, 1660–1688' (Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge, 1977).

[15] Michael Treadwell, 'On false and misleading imprints in the London book trade, 1660–1750', in Robin Myers and Michael Harris, eds., *Fakes and frauds: varieties of deception in print and manuscript* (Winchester, 1989), pp. 29–46; David F. Foxon, *Pope and the early eighteenth-century book trade*, rev. and ed. James McLaverty (Oxford, 1991), pp. 1–12; Andrew Benjamin Bricker, 'Who was "A. Moore"? The attribution of eighteenth-century publications with false and misleading imprints', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 110 (2016), pp. 181–214.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ornaments, paper stock, and advertisements, which is hardly an attractive proposition to most historians of political thought.[16]

Yet bibliographical methods do yield results. Scholars such as Noel Malcolm have demonstrated that it is possible to identify the output of Darby's press beyond those titles to which he put his imprint.[17] In reopening this chapter, my aim is to move Darby from the periphery to the centre of our attention. Doing so reveals that the whig canon as we know and study it was just one element in a much broader and more ambitious programme to establish an historic canon of oppositional literature. The printer may not have co-ordinated the whole campaign, but he certainly helped shape it. In a very real sense, Toland's canon was just one branch of Darby's canon. Alongside the celebrated works of philosophy and memoir, and a quickfire series of tracts against standing armies, Darby was simultaneously republishing 'secret histories' and 'state poems' from the Interregnum and Restoration. Darby did not put his name to these books and has not previously been recognized as their printer. By identifying the relationship between these volumes and the canonical texts edited by Toland, I want to encourage scholars towards a more expansive vision of the whig canon, which was fundamentally part of an oppositional campaign not a republican project. If the texts edited by Toland provided a philosophical framework for the oppositional activities of the country whigs, the poems supplied their cultural foundation. More broadly, the example of John Darby and the whig canon demonstrates that any history of political thought which ignores the history of the book is in danger of oversimplifying the past.

II

Little enough is known about Darby's career to make a brief summary of his early activities necessary. He was bound as an apprentice to John Hide in September 1647, a few months before the second phase of the Civil Wars was triggered in early 1648.[18] In religion, Darby was said to align with the anabaptists.[19] It seems likely that his sympathy for the radical fringe of dissent was

[16] On the reluctance of intellectual historians to embrace bibliographical methods, see Jacob Soll, 'Intellectual history and history of the book', in Richard Whatmore and Brian Young, eds., *A companion to intellectual history* (Oxford, 2015), pp. 72–82; Quentin Skinner, 'On intellectual history and the history of books', *Contributions to the History of Concepts*, 1 (2005), pp. 29–36; David Womersley, 'Literature and the history of political thought', *Historical Journal*, 39 (1996), pp. 511–20. For masterful use of these techniques, see David R. Como, *Radical parliamentarians and the English Civil War* (Oxford, 2018).

[17] Malcolm, 'Ornaments'; J. C. Walmsley and Felix Waldmann, 'John Locke and the toleration of Catholics: a new manuscript', *Historical Journal*, 62 (2019), pp. 1093–115, at p. 1100. For Darby junior, see Hazel Wilkinson, 'Printers' flowers as evidence in the identification of unknown printers: two examples from 1715', *The Library*, 7th ser., 14 (2013), pp. 70–9; James E. May, 'Edmund Curll's printers, 1706–1715, with evidence from woodcut ornaments', *Swift Studies*, 33 (2018), pp. 33–98, at pp. 77–8.

[18] D. F. McKenzie, *Stationers' Company apprentices, 1641–1700* (Oxford, 1974), p. 78.

[19] John Dunton, *Life and errors*, ed. John Nichols (2 vols., London, 1818), I, p. 247.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

forged in the religious crucible of Interregnum London, during his years as an apprentice. Soon after he was released from his apprenticeship in November 1660, Darby began printing incendiary tracts on a variety of political and religious topics.

The underground book trade was bound together as much by political and religious loyalties as by professional interest. Darby worked with members of the trade he could trust. Others, in turn, trusted him. According to the surveyor of the press, Roger L'Estrange, in 1663 he worked with John Twyn on parts of the tyrannicidical pamphlet *Mene tekel*. After Twyn was seized along with his unfinished sheets, Darby 'perfected' the book and issued it for sale.[20] When arrested in 1668 for printing a lampoon on the king, he was linked to the bookseller Ann Brewster, the widow of Thomas Brewster with whom he had earlier worked on a notorious commonwealth tract, *The phoenix of the Solemn League and Covenant*.[21] Perhaps his closest associate in this period was the nonconformist bookseller Nathaniel Ponder, for whom he printed Andrew Marvell's *The rehearsal transpros'd* in 1672 and, four years later, composed one sheet of Marvell's puritan satire *Mr Smirke*.[22] In 1677, he was employed by another nonconformist, Francis Smith, to print what would become Marvell's most celebrated polemic, *An account of the growth of popery*.[23] Like most of Darby's pamphlets of that year, the *Account* was a surreptitious edition, printed with a false Amsterdam imprint, though the ruse seems to have fooled no one.[24] A warrant was soon drawn up for the printer's arrest and, a month later, a reward issued for information leading to his capture.[25]

Outside the book trade, Darby cultivated personal links with dangerous opposition figures. Those connections came sharply into focus during the

[20] Although Twyn was convicted for printing *A treatise of the execution of justice* (1663), not *Mene Tekel* (1663), L'Estrange claimed that Darby 'printed 6 or 7 sheets of Mene-Tekel; [the] Book I seized in the Presse & one Twyne was Hangd and Quarterd for 't. He perfected this Book, after the Other had dyd for 't' (London, The National Archives (TNA), SP 29/425, fo. 156r). Either L'Estrange confused the two books or had evidence linking Twyn to *Mene Tekel* that never made it to court. On Twyn's trial and execution for treason, see Joseph F. Loewenstein, 'Legal proofs and corrected readings: press-agency and the new bibliography', in David Lee Miller, Sharon O'Dair, and Harold Weber, eds., *The production of English Renaissance culture* (Ithaca, NY, 1994), pp. 111–22; Jody Greene, *The trouble with ownership: literary property and authorial liability in England, 1660–1730* (Philadelphia, PA, 2005), pp. 66–74.

[21] TNA, SP 29/239, fo. 10r.

[22] There is some doubt as to whether he printed the sheet after composing it; see Martin Dzelzainis and Steph Coster, 'The commissioning, writing, and printing of *Mr Smirke*: a new account', in Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton, eds., *The Oxford handbook of Andrew Marvell* (Oxford, 2019), pp. 538–57.

[23] Andrew Marvell, *The prose works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. Martin Dzelzainis et al. (2 vols., New Haven, CT, 2003), II, p. 188.

[24] Suspected Darby pamphlets from that year include J. E., *A narrative of the cause and manner of the imprisonment of the lords* (Amsterdam [i.e. London], 1677); *A seasonable argument to perswade all the grand juries in England to petition for a new parliament* (Amsterdam [i.e. London], 1677); *A list of several ships belonging to English merchants* (Amsterdam [i.e. London], 1677).

[25] TNA, SP 44/334, p. 457; *London Gazette*, 1288 (25 Mar. 1678).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

spring and summer of 1683, in the weeks surrounding the failed Rye House plot, when the press was under renewed surveillance.[26] As part of his duties for the secretary of state, the government agent Sir Philip Lloyd had been running spies among the whigs.[27] During his inquiries Lloyd received a tip-off about 'a Hamper' which had been sent to a printer from the house of Robert West, one of the leading plotters. Lloyd was given the address of Thomas Braddyll, another printer who had recently turned informer.[28] But the package had actually been delivered to Darby's workshop on Bartholomew Close. L'Estrange suspected foul play from Lloyd's men: 'It was a palpable Abuse, for they do know; (Both of them) that Braddyl does not live in St Bartholomews Close; if the Information poynted thither: And then that Darby the Printer, does Live there: as dangerous, and Desperate an Anabaptist as lives.'[29] He informed the secretary of state that Darby's daughter had until recently lived with West's wife and mother-in-law. Regarding the Rye House plotters being investigated by Lloyd, he entertained 'no doubt of Darby's beeing as far in as any man'.[30]

The precise nature of Darby's involvement was left unclear. The printer was reportedly 'Inseparable' from Henry Danvers, a notable Baptist plotter who was described in another letter as Darby's 'Crony'.[31] He could have been working as a courier between the conspirators; alternatively, we might speculate that the hamper contained manuscript papers to be printed. On the same day that Algernon Sidney and Lord Russell were arrested, 26 June, L'Estrange updated the secretary of state that 'there is some Lewd work in the Presse in St Barthlomew Close'. Darby and his servants had been observed 'doing some desperate piece of night-work' which he believed was 'nothing more likely then some Declaration or Discourse in favour of this Conspiracy'.[32] Such 'night-work' would need to be smuggled out of the printing house without attracting attention. Darby had the necessary infrastructure in place. In anticipation of a raid on Bartholomew Close, L'Estrange notified the messengers of 'a secret Conveyance' out of the premises, large enough to hold fifty or sixty

[26] Peter Hinds, 'Rogers L'Estrange, the Rye House plot, and the regulation of political discourse in late-seventeenth-century London', *The Library*, 7th ser., 3 (2002), pp. 3–31; Grant Tapsell, *The personal rule of Charles II, 1681–1685* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 102–3.

[27] Lloyd was the point of contact for Nathaniel Hartshorne, a double agent who infiltrated the chambers of Richard Goodenough and witnessed him scheming with John Ayloffe and others on how best to kill the king (TNA, SP 29/427, fo. 48). It was Lloyd who seized the papers of Algernon Sidney: see Jonathan Scott, *Algernon Sidney and the Restoration crisis, 1677–1683* (Cambridge, 1991), p. 294.

[28] TNA, SP 29/424, fo. 230r; Joseph Hone, 'David Edwards and the later Stuart underground press', *English Historical Review*, forthcoming.

[29] TNA, SP 29/425, fo. 100r.

[30] Ibid., fo. 100r.

[31] Ibid., fos. 100r and 156r.

[32] Ibid., fo. 156r.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

people, which he alone could 'Direct to'.[33] Such a passageway could have been used by Darby to hide finished books, spirit them away, or take delivery of sheets printed elsewhere. It was suggested that Darby's men operated an additional 'private presse' on Blue Anchor Alley, which was accessible only via 'many back doors by holes and passages'.[34] The 'secret Conveyance' at Bartholomew Close might therefore have been used to traffic material between the two presses.

The identity of the 'night-work' undertaken by Darby and his men in the summer of 1683 is an unsolved puzzle. But we do know that around this time he was busy printing a new pamphlet by the whig cleric Samuel Johnson. The main sheets of *Julian's arts to undermine and extirpate Christianity* were completed well before 3 August, when Darby was taken for questioning. The pamphlet was a sequel to Johnson's exclusionist tract of the previous year, *Julian the apostate*, which would be among the seditious and heretical books burned at Oxford in the following month.[35] His servants had printed 3,000 copies and were waiting for the prefatory matter before stitching the pamphlets and sending them to Johnson to be distributed.[36] At the end of September, the printer was interrogated once again, and explained that although *Julian's arts* had been printed, it was 'not publick' for he had obeyed the secretary of state's injunction and had 'disposed of itt, to supress itt'. When asked where he had hidden the sheets, though, Darby 'Refused to tell'. Meanwhile, he had printed for Johnson another 3,000 copies of *Julian* with a false '1682' imprint. These copies were now 'in y^{e} Country' at large.[37]

With the tory reaction in full swing, Johnson was prosecuted for seditious libel in November. Darby was tried and convicted on the same day for printing 20,000 copies of the scaffold speech of the whig martyr Lord Russell, of which Johnson, as Russell's chaplain, was widely suspected of being the author.[38] He was responsible for three editions that year, the second printed from standing type, 'by Direction of the Lady *RUSSEL*'.[39] The most 'remarkable' feature of this printed speech, in the judgement of Narcissus Luttrell, was that Darby 'putt his name to it, and did it not in private'.[40] Copies of the speech had been distributed across the country by Russell's widow, though it

[33] TNA, SP 29/432, fo. 2r.

[34] TNA, SP 29/237, fo. 165r; SP 29/236, fo. 309r.

[35] Goldie, *Morrice*, p. 566.

[36] TNA, SP 29/430, fo. 49r.

[37] TNA, SP 29/433, fos. 13–14. The 'reply to Jovian' mentioned by Johnson under interrogation was *Julian's arts*. This false '1682' edition of *Julian* (ESTC R22222) is octavo; the true first edition is duodecimo.

[38] TNA, SP 29/433, fo. 13v; Melinda S. Zook, *Radical whigs and conspiratorial politics in late Stuart England* (University Park, PA, 1999), p. 61.

[39] *The speech of the late Lord Russel* (London, 1683), p. 4.

[40] Narcissus Luttrell, *A brief historical relation of state affairs* (6 vols., Oxford, 1857), I, p. 288.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

was Darby on whom the blame fell.[41] On this occasion he escaped with a fine. Previously he had faced the pillory.[42]

III

Having suffered for the whig cause under the Stuart kings, Darby and his associates had good cause to welcome the regime change of 1689. In the early months of the revolution, a small group of commonwealthmen had urged root-and-branch constitutional reform.[43] They argued that kings could rule only by the consent of the people and that any new political settlement ought to enshrine the right of popular resistance. Once it became clear that establishment whigs would surrender these principles in return for office, and that William would continue to govern as an authoritarian monarch, the commonwealthmen aimed to transform the dissident whigs into a legitimate party of opposition, without the taint of sedition. There were two sides to this project. The first was to establish the principles along which an opposition could legitimately be formed. The second was to adapt and apply those principles to the present circumstances. In the first instance, this required the compilation of an historic canon of whig texts; in the second, it required a co-ordinated quick-fire series of pamphlets. Darby was to prove integral to both efforts.

The project of reprinting true whig literature began with a series of works that appeared to celebrate the revolution while pressing the new regime to cleave to the commonwealth ideas of those who enabled it. Once Johnson was released from prison in the early months of 1689, Darby issued the suppressed 1683 edition of *Julian's arts* and a retrospective collection of his polemical writings, *A second five year's struggle against popery and tyranny* (1689), which helped establish Johnson's reputation as the 'incomparable Phœnix of our Age'.[44] The major event was the publication of *State tracts* by Richard Baldwin in 1689 and 1692, parts of which look to have been printed by Darby. Totalling nearly a thousand pages of dense print, the two folio volumes of *State tracts* collected together more than a hundred treatises from the previous two reigns, including parliamentary speeches, private letters, coronation oaths, royal proclamations, and major works such as Marvell's *Account*, excerpts of which were separately published as a *Character of popery* in January 1689. It was printed explicitly 'at the request, and for the sole use of some particular Gentlemen, who set an extraordinary value and estimate' on the arguments of the early whigs, in

[41] Lois G. Schwoerer, *Lady Rachel Russell* (Baltimore, MD, 1988), pp. 137–42.

[42] TNA, PC 2/61, pp. 143, 189, and 289–90; SP 29/425, fo. 157r; London, The Stationers' Company, 1/E/17/08; Dzelzainis, 'Managing the later Stuart press', p. 536.

[43] Mark Goldie, 'The roots of true whiggism, 1689–1694', *History of Political Thought*, 1 (1980), pp. 195–236.

[44] D. J., *King Charles I no such saint* (London, 1698), pp. 22–3. The licence for *Julian's arts* was obtained by Richard Chiswell, with whom Darby worked regularly (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawl. d. 730, fo. 198v).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which 'is the Constitution of the *English* Government truly Stated and Asserted'.[45] Each volume opened with a preface clarifying that true whig principles could be used to oppose as well as to uphold the new regime. The tracts contained therein were written not against particular monarchs or counsellors, rather against 'the Interruption of the free course of the Laws, and the altering of the Legislative Power'.[46] 'This is a Collection, that *in the general* will set forth the true and Legal Constitution of our Ancient, Famous *English* Government', explained the second volume.[47]

The contents of *State tracts* reinforced the importance of a balanced trinitarian constitution, founded on the laws of the Saxon republic, 'Interruption' of which provided legitimate grounds for opposition. This ancient constitutionalism was shared by the whig historian James Tyrrell, whose collected *Bibliotheca politica* (1692–4) contained advertisements for *State tracts* and other books printed by Darby, and was rumoured to have been printed by him.[48] It was shared by William Atwood, whose *The fundamental constitution of the English government* was printed by Darby in 1690, shortly before Atwood reconciled with the court.[49] And it was shared by Johnson, who frequently invoked historians of the Saxon republic in his writings.[50] In particular, his citation of the medieval *The mirror of justices*, which established the Saxon precedent for elective kingship and frequent parliaments, echoed that of Milton's *Eikonoklastēs*, which was abridged and reprinted in 1690.[51] Despite the '*Amsterdam*' imprint, the specific combination of founts strongly hints that this new edition came from Darby's workshop. Naming the 'old Laws' recorded in the *Mirror*, Milton had demanded 'that a Parliament should be call'd every Year' or 'twice a Year' in London.[52] Johnson transformed Milton's ancient constitutionalism into a practical language of opposition, reapplying his arguments to the ongoing tussle over a new triennial bill.[53] More generally, in his celebrated *Argument* of 1692, Johnson warned that if the new regime should 'Relapse into the Miseries of Arbitrary Government', the nation 'shall then want a new

[45] *State tracts* (2 vols., London, 1689–92), I, sig. A2r.
[46] Ibid., sig. A2r.
[47] Ibid., II, sig. A2r.
[48] [William Pittis et al.], *Letters from the living to the living* (London, 1703), pp. 153–4. The advertisements and combination of founts confirm the charge. On Tyrrell's ancient constitutionalism, see Janelle Greenberg, *The radical face of the ancient constitution: St Edward's 'laws' in early modern political thought* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 283–6; Julia Rudolph, *Revolution by degrees: James Tyrrell and whig political thought* (Basingstoke, 2002); J. W. Gough, 'James Tyrrell, whig historian and friend of John Locke', *Historical Journal*, 19 (1976), pp. 581–610.
[49] Goldie, 'Roots', p. 225.
[50] Ashley Walsh, 'The Saxon republic and the ancient constitution in the standing army controversy, 1697–1699', *Historical Journal*, 62 (2019), pp. 663–84; Melinda S. Zook, 'Early whig ideology, ancient constitutionalism, and the Reverend Samuel Johnson', *Journal of British Studies*, 32 (1993), pp. 139–65.
[51] On the *Mirror*, see Greenberg, *Radical face*, pp. 76–8.
[52] John Milton, *Eikonoklastēs* (Amsterdam [i.e. London], 1690), p. 36.
[53] Samuel Johnson, *An essay concerning parliaments at a certainty* (London, 1693), pp. 8–13.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Revolution'.[54] The book was manufactured covertly by Darby but owned openly by the cleric: Johnson splashed his name across the title page, whereas Darby would not even put his initials to the imprint until the fifth edition of the following year. Establishment whigs were outraged by Johnson's return to 'the same *Kidney* and *Spirit*' of his writings from 'the *Ad-Republican Days*', which they believed over.[55] Equally, the commonwealthmen were dismayed by a king who failed to govern by the principles for which they had suffered under the Stuart yoke.

Johnson did not receive the preferment he was promised and, following the publication of the *Argument*, was nearly killed by masked vigilantes.[56] Another martyr of the revolution was the old regicide Edmund Ludlow, who had returned from exile in 1689 only to be promptly deported.[57] Between 1691 and 1693, four pamphlets were published under his name. Like Johnson's writings, those pamphlets appropriated arguments previously set out in *Eikonoklastes*.[58] The 1690 edition had for the first time published the memorandum asserting John Gauden's role as the true author of *Eikon basilike*. The 'Ludlow' pamphlets latched onto this memorandum and, as one tory polemicist observed, reused 'the very words of *Milton*' against the *Eikon*.[59] The authorship of the 'Ludlow' pamphlets has long been a vexed question. They have been attributed variously to Slingsby Bethel and to John Toland, who later echoed material from them in *Amyntor* (1699) and his *Life* of Milton.[60] According to Anthony Wood, they were 'commonly reported' to have been written by Milton's nephew John Phillips, whose association with his uncle makes him a likely contributor.[61] Another candidate was a Cambridgeshire lawyer called Thomas Percival, who was certainly involved in some capacity.[62]

Although the 'Ludlow' pamphlets appeared with '*Amsterdam*' imprints, and the bibliographical evidence is inconclusive, there are external clues linking them to Darby. In 1697, he printed an advertisement for '*BOOKS* published by *Thomas Percival*, Author of *Ludlow*'s Letters' and, in the prefatory matter to

[54] Samuel Johnson, *An argument proving that the abrogation of King James by the people of England from the regal throne* (London, 1692), pp. 13–14.

[55] *The canonical states-man's grand argument discuss'd* (London, 1693), sig. A2v.

[56] *A true and faithful relation of the horrid and barbarous attempt to assassinate the Reverend Mr Samuel Johnson* (London, 1692), p. 2.

[57] Barbara Taft, 'Return of a regicide: Edmund Ludlow and the glorious revolution', *History*, 76 (1991), pp. 197–220; Gaby Mahlberg, *The English republican exiles in Europe during the Restoration* (Cambridge, 2020), pp. 268–9.

[58] George W. Whiting, 'A late seventeenth century Milton plagiarism', *Studies in Philology*, 31 (1934), pp. 37–50; George F. Sensabaugh, 'Milton in the revolution settlement', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 9 (1946), pp. 175–208, at pp. 201–2.

[59] Thomas Long, *Dr Walker's true, modest, and faithful account* (London, 1693), p. 4.

[60] George W. Whiting, 'The authorship of the Ludlow pamphlets', *Notes and Queries*, 165 (1933), pp. 426–7; Worden, ed., *Voyce*, pp. 35–9; Champion, *Republican learning*, pp. 103–5; Goldie, *Morrice*, pp. 221–4.

[61] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Wood 363.

[62] C. C., 'Major-General Edmund Ludlow: his letters', *Notes and Queries*, 165 (1933), p. 279.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

his reissue of Bethel's *The providences of God*, he likewise attributed the 'Ludlow' pamphlets to Percival.[63] Although Percival is named as 'Author' of the pamphlets, his role as 'publisher' of the other books on the list would suggest that he was responsible for communicating manuscripts to the press. Until these advertisements, Percival's involvement with the 'Ludlow' pamphlets was a well-kept secret. Darby's confidence assigning the books to him shows he must have been privy to inside knowledge. His usual founts appear in most of the books listed as 'published' by Percival, including Charles Blount's *Reasons humbly offered for the liberty of unlicens'd printing* (1693). Like the 'Ludlow' pamphlets, Blount's text reworked a Miltonic original. It was a plagiarism of *Areopagitica*.[64] So between 1691 and 1693, we find Percival shepherding multiple adaptations of Milton through the press. In 1692 was published Joseph Washington's English translation of Milton's *Defensio*, from unknown quarters. His translation emphasized the text's radical ancient constitutionalism.[65] Edward Phillips's edition of Milton's *Letters of state* was printed in 1694. In this instance, too, the printer and publisher go unnamed in the imprint; but the founts match those used elsewhere by Darby.[66]

This cluster of activity lends credence to the idea that the folio *Collection* of Milton's prose published by Darby in 1698 was already in the works. An examination of the books would suggest that they were substantially completed in 1694. With the exception of the Latin writings in the third volume, which have a 1698 imprint, texts were grouped together with title pages dated 1694 with 'AMSTERDAM' as the place of publication, like the earlier *Eikonoklastēs* and 'Ludlow' pamphlets.[67] Washington's translation was included, and may have been commissioned for the edition.[68] The life published with Phillips's *Letters of state* in 1694 gives the impression of somebody working through Milton's texts with an editor's eye for detail.[69] Probably the Phillips brothers were responsible for preparing the text, perhaps with the assistance of the enigmatic Percival. Ultimately, several factors contributed to work on the edition being suspended. In 1689, the bookseller Awnsham Churchill had announced his

[63] Titus Oates, *Eikōn vasilikē tritē* (London, 1697), p. 103; Slingsby Bethel, *The providences of God* (2nd edn, London, 1697), sig. a2r. This 'second edition' comprised the repackaged sheets of Darby's 1694 edition for Baldwin. Worden does not mention this evidence in favour of Percival ('Whig history', p. 223). *The Rye-House travestie* (1696) is among the books 'published' by Percival in the *Eikōn vasilikē tritē*, but is 'by' Percival in *The providences of God*.

[64] G. F. Sensabaugh, 'Adaptations of *Areopagitica*', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 13 (1950), pp. 201–5; Geoff Kemp, 'Ideas of the liberty of the press' (Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge, 2000), pp. 155–60.

[65] John Milton, *A defence of the people of England*, [trans. Joseph Washington] ([London], 1692), pp. 191–2.

[66] The *Letters* was advertised among books sold by Richard Baldwin, though not among those published by him (*Post Man*, 240 [21 Nov. 1696]).

[67] John Milton, *A complete collection of the historical, political, and miscellaneous works* (3 vols., Amsterdam [i.e. London], 1698), sigs. B1r, T1r, Nn1r, Lll1r, Pppp1r, 5M1r.

[68] Ibid., II, pp. 565–656.

[69] John Milton, *Letters of state*, [ed. Edward Phillips] (London, 1694), pp. xxxviii–xxxix.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

intention of publishing Milton's prose.[70] Darby was Churchill's go-to printer at this time and may originally have been recruited for the project by the bookseller.[71] But the edition would also include texts for which neither Darby nor Churchill owned the copyright.[72] Equally important was the cost of printing a multivolume folio edition. Darby was operating at least three presses and was capable of printing the entire edition in house, but could not have shouldered the financial burden alone.[73] With the elevation of the junto and the entrenchment of 'modern' whiggism by 1694, it would not have been prudent for dissident radicals to sponsor a collection of works by a notorious champion of the regicide.[74] The edition was put to one side until a more opportune moment arrived. When it appeared in 1698, the principal bookseller was not Churchill. It was Darby.

IV

By 1694, the Darby press had already begun to lay down the roots of a true whig canon. Through their writings, Johnson and the commonwealthmen demonstrated how earlier arguments made by Milton and the first whigs could now be turned against an increasingly powerful executive. Another strand of this campaign was the publication of partisan history. Some of this writing was intended to set out the ancient constitutional principles to which the nation ought to have returned after the revolution. Soliciting subscriptions for his *General history* in 1694, Tyrrell explained he would draw on material 'by which the Reader may have a *better View* of our *History and Constitution, the Prerogatives of the King, and the Rights and Liberties of the People*'.[75] The first volume would be advertised among Darby books once it appeared in 1697.[76] Also published were 'secret histories' of court intrigue under the Stuarts, many of them hastily cobbled together from earlier printed accounts.[77] *State*

[70] Edward Arber, ed., *A transcript of the registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers, from 1640–1708* (3 vols., London, 1913), III, p. 345.

[71] Between 1685 and 1695, Darby's initials appear in seven Churchill imprints; John Leake in four; Thomas Braddyll in two; Freeman Collins in one. Both Darby and Braddyll used the founts with which Locke's *Two treatises* was printed for Churchill in 1690.

[72] Nicholas von Maltzhan, 'The whig Milton, 1667–1700', in David Armitage, Armand Himy, and Quentin Skinner, eds., *Milton and republicanism* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 229–53, at pp. 245 and 249.

[73] Michael Treadwell, 'A new list of English master printers *c.* 1686', *The Library*, 6th ser., 4 (1982), pp. 57–61.

[74] Goldie, 'Roots', p. 235.

[75] [James Tyrrell], *Proposals for printing a general history of England* (London, 1694), p. 1.

[76] [Joseph Jackson], *An essay concerning a vacuum* (London, 1697), sig. D2r; [John Toland], *The militia reform'd* (2nd edn, London, 1699), inserted sheet; [Stephen Nye], *An historical account and defence of the canon* (London, 1700), sig. H6v.

[77] Rebecca Bullard, *The politics of disclosure, 1674–1725: secret history narratives* (London, 2009), pp. 45–62; Alastair Bellany and Thomas Cogswell, *The murder of James I* (New Haven, CT, 2015), pp. 517–18.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tracts claimed to uncover 'the secret Springs' that set the revolution 'in motion' and to 'discover to us the *Mysteries* of the *Monarchy* in the two Late Reigns'.[78] Another of Darby's more successful publications, Roger Coke's *A detection of the court and state of England* (1694), was written expressly 'to shew the Consequences' of a king lavishing grants 'upon Minions and Favourites, whose Servant he makes himself'.[79] That was precisely the behaviour of which William was now accused.

Secret history could take other forms. Late in 1696 was published the first in a four-volume series of *Poems on affairs of state*.[80] Some of the contents were lifted from three earlier collections of 'state poems' by Andrew Marvell and 'other Eminent Wits', which republished the satires of Marvell alongside three elegies for 'the late Usurper *Oliver Cromwell*' by the turncoat royalists John Dryden, Edmund Waller, and Thomas Sprat.[81] To these were added a number of lampoons dating from the days of the protectorate through to 1688. Its preface linked the collection to *State tracts* and the recent histories by Coke and others. The poems in the volume were calculated to expose 'the selfish evil Designs of a corrupt Court', explained the editor. The resulting collection constituted 'a just and secret History of the former Times', which, the editor observed, 'cannot be thought unseasonable', even under a 'Government founded on Liberty', as 'an Account of the true sourse of all our present Mischiefs'.[82]

Bibliographical evidence, advertisements, copyright, and contemporary gossip all point towards Darby as the printer of *Poems on affairs of state* and to Richard Baldwin as distributor of the first volume.[83] First, there is the evidence of the book itself. The combination of several different founts enables us to narrow the search to two printers: John Darby and Thomas Braddyll. The prefatory matter on sheet A uses an old-fashioned swash italic great primer: the capital '*B*', '*D*', '*P*', and '*R*' are easily distinguished by the exaggerated serif.[84] The pica used for the body of the text is undistinctive but entirely of a piece with the fount Darby used elsewhere for smaller octavo books; likewise with

[78] *State tracts*, I, sig. A2r; II, sig. [A2r].

[79] Roger Coke, *A detection of the court and state of England* (2 vols., London, 1694), I, sig. A3r. The first edition was printed by Darby and partially financed by John Dunton and John Harris: see Henry Park, *Lachryme sacerdotis* (London, 1695), sig. C2r; William Turner, *The history of all religions* (London, 1695), sig. Xx3v; Dunton, *Life*, I, p. 231.

[80] *Post Boy*, 253 (19 Dec. 1696).

[81] *Poems on affairs of state* (4 vols., London, 1697 [i.e. 1696]–1707), I, pp. 7–25. The earlier collections were *A collection of poems on affairs of state* (London, 1689); *A second collection of poems on affairs of state* (London, 1689); *A third collection of poems on affairs of state* (London, 1689); compare to *Three poems upon the death of the late usurper* (London, 1682).

[82] *Poems on affairs of state*, I, sigs. A4v–A5r. Compare the phrasing with Toland's introduction to Algernon Sidney, *Discourses concerning government* (London, 1698), sigs. A2r–A2v.

[83] *Post Man*, 300 (3 Apr. 1697).

[84] W. J. Cameron, 'The Princeton copies of *Poems on affairs of state*, vol. II, 1703', *Princeton University Library Chronicle*, 24 (1963), pp. 121–7, at p. 124.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the large capitals used for headers, though the lack of any obviously broken pieces of type makes it impossible to match them with complete certainty. More significant is the title page, which uses the swash italic alongside a larger black letter fount. Common enough in books of this decade, the fount nonetheless precisely matches the black letter used elsewhere by Darby and Braddyll.[85]

The contents of the second volume settle the argument in favour of Darby. Unlike the first volume, which mostly comprised old manuscript lampoons, this volume included recently printed satires. Of the newer texts, almost all of them were first printed by Darby, though his name was seldom in the imprints. The separate editions of the opening poem, John Tutchin's *The foreigners*, were printed with the same amply spaced great primer used elsewhere by Darby and the title page featured precisely the same ornament that adorned his editions of both Johnson and Milton.[86] The second poem in the collection was Defoe's famous *The true-born Englishman*, which first appeared in December 1700 as a riposte to Tutchin. Gossip assigned the book to Darby. Reporting the 'common Discourse' of the town, the Jacobite pamphleteer and poet William Pittis wrote that Darby was to 'be taken up by a Messenger' for printing this satire and would soon be consigned to the pillory.[87] Examination of the type confirms Pittis's accusation. The preface is set in the familiar italic great primer.

From here, a pattern can be spotted. The anonymous *A description of Mr Dryden's funeral* was a Darby production; the third edition was printed with advertisements for twenty-five books from Darby's press.[88] Robert Gould's *The dream* had been listed in those advertisements and in the catalogue of Darby books at the end of *The foreigners*.[89] The first edition of *A poem on the death of his highness the duke of Gloucester* (1701) had Darby's name in the imprint. The 'Fables on state affairs', which take up fifty-eight pages, were reprinted from a series of 'Aesop' pamphlets from 1698, variously written from the perspectives of court and country.[90] *Æsop at Amsterdam* (1698) appeared with a suspicious

[85] The black letter 'A' has a broken serif. Despite an exhaustive search, I have not been able to find this precise broken piece of type in any book published between 1690 and 1700. Tracing this particular piece of type would either confirm or disprove my argument for Darby's involvement.

[86] [John Tutchin], *The foreigners* (London, 1700), t.p.; Samuel Johnson, *A second five year's struggle against popery and tyranny* (London, 1689), t.p.; Milton, *Collection*, I, sig. A1r. The same ornament appears on the title page of R[ichard] B[ovet], *A poem humbly presented to his most excellent majesty* (London, 1696), which was printed by Darby's stepson, James Dover, on the press at Bartholomew Close.

[87] [William Pittis], *The true-born Englishman: a satyr, answer'd paragraph by paragraph* (London, 1701), pp. 2 and 86. See Christopher Borsing, *Daniel Defoe and the representation of personal identity* (Abingdon, 2017), p. 29.

[88] *A description of Mr D—n's funeral* (3rd edn, London, 1700), sig. C2v. The poem is conventionally attributed to Thomas Brown on no basis whatsoever; it was not included in Samuel Briscoe's edition of *The works of Mr Thomas Brown* (2 vols., London, 1707).

[89] [Tutchin], *The foreigners*, sig. C2v.

[90] *Poems on affairs of state*, II, sig. A3v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'Amsterdam' imprint and the attribution 'By Ludlow Redivivus'; the row of four ornaments decorating the title page precisely match a set often used by Darby for anonymous publications, and make his involvement certain.[91] The printer of Toland's *Clito* (1700) is unknown, though Darby would be a fair guess considering that he was simultaneously guiding Toland's edition of Harrington through the press. One final piece of evidence ought to clinch the matter. In 1707, after all four volumes of *Poems on affairs of state* had been published and the rights seemingly handed over to the bookseller James Woodward, a printed list of '*Books sold by* J. Darby' contained an entry for 'State-Poems, in 4 vol.'.[92] A 1709 catalogue of Darby's wares included 'Poems on Affairs of State, by the greatest Wits of the Age. Many of which never before publish'd. In 4 Vol.'[93] At this stage, Darby was not a common retail bookseller. These catalogues listed books printed by him for sale to the trade.

Linking Darby to the first volumes of *Poems on affairs of state* prompts a fresh evaluation of their purpose. For the consensus among literary critics has been that these volumes celebrate the revolution settlement and the 'liberating political climate' of the Williamite regime.[94] But like Coke's *Detection*, the preface gestured to the 'corrupt Court' of the Stuarts with one hand while slyly pointing to 'all our present Mischiefs' with the other.[95] In short, the preface constructed a parallel between the corruptions of the old and the new regimes. The same holds true of the poems. Whereas slavish courtiers such as Waller and Dryden deserted their principles and praised the tyrant Cromwell in verse, the opposition satirists led by Marvell and Rochester were shown to have held fast to the cause of liberty. Marvell's embarrassing Cromwellian poems were excluded from the volume. He was included purely as an antagonist of the Stuart court, a model citizen in the vein of Catullus, who, according to the preface, 'in the midst of *Cæsar*'s Triumphs attack'd the Vices of that great Man, and expos'd 'em to lessen that Popularity and Power he was gaining among the *Roman* People, which he saw would be turn'd to the destruction of the Liberty of

[91] *Æsop at Amsterdam* (Amsterdam [i.e. London], 1698), t.p.; for the same fleurons, see the title pages of *A letter to a member of parliament concering guards and garisons* (London, 1699); *A letter to a member of parliament concerning the four regiments* (London, 1699); Denzil, Lord Holles, *Memoirs* (London, 1699); [John Tutchin?], *The state of the navy consider'd* (London, 1699); [Samuel Johnson], *The second part of the confutation* (London, 1700); [Matthew Tindal], *Four discourses* (London, 1709). For an alleged link to Toland, see *Old Æsop at White-hall* (London, 1698), sig. A2v.

[92] *The declaration lately publish'd in favour of his Protestant subjects* (London, 1707), sig. C8v. Woodward seems to have worked as both a copyright owning bookseller and a trade publisher: see John McTague, 'The *New Atalantis* arrests: a reassessment', *The Library*, 7th ser., 15 (2014), pp. 439–46.

[93] *Books sold by John Darby in Bartholomew-Close* ([London], [1709]), p. 3.

[94] Annabel Patterson, 'Lady State's first two sittings: Marvell's satiric canon', *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900*, 40 (2000), pp. 395–411, at p. 401; Paul Hammond, *The making of Restoration poetry* (Cambridge, 2006), p. 27.

[95] *Poems on affairs of state*, I, sigs. A4v–A5r.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Rome'.[96] The implicit message was that true whigs ought to be equally concerned by the destruction of liberties at the present moment in England.

Concern would lead to fresh literary opposition. Much like Milton's prose had shaped the polemics issued from Darby's press, so Marvell's lampoons inspired his poetic campaign against the court. The most dynamic adherent of this tradition was John Tutchin, whose verse owed much to Marvell's satirical technique.[97] A key figure in Darby's entourage and close friend of John Phillips, Tutchin recycled the familiar complaint of the disgruntled commonwealthmen in his invectives against the court: that 'none are so fit to support a just Government, as those who oppos'd the Tyranny of an arbitrary One, and purchas'd a just and legal Settlement with the expence of their Blood', whereas William retained only '*Fools* and *Knaves*' who made the revolution 'precarious'.[98] He was overheard exclaiming that the king 'employed Rogues and Tories, Men that would betray and Ruin the Protestant Religion, the King himself, and the civil Rights of the People'.[99] Tutchin's poems reflect this country sensibility. After Whitehall burned to the ground in 1698, he wrote a smirking ode on the opportunity to demolish a court tainted by 'numerous Crimes' and rebuild it in 'comely Order'.[100] The appearance of *The foreigners* from Darby's press in 1700 was a triumph of opposition propaganda, initiating a flurry of responses from the government.[101] Here, Tutchin inveighed against both the 'crafty Knaves' of the junto and the 'lavish Grants' bestowed by William to his Dutch favourites.[102] And though he was careful to endorse support for the king, he protested that these wicked counsellors would 'set your Constitution

[96] Ibid., sig. A4r. Toland likewise used the example of 'the Usurper *Julius*' (Ludlow, *Memoirs*, I, pp. iii–iv) and spoke of Cromwell as a new tyrant Caesar (John Toland, *Clito* [London, 1700], pp. 11–12). Compare also 'an equal share with many of the most celebrated of the *Romans*' (sig. A4v) with Milton, *Collection*, I, p. 30.

[97] Joseph Hone, 'Daniel Defoe and the whig tradition in satire', *English Literary History*, 84 (2017), pp. 865–90, at pp. 874–8.

[98] John Tutchin, *A pindarick ode in the praise of folly and knavery* (London, 1696), sig. A2r. The title page ornaments are 'fleuron 1' used by Darby for his edition of *Leviathan*. To Noel Malcolm's list of Darby books containing this fleuron ('Ornaments', p. 31), I add the aforementioned ode by Tutchin and the following five works: [Andrew Marvell], *An account of the growth of popery and arbitrary government in England* (Amsterdam [i.e. London], [1678]; ESTC R15579); [Thomas Hodges], *Plantation justice* (London, 1701); *Reflections upon a late scandalous and malicious pamphlet entitul'd the shortest way with the dissenters* (London, 1703); *Eight fables on the present posture of affairs* (London, 1703); *A dialogue betwixt whig and tory* (London, 1710). On Tutchin's friendship with Milton's nephew, see John T. Shawcross, *The arms of the family: the significance of John Milton's relatives and associates* (Lexington, KY, 2004), p. 112.

[99] William Fuller, *The whole life of William Fuller* (London, 1703), p. 4. Tutchin continued to rail against modern whigs into the following reign: see Edward Taylor, 'John Tutchin's *Observator*, comment serials, and the "rage of party" in Britain, 1678–c. 1730', *Historical Journal*, 63 (2020), pp. 862–84, at p. 878.

[100] John Tutchin, *White-hall in flames* (London, 1698), p. 20.

[101] J. A. Downie, *To settle the succession of the state: literature and politics, 1678–1750* (Basingstoke, 1994), pp. 51–5.

[102] [Tutchin], *The foreigners*, pp. 4 and 7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

soon aside, / And o'er your Liberties in Triumph ride.'[103] The poem was, in essence, a versification of Johnson's nativist Saxon constitutionalism, and indeed Johnson seems to have acted as Tutchin's early mentor.[104] The avowed aim of the poem was to press the court whigs to 'return to their old Principles'.[105] Within the year, Darby would print a sequel. As his title suggests, in *The apostates* (1701) Tutchin once more took aim at those whig courtiers who had abandoned their principles in the wake of the revolution: men who 'quit their Freedoms and their Antient Rights' in return for 'Wealth' and 'Office'.[106] The poem compared these quisling statesmen to 'Leeches' growing fat from 'our Pockets and our Blood'.[107] The purpose of these satirical texts was identical to the secret histories and the polemics by Johnson and his followers: to expose the apostacy and corrupt dealings of the court whigs. But the satires achieved those ends by different means, harnessing the potent forces of ridicule, wit, and invective in place of ironclad moral argumentation.

V

Darby's 1698 editions of Sidney, Milton, and Ludlow emerged from the same workshop and context as *Poems on affairs of state*. These historic texts were also brought into dialogue with the immediate circumstances of their republication. When William concluded his war with France in 1697, he resolved to maintain his army during peacetime. From the earliest days of the revolution, standing armies had been condemned as instruments of tyranny. The preface to *State tracts* had underscored 'the dangerous Consequences of keeping up a standing Army within these Kingdoms in a time of Peace'.[108] William ignored those warnings, kickstarting a stagnant opposition in parliament and the press. During the war, it had been difficult for commonwealthmen to attack the government without attracting charges of disloyalty. Resistance to a standing army provided a more solid foundation on which their opposition could be justified.

It has long been known that the headquarters of the anti-standing army campaign was the Grecian coffeehouse.[109] The alleged ringleaders of this 'republican clubbe' were John Trenchard and Thomas Raulins.[110] Trenchard was a classically educated lawyer whose writings were steeped in the republicanism

[103] Ibid., p. 10.

[104] Walsh, 'Saxon republic', p. 672; William Fuller, *Mr William Fuller's letter to Mr John Tutchin* (London, 1703), p. 3.

[105] *Observator*, 75 (9 Jan. 1703).

[106] [John Tutchin], *The apostates* (London, 1701), p. 4. The title page features a small ornament elsewhere used by Darby: [Tindal], *Four discourses*, p. 1; [Matthew Tindal], *A defence of the rights of the Christian church* (2nd edn, London, 1709), p. 3.

[107] [Tutchin], *The apostates*, p. 6.

[108] *State tracts*, II, sig. A2r.

[109] Jonathan Harris, 'The Grecian coffee house and political debate in London 1688–1714', *London Journal*, 25 (2000), pp. 1–13.

[110] London, British Library (BL), Add. MS 4291, fo. 40r.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of James Harrington. His initial salvo in the anti-army campaign, *An argument showing that a standing army is inconsistent with a free government*, printed by Darby in November 1697, drew on examples from both ancient and modern history to illustrate how professional armies had been used by a corrupt executive to overpower the legislature. About Raulins, much less is known. As a pamphleteer, he was careful to cover his tracks when necessary.[111] He came from a family of Herefordshire landowners with firm whig allegiances, and, in 1686, was pardoned for 'misprisions of Treason and Rebellion', which could suggest that he had been tangentially involved in the Monmouth rebellion of the previous year.[112] By January 1697, Raulins was thick with both Toland and Darby. In that month, he countersigned Toland's contract with the printer concerning delivery of 'original copy or Translations'.[113] One year later, he was described in Toland's *Life* of Milton as the writer's 'best Friend', before joining Trenchard on the board of Irish forfeitures in 1700.[114] Another shady figure in this group was the translator Isaac Littlebury, a man of 'republican spirit' who 'carried' the manuscript of Trenchard and Moyle's *Argument* to Bartholomew Close in 1697.[115] He performed the same duties for Sidney's *Discourses* in 1698; in a later advertisement for the book, Darby named Littlebury as the 'publisher' of the 'Original Manuscript'.[116] His use of the same word in 1697 to describe Thomas Percival's involvement with the 'Ludlow' pamphlets suggests that Littlebury was once again the person who brought the edited copy to the press.

The Grecian club took instruction from country MPs such as Walter Moyle and Robert Harley, who suggested possible lines of argument that would influence votes in the house.[117] Less noticed is the fact that the Grecian also became the meeting point for this new generation of classical whigs and Darby's existing core of writers. In 1699, Tutchin joined the Grecian set by contributing his own anonymous pamphlet to their campaign, revamping country arguments against 'Evil Ministers' and warning that the 'Court-party' had 'grown already to such a height, that there is no way of calling them to an

[111] J. A. Downie, 'William Stephens and the *Letter to the author of the memorial of the state of England* reconsidered', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 50 (1977), pp. 253–6.

[112] Philip Jenkins, 'Anti-popery on the Welsh Marches in the seventeenth century', *Historical Journal*, 23 (1980), pp. 275–93, at p. 287; TNA, SP 44/337, fo. 43r; SP 44/71, fo. 269r.

[113] BL, Add. MS 4295, fo. 6r.

[114] J[ohn] T[oland], *The life of John Milton* (London, 1699), p. 5; Giancarlo Carabelli, *Tolandiana: materiali bibliografici per lo studio dell'opera e della fortuna di John Toland* (Florence, 1975), pp. 44–7; Duke-Evans, 'Commonwealthsman', pp. 22–3; Champion, *Republican learning*, p. 99.

[115] BL, Add MS 35403, fo. 31r; Luttrell, *Relation*, IV, p. 313.

[116] *Books sold by John Darby in Bartholomew-Close* ([London], [1717]), p. 1. Worden muddles Isaac Littlebury and the stationer Robert Littlebury ('Whig history', p. 215).

[117] J. A. Downie, *Robert Harley and the press: propaganda and public opinion in the age of Swift and Defoe* (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 29–37; compare D. W. Hayton, ed., *The parliamentary diary of Sir Richard Cocks, 1698–1702* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 1, 10–11, 25, 31–2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Account'.[118] Johnson was a more influential presence. His ancient constitutionalism shaped Trenchard's engagement with the republicanism of Harrington and Machiavelli.[119] 'I am of Mr *Johnson*'s Opinion', Trenchard wrote bluntly.[120] The last of the original whigs, Johnson returned to the fold in 1698 and 1700 with the two parts of his *A confutation of a late pamphlet*, both printed by Darby. Before the end of 1698, the new generation of commonwealthmen were clamouring for a collected folio of Johnson's writings, subsuming him into the canon of whig political thought.[121]

Of the sixteen anti-army interventions catalogued by Lois G. Schwoerer, Darby is known to have printed all but three.[122] Advertisements demonstrate the importance of these tracts to his business. Darby often added a list of his books to the final leaf of a pamphlet. Those lists fall into two categories: advertisements for titles 'printed for' booksellers such as John Harris and Awnsham Churchill, or advertisements for books 'sold by' retailers such as Abigail Baldwin and Darby's son-in-law Andrew Bell. The former include some titles not printed by Darby, presumably taken from a list supplied by the bookseller.[123] The latter comprise books printed by Darby on his own behalf and are a useful guide to his output.[124] In 1699, he started adding '*A Catalogue of Books written against a standing Army*', including all the major treatises by Trenchard, Toland, Tutchin, and Johnson.[125] It was unusual for a printer to single out a certain polemical stance in their advertising. Listing the tracts in this manner displayed Darby's

[118] [John Tutchin], *The seaman's opinion of a standing army* (London, 1699), pp. 4–5. Tutchin claimed authorship of this pamphlet in *Observator*, 16 (26 May 1705), writing 'if any Body desires to know the Truth hereof let 'em enquire of Mr *John Darby*, a Printer in *Bartholomew Close*'. The pamphlet also hints at an old intimacy with Richard Baldwin (p. 14). It has not previously been attributed to Tutchin. For Tutchin's early opposition to mercenary armies, see his *Civitas militaris* (London, 1690 [i.e. 1689]), p. 5.

[119] Walsh, 'Saxon republic'.

[120] [John Trenchard et al.], *An argument shewing that a standing army is inconsistent with a free government* (London, 1697), p. 18.

[121] D. J., *King Charles*, pp. 22–3. Johnson was considered in this light in *Remarks upon the most eminent of our antimonarchical authors* (London, 1699).

[122] Lois G. Schwoerer, 'Chronology and authorship of the standing army tracts, 1697–1699', *Notes and Queries*, 13 (1966), pp. 382–90. The dubious titles are *The several debates of the House of Commons* (London, 1697); *Considerations upon the choice of a Speaker* (London, 1698); *Some further considerations about a standing army* (London, 1699). Despite his importance in this campaign, Darby receives no mention in David Womersley, ed., *Writings on standing armies* (Carmel, IN, 2020).

[123] Bernardo Davanzati, *A discourse upon coins*, trans. John Toland (London, 1696), sigs. D2r–D2v; George Meriton, *Immorality, debauchery, and profaneness, exposed* (London, 1698), sigs. H6r–H8v.

[124] [Matthew Tindal], *An essay concerning the power of the magistrate* (London, 1697), p. 204; [Jackson], *An essay*, sig. D2r; *The anatomy of a project for raising two millions* ([London], 1698), p. 8; [Toland], *The militia reform'd* (2nd edn), inserted sheet; [Nye], *An historical account*, sigs. H6v–H7v.

[125] [Tutchin?], *The state of the navy consider'd*, p. 16; [William Stephens], *A letter to his most excellent majesty King William III* (3rd edn, London, 1699), sig. B4v; [Tutchin], *The foreigners*, sig. C2v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

commitment to the issue. Sometimes, this catalogue of anti-army tracts appeared alongside advertisements for Darby's other books.[126] Heading that other list was Sidney's *Discourses* and the *Collection* of Milton's prose. In 1700, Darby entered eight occasional pamphlets in the term catalogues, including works by Tindal, Johnson, Tutchin, Toland, and William Stephens, alongside the Harrington, Milton, and Sidney folios.[127] The link between these newly published historical works of the whig canon and their contemporaneous application in the pamphlets could not be clearer.

Debate over standing armies shaped this new phase of canon formation. In his preface to volume three of Ludlow's *Memoirs*, Toland warned how 'the *Cromwellian* Tyranny' demonstrated that 'Liberty and a Standing Mercenary Army are incompatible.'[128] He had altered Ludlow's text to emphasize this message. Likewise, from Milton's prose he drew the lesson that as the New Model Army 'was capable of inslaving their Country' so the same 'may be expected from any other' standing force.[129] Another person conducting very similar editorial work for Darby was David Jones, whose *The secret history of White-hall* (1697) and its sequel inveighed against the corrupt use of 'a Standing Army to Enslave the Nation'.[130] Jones was an old friend of Coke's and in 1697 'very much corrected' a new edition of his *Detection*, printed by Darby for Andrew Bell.[131] The original text was already hostile to standing armies, which gave it obvious currency.[132] Its editor inserted new material on Cromwellian tyranny, including a lengthy account of the folly and expense of foreign military campaigns.[133] There are clues that Jones either consulted Toland while he was editing Ludlow's manuscript or had advance access to the finished text; several of his interventions concerning Cromwell echoed material from the as yet unpublished *Memoirs*.[134] In its earliest iteration, the

[126] *A dialogue between a director of the New East-India Company and one of the committee for preparing by-laws for the said company* (1699), sigs. D3v–D4r; *A description of Mr D—n's funeral* (3rd edn, London, 1700), sig. C2v.

[127] Edward Arber, ed., *The term catalogues, 1668–1709* (3 vols., London, 1906), III, p. 188.

[128] Edmund Ludlow, *Memoirs*, [ed. John Toland] (3 vols., London, 1698–9), III, sig. A3v.

[129] Milton, *Collection*, I, p. 37.

[130] David Jones, *The secret history of White-hall* (London, 1697), p. 6; David Jones, *A continuation of the secret-history of White-hall* (London, 1697), p. 384. The books were published by John Harris and Andrew Bell, and distributed by Richard Baldwin. Darby printed the second edition (in which he had a stake) and likely printed the first.

[131] Roger Coke [and David Jones], *A detection of the court and state of England* (3rd edn, 2 vols., London, 1697), t.p.; an advertisement for Darby books sold by Bell is on p. 10. For Jones's part, see Henry Snyder, 'David Jones, augustan historian and pioneer English annalist', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 44 (1980), pp. 11–26.

[132] Coke [and Jones], *Detection* (1697), I, pp. 199–201, 228, 236, 285; II, 387–92, 431, 493, 539, 625–7, 642–3, 647; Womersley, ed., *Writings*, p. xxix.

[133] Compare Coke, *Detection* (1694), II, pp. 51–2, with Coke [and Jones], *Detection* (1697), II, pp. 387–92.

[134] Compare Coke, *Detection* (1694), II, p. 11, with Coke [and Jones], *Detection* (1697), II, p. 348; Worden, ed., *Voyce*, pp. 37–8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Detection belonged to the first phase of whig canon formation in 1694. Through Jones's editorial labours it was brought into the second phase.

Just as standing armies were a symptom of corruption and arbitrary government, not their cause, so the standing army controversy shaped the whig canon but did not create it. Toland was responding to his immediate political circumstances. But his editorial activities also belonged to a deep-rooted campaign to marshal the intellectual resources of the commonwealthmen against the apostacy of the court whigs. From the earliest days of the revolution, Darby had systematically published books that justified opposition to corrupt administrations. He had done so on grounds that the constitution was under threat. His publications provided a language, a rationale, and a model for country opposition, not for republicanism: in both the civic virtue of Sidney and Harrington, and the lampoons of Johnson and Marvell. The standing army controversy was an opportunity to imitate those models and put their principles to practice.

VI

One question remains. To what extent was Darby his own man or a mere functionary? It has long been alleged that Darby was dancing to the tune of wealthy patrons 'helping to finance the whole coordinated project'.[135] And there can be little doubt that the Grecian set provided financial assistance. *The danger of mercenary parliaments* was, according to Toland, written 'by Lord Shaftesbury's Direction, and printed and dispersed privately at his Expense'.[136] The Milton edition was likewise rumoured to have been published 'at the expence of some worthy Patriots'.[137] There is also the evidence of Toland's two surviving contracts with Darby. The second contract, in which Toland promised Darby £30 for reprinting *Oceana* 'upon very good paper', was witnessed by Charlwood Lawton.[138] A prominent 'whig Jacobite' who combined commonwealth principles with support for the exiled Stuarts, Lawton's involvement reinforces the oppositional aims of the project; Darby was more comfortable working with a Jacobite commonwealthman than with a court whig.[139] Equally importantly, Lawton provided a concrete link between the Harrington edition and Robert Harley, his fellow Middle Temple lawyer with whom he maintained a lively correspondence.[140] Toland later claimed that

[135] Peter Lindenbaum, 'Dispatches from the archives', *Milton Quarterly*, 36 (2002), pp. 46–54.

[136] [John Toland], *The danger of mercenary parliaments* (2nd edn, London, 1722), p. xi.

[137] Thomas Brown, *Letters from the dead to the living* (London, 1702), p. 27.

[138] BL, Add. MS 4295, fo. 10r.

[139] On Lawton's Harringtonianism, see Mark Goldie and Clare Jackson, 'Williamite tyranny and the whig Jacobites', in Esther Mijers and David Onnekink, eds., *Redefining William III: the impact of the king-stadholder in international context* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 177–99, at pp. 187–8.

[140] Paul Monod, 'Jacobitism and country principles in the reign of William III', *Historical Journal*, 30 (1987), pp. 289–310, at p. 300.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Harley had 'encourag'd' the republication of Harrington as a statement against the court.[141] One possibility is that Lawton was working as intermediary and that Harley provided the £30 subvention which Toland passed on to Darby. Shaftesbury too seems to have been involved, albeit at a later stage, purchasing multiple copies through Awnsham Churchill to send to friends in Rotterdam.[142]

In the case of prestige folio editions, such financial backing is to be expected; those volumes required huge initial outlay in both paper and labour.[143] But, as I hope to have demonstrated here, the folios were merely the culmination of a much broader and more miscellaneous publishing campaign. Darby began to lay down the roots of a true whig canon in 1689 with the retrospective collection of Johnson's polemical writings. Before the standing army controversy took off in 1697, Darby had already printed and reprinted classic works of whig polemic, satire, and history. Drawing contrasts and comparisons with the English past, Tyrell, Percival, and Coke all made a distinct intervention in contemporary political debate. The editors of *Poems on affairs of state* likewise demonstrated how earlier modes of whig satire could inspire new oppositional verse. The separation of the prestige editions from the more humble products of Darby's press is a result of the later eighteenth-century reception, not least the efforts of the whig bibliophile Thomas Hollis in promoting and reprinting particular texts from this earlier campaign while ignoring other, seemingly more ephemeral texts.[144] And yet all these volumes were originally prepared and printed by the same personnel. They were advertised alongside one another. They ought to be seen as a group. Certainly that is how Darby saw them.

To appreciate the distinctive stamp Darby left on this canon it is important to situate the major texts within the broader context of his entire output. In some ways, the classical republicanism of the Harrington edition is anomalous, as is that of the concomitant anti-army tracts by Trenchard and his followers. From the earliest days of the revolution, Darby's publications had been characterized not by Harringtonianism but by the ancient constitutionalism of Johnson, Tyrrell, Tutchin, and the followers of Milton. And yet, as Ashley Walsh has recently demonstrated, ancient constitutionalism could be brought

[141] John Toland, *A collection of several pieces* (2 vols., London, 1726), II, p. 227.

[142] TNA, PRO 30/24/20, fo. 33v.

[143] The £30 from Harley would have covered considerably less than a quarter of the paper costs for *Oceana*, generously assuming a small print run of 500 copies and paper costing 32*s* per ream (Foxon, *Pope*, pp. 52–4), which would be a cheap price for the 'very good paper' Toland demanded; a larger run and more expensive paper seem likely, in which case £30 was a truly paltry sum.

[144] Caroline Robbins, 'The strenuous whig: Thomas Hollis of Lincoln's Inn', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 7 (1950), pp. 406–53; P. D. Marshall, 'Thomas Hollis (1720–74): the bibliophile as libertarian', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 66 (1984), pp. 246–63; Blair Worden, 'Introduction', in Marchamont Nedham, *The excellencie of a free state*, ed. Worden (Indianapolis, IN, 2011), pp. lxiv–lxxxiii. Through his editorial interventions, Hollis transformed Darby's oppositional canon into a republican canon.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

fruitfully into dialogue with classical republicanism.[145] Both doctrines were averse to parliamentary corruption, an overpowerful executive, and the maintenance of standing armies. The coherence of this body of writings came not from a singular conceptual framework, but from a shared set of polemical objectives. Drawing political lessons from the recent past, the canon underscored the enduring threat of arbitrary power and corruption while providing historical exemplar for virtuous country opposition. Darby was prepared to draw on diverse intellectual resources to achieve those ends.

Toland shared Darby's aims. In a private letter, he confessed that the editions of Harrington and Milton were intended not to advocate for 'Democratical Schemes of Government', rather to 'beget in the minds of men' an 'extreme aversion to arbitrary power'.[146] Aversion should give rise to activism. Through these means the commonwealthmen hoped both to win loyal Williamites to their cause, and to prompt their more docile sympathizers into active opposition. An important figure in the story is John Holles, duke of Newcastle, who is commonly assumed to have 'encouraged Toland to publish' the *Memoirs* of Denzil Holles.[147] And yet, in his dedicatory epistle to the duke, Toland bluntly states that the papers were not given to him by Newcastle but 'happen'd to fall into my Hands'.[148] Mark Goldie has shown the likely source to have been Holles's former chaplain, Roger Morrice, from whom Toland also acquired the manuscript of Berkley's *Memoirs*.[149] In this instance, then, the dedicatory address is no evidence of direct patronage. Rather, by praising Holles as someone who '*took up arms, not to destroy the King, or alter the constitution, but to restore the last, and oblige the former to rule according to Law*', Toland was encouraging Newcastle to take up the opposition battlecry.[150] The canon was fundamentally a spur to action.

The deep-rooted oppositional aims of this campaign were understood by contemporaries. Readers eagerly assigned anonymous works to Darby's press. Regarding the false '*Switzerland*' imprint of Ludlow's *Memoirs*, William Baron riddled 'had they said at *Darby* it had been nigher home, and nigher truth too' by 'a little quibling transition from *Place* to *Person*'.[151] Elsewhere, a hostile pamphleteer teased that the main printer of opposition propaganda was 'as well known to the rest of the Trade, as *Darby* Ale to a Toper'.[152] The Tory wit Tom Brown ventriloquized the spirit of Richard Baldwin in the underworld, asking a new arrival: 'have no fresh batteries attack'd the Court lately

[145] Walsh, 'Saxon republic', pp. 671–6.
[146] Toland, *Collection*, II, p. 339.
[147] Champion, *Republican learning*, p. 99.
[148] Holles, *Memoirs*, p. v.
[149] Goldie, *Morrice*, p. 220.
[150] Holles, *Memoirs*, p. xii.
[151] [William Baron], *Regicides no saints nor martyrs* (London, 1700), pp. 8–9.
[152] *England's enemies exposed* (London, 1701), p. 28.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from honest Mr *Darby*'s in *Bartholomew Close?*'[153] The question is soon answered by the shades of Harrington, Sidney, Milton, and Ludlow, who boast of their 'friends in *London*' by whom their works are 'lately reprinted'.[154] In this satire, the works of the whig canon were conceived as oppositional country 'batteries'. William Pittis shifted the emphasis in a parodical letter addressed from Darby to Toland, after the latter left London for Hanover. Pittis was plainly aware of Toland's editorial role; his incarnation of Darby begs Toland for 'Another *Sydneys* Works or *Harringtons Oceana*'.[155] But the overall sense is one of a fruitful partnership. 'It is the time for us', explains Darby, 'to sound the Trumpet for the Preservation of our Liberties and Immunities.'[156] In short, Darby required Toland's assistance to spur the commonwealthmen into action. In this narrative, it is Toland who follows Darby's lead.

Shifting attention from Toland to his printer underscores that the whig publishing campaign was a collaborative enterprise rather than one man's crusade. Toland was an editor of the whig canon, but only one of several. Equally significant in Darby's circle were Johnson, Tutchin, Percival, Littlebury, and Jones, each of whom deserves greater scholarly attention. Many of the broader patterns in Darby's output from this period may be traced to the shared priorities of this milieu rather than to the individual nuances of thought associated with Toland. This is particularly true of the emphasis on the maleficence of government ministers and the endangered status of the ancient constitution, which had been the enduring shibboleths of Darby's press in the decade before Toland's edition of Harrington was published.

Usually the writings of the whig canon are viewed by modern scholars through the prism of republican political thought. Pocock's verdict that 'this whig canon was in fact a republican canon' has cast a long shadow.[157] Expanding the focus to include Darby's broader output reveals that the original aim of his publishing campaign was not to establish coherent republican principles of government, but to invigorate a stale opposition by emphasizing the dangers of corruption and apostacy. Darby was an activist not a philosopher. He used his press to move readers from political thought to political action.

[153] Brown, *Letters*, pp. 17–18.

[154] Ibid., pp. 26–7.

[155] [Pittis et al.], *Letters*, p. 154. Tutchin attributed this volume to '*Harry Clitus* [i.e. Pittis], and his Club' (*Observator*, 60 [3 Nov. 1703]).

[156] [Pittis et al.], *Letters*, p. 152.

[157] Pocock, 'Varieties of whiggism', p. 232. On the canon in this tradition, see Rachel Hammersley, *Republicanism: an introduction* (London, 2020), pp. 94–9; Simone Zurbuchen, 'Republicanism and toleration', in Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner, eds., *Republicanism: a shared European heritage* (2 vols., Cambridge, 2002), II, pp. 47–72; Blair Worden, 'English republicanism', in J. H. Burns and Mark Goldie, eds., *The Cambridge history of political thought, 1450–1700* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 443–75, at pp. 461–75.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000606 Published online by Cambridge University Press