ON THE CHARACTER OF A GREAT PATRIOT: A NEW ESSAY BY BOLINGBROKE

WORD COUNT: WITH NOTES 11,190; WITHOUT NOTES 8829

Henry St John, first Viscount Bolingbroke (1678-1751), was one of the most significant polemicists and political thinkers of the first half of the eighteenth century. The canon of Bolingbroke’s political writings has been relatively stable ever since the posthumous appearance of his collected Works in 1754, edited, according to Bolingbroke’s friend David Mallet, “from the manuscripts delivered to me by his executors, without the smallest addition or alteration.”¹ Simon Varey identified and edited Bolingbroke’s contributions to The Craftsman back in 1982, while Adrian Lashmore-Davies has recently collected his Unpublished Letters (2013), including some significant and previously unknown reflections on contemporary political debate.² Outside the correspondence, no substantial works have been added to the canon in recent years. In this article we present and attribute to


Bolingbroke for the first time a hitherto uncatalogued, unpublished, and unascribed manuscript essay transcribed in Senate House Library, MS 533. We take On the Character of a Great Patriot as our title for this work, which has no title in the manuscript. In addition to demonstrating why the essay must have been written by Bolingbroke, our arguments are threefold: firstly, that the essay is a description of the character of William Pulteney; secondly, that it was written in the final months of 1731, in response to a fresh government assault on the opposition, and most likely intended for publication in the opposition journal The Craftsman; and, thirdly, that in this essay Bolingbroke outlines principles of opposition that he would not fully articulate until the composition of On the Spirit of Patriotism (1736) several years later. The Character dates from a period in which Bolingbroke wrote very little, and is thus crucial to our understanding of his nascent ideas about the necessity of a systematic opposition party.

I

The essay in question describes the character of an unnamed “great Patriot” who is nonetheless readily identifiable as William Pulteney. Evidence for this identification is ample. The “Person” was formerly a loyal Whig MP who later “took upon him to oppose whatever practices he thought pernicious to its Interest at home, & its Credit & Honour abroad.” This fits Pulteney perfectly. The “Person” is said to spend “numerous fatigueing

---


4 All quotations from On the Character of a Great Patriot are from Senate House Library, MS 533, fols. 17v-20v. The text is included in the Appendix below. In lieu of a modern biography of Pulteney, the standard sources
days in Parliament, Maintaining long Debates, the weight of which lay almost wholly upon himself.” Pulteney led the parliamentary wing of the opposition to Walpole because Bolingbroke was unable to enter the Lords, having been struck from the roll of peers after his return from France.\(^5\) The “Person” is famous for having a “great Fortune” which “he possess[es] in a greater degree than any one in this Country.” Pulteney was one of the wealthiest men in England.\(^6\) Although the “Person” is “firmly fixd to the Illustrious House” of Brunswick, he “was not one of them who had the honour of fixing the happy Establishment.” This must be a reference to the Act of Settlement, passed in 1701.\(^7\) Pulteney did not enter parliament until 1705 and had therefore played no part in ratifying the Act. The “Person” is “dayly exposed to malitious attacks of all sorts [on] his reputation by various aspersions besides even attempts upon his Life contriv’d.” Not only was Pulteney the subject of numerous hatchet jobs, but was also challenged to a duel by Lord Hervey in January 1731, from which both combatants escaped with minor wounds. This helps fix the composition of the Character to the spring of 1731 or later. Perhaps more significantly, the “Person” is said to have supported the “worthy Cause” of opposition for “five or six years successively.” By the second half of 1731, Pulteney had been in opposition for six years, and had been “caballing” with Bolingbroke for five.\(^8\) The composition date of the Character can therefore

---


be pinned down with some accuracy to the autumn of 1731. This conclusion is supported by additional contextual and circumstantial evidence discussed below.

In subject matter, phraseology, style, and ideas, the Character is entirely consistent with Bolingbroke’s known writings. Compare the Character against Bolingbroke’s obituary of the Whig MP and lawyer Nicholas, Lord Lechmere, published in The Craftsman on 15 July 1727. Bolingbroke commends Pulteney in strikingly similar terms to Lechmere. For instance, where Lechmere is praised for “sacrificing [his] own particular ease and enjoyments of Pleasure and Plenty to the more general concerns of the Publick,” so Pulteney is described as “of an age in which it might be expected, that he would indulge himself, like the Generality of mankind, in a Life of ease and pleasure: For his great Fortune & other uncommon Advantages, which he possesses in a greater degree than any one in this Country, and might entitle him to pursue & enjoy as entertaining a life a possible, without the least pretence of being wondered at, or objected to even by Enemys. However this Person thought fit to take a more Noble Turn of Acting: For when he saw his Country sinking to Ruine by all sorts of Mismanagments, he took upon him to oppose whatever practices he thought pernitious to its Interest at home, & its Credit & Honour abroad.”

For the final part of this passage, we find a parallel in Bolingbroke’s later reflections on the character of Sir William Wyndham: “He thought this country on ye brink of ruin, and ye monarchical but free constitution of Government wherein the glory & ye happyness of our nation consisted, att ye point of being dissolved, & sacrificed to ye support of a weak & wicked administration.”

---

9 Contributions, 19.

Consider too Bolingbroke’s portrayal of Lechmere’s “generous Benevolence to all Men” and his devotion “to an universal Interest.” Again we find echoes in the Character of Pulteney, who is “so Universal a Benefactour to Mankind, as such a man must be allowd to be.” Lechmere’s “remarkable resolution” and “noble Sentiment” are renewed in Pulteney’s “Uncommon Resolution” and “noble Spirit.” Lechmere “pursue[d] the Publick Good, and acquire[d] such vast Applause, as regularly procured him all the Honours of the Long Robe.” So too “all people, under all views & Denominations, should unanimously concur to Esteem, Love, & to Admire” Pulteney, “and adhere to him in all his future attempts for the Publick Good.” In the Character it is Pulteney’s “Example & Eloquence” that “brought almost the whole Nation (which was before seemingly, nay effectually, sunk into Indolence, Blindness & a Servile Tameness) to move out of the First by degrees.” And again, his “Example & Eloquence that brought a Grumbling, useless Minority to become a bold, Generous, considerable sett of worthy Assertors of the Interest of their Country on many occasions, and even when it plainly dash’d with their own private advantages.” The rejection of “private advantages” for the “Interests” of society once again echoes Bolingbroke’s reflection on Lechmere. But it is the dual pairing of “Example & Eloquence” that is most significant here, for in On the Spirit of Patriotism Bolingbroke writes that eloquence is of little use unless men also lead by example. Thus Tully’s “eloquence in private causes gave him first credit at Rome, but it was this knowledge, this experience, and the continued habits of business, that supported his reputation, enabled him to do so much service to his country,

11 Contributions, 21.
12 Contributions, 19.
13 Contributions, 20.
and gave force and authority to his eloquence.”¹⁴ Pulteney’s rhetoric at the dispatch box and in the press is backed up by his “fatigueing days in Parliament.” These are not random verbal parallels, but rather sustained consistencies of thought and style.

Bolingbroke had already come to Pulteney’s defence once before. Some months before writing the Character, he concluded his Remarks on the History of England with a “Vindication” of himself and Pulteney, published in The Craftsman on 22 May 1731. Here Bolingbroke wrote that Pulteney “might have done Honour to a Roman Citizen, in the best Times of that Commonwealth.”¹⁵ Yet he also claimed that Pulteney had aimed at “Nothing less therefore than a constant and vigorous Opposition, of which you have set us the Example,” again reflected in the “firm, open, & spirited opposition” of which Pulteney provides the “Example” in the Character. We will consider the relationship between the Character and the paper war initiated by the “Vindication” of Pulteney in more detail later on. For now, though, it is important to understand that the Character is not a one-off. It belongs to a polemical moment and demands to be read alongside other texts arising from and responding to that moment. Knowledge that Bolingbroke addressed the topic of Pulteney’s character earlier in the same year considerably strengthens the case for his authorship.

For what outlet was the Character written? One strong possibility is that the Character was intended for publication in The Craftsman. Late in the summer of 1731, the editor and chief author Nicholas Amhurst “publish’d an Advertisement” in the paper, which, 

¹⁴ Henry St John, Lord Bolingbroke, Political Writings, ed. David Armitage (Cambridge, 1997), 214; hereafter Political Writings.

according to a later issue, “made us soon expect a farther Defence of Mr. P[ulteney]; but as that able Hand hath not yet appear’d, or at least cannot be distinguish’d, I suppose you have laid your Design aside.”

The fact that the authors of this issue (probably Amhurst in collaboration with Pulteney) expected the defence to be written by an “able Hand” is promising. Ministry hacks claimed the non-appearance of this “farther Defence” as a sign of weakness in the opposition. Writing in *The Free Briton* on 16 September 1731, Arnall protested that “A further Defence of Mr. P. is promised in one Craftsman; that further Defence is deferred in the next Craftsman [. . . ] After all, the whole is dropped; Weeks and Months are suffered to pass, without the least Appearance of this promised Vindication.”

The *Character* certainly fits the description of this highly anticipated but unpublished text.

Who else besides Bolingbroke could have written *On the Character of a Great Patriot*? In the absence of a contemporaneous ascription to Bolingbroke, we must ask the question. The shortlist includes Bolingbroke’s fellow contributors to *The Craftsman*, principally Amhurst. Thomas Davies later remarked that Amhurst “had almost as much wit, learning, and various knowledge” as Bolingbroke and Pulteney, and that “his essays were often ascribed to them.”

Thomas Lockwood’s examination of anonymous contributions to the journal has now recovered Amhurst’s reputation as “the best polemical journalist of his day,” with “a gift for close partisan political debate leavened with sarcastic mockery.”

Amhurst knew Pulteney very well from their collaborations; but there is no way that he could

---

16 *The Craftsman*, 270 (4 September 1731); the advertisement has not been traced, but cf. 265 (31 July 1731).

17 *Free Briton*, 94 (16 September 1731).

18 Thomas Davies, *The Characters of George the First, Queen Caroline, Sir Robert Walpole, Mr Pulteney, Lord Hardwicke, Mr Fox, and Mr Pitt, Reviewed* (London, 1777), 42-3.

have written *On the Character of a Great Patriot*. That is not just because editorial duties for *The Craftsman* kept Amhurst occupied—although they surely did—rather because the *Character* is so out of kilter with Amhurst’s distinctive and caustic prose. The *Character* is an exercise in panegyric not satire. Peripheral figures associated with *The Craftsman* included Daniel Pulteney, Jonathan Swift, John Arbuthnot, John Gay, and Alexander Pope. Of those five men, Daniel Pulteney had died in September 1731, and the style of the *Character* is simply irreconcilable with the writings of Swift and Arbuthnot.\(^\text{20}\) Certainly Pope was capable of prose flattery in this genre, as evinced by his *The Character of Katherine, Duchess of Buckingham* (1729), a unique scribal copy of which immediately precedes *On the Character of a Great Patriot* in the Senate House manuscript.\(^\text{21}\) Yet in the autumn of 1731 Pope was busy working on the *Epistle to Burlington*. To our knowledge he never contributed to *The Craftsman*, nor did he write about detailed party and parliamentary politics at this point in time.

Gay would be an altogether more likely candidate. He and Pulteney were longstanding friends by the early 1730s, having travelled together to Bolingbroke’s retreat at Aix-la-Chapelle more than a decade earlier in 1717.\(^\text{22}\) The opposition press had hailed *The Beggar’s Opera* as a crucial blow in the culture war against Walpole; seventeen issues of *The Craftsman* published between February and July 1727 referenced the success of Gay’s new

---

\(^{20}\) In 1735 Pulteney remembered his cousin fondly in a letter to Swift: “I had a very near relation of great abilities, who was my fellow labourer in the public cause: he is gone; I loved and esteemed him much”: *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, D.D.*, ed. David Woolley, 5 vols. (Oxford, 1999-2014), 4:234. Varey believes Daniel Pulteney was at least an occasional contributor to *The Craftsman*: see *Contributions*, xxvi.


play. His sequel, *Polly*, was denounced as a “theatrical *Craftsman*” by Lord Hervey and banned by the court. The Duchess of Queensbury suspected Pulteney himself of encouraging Gay to “pursue [Walpole], & bring him to punishment” in the sequel. Despite ailing health, Gay continued his association with the *Craftsman* group through 1731, when he was working hard on a new and deeply political set of fables about ministerial corruption. Certain features of the *Character* tally with Gay’s works from this period, not least the short passage concerning princely counsel. Like Bolingbroke, Gay was very interested in the counsel and education of rulers. His first volume of *Fables* (1727) had been intended for the moral instruction of the young Prince William. However, while the themes and style of the *Character* are not incompatible with Gay’s writings, other features of the text make Gay’s authorship very unlikely. By 1731 Gay and Pulteney had been friends for fifteen years, so why would Gay only vindicate Pulteney’s conduct over the last “five or six” years? Why would Gay concentrate on Pulteney’s actions in parliament, when their principal common interest was literature and the press? Why would Gay describe the Tories as a “Grumbling, useless Minority” and an “unactive Sett of men,” phrases which speak of personal experience rallying that party? Nobody, by contrast, had greater cause than Bolingbroke to complain about the recalcitrance of Tory backbenchers.

---


We conclude, therefore, that Bolingbroke is by some margin the most likely author of *On the Character of a Great Patriot*, that the text was written in the autumn of 1731, that it is probably related to the “farther Defence of Mr. P.” advertised as forthcoming in *The Craftsman* late that summer, and that it responded to the many and varied aspersions cast on Pulteney’s honour in those months. Yet these preliminary conclusions also raise questions. Why was the *Character* written? How did the text counter the ministry’s accusations? Why was it never published?

II

The autumn of 1731 was a difficult time for the opposition. The opportunity to embarrass the government over the Dunkirk affair had long since passed, yet general elections were more than two years away. Walpole’s minions continued to assault the opposition in the press. Pulteney was chief among their targets. William Arnall was particularly nasty, writing under the pseudonym “Walsingham” in pages of *The Free Briton.* And then, at the beginning of October, James Pitt, another of Walpole’s hacks, wrote an article in the *London Journal* observing “that the Opposition is very much upon the Decline” and that the “Imprudence and Heat, the Passion and Rage of Mr. P[ulteney]; his vile Usage of the King himself, his betraying the Conscience of his Friends, and charging them with Combinations, Plots, and *Vows of Destruction*, hath made those Friends cool, and caus’d them to withdraw from a Man with whom “tis dangerous to converse: He is left almost alone, and deserted at his utmost

---

28 See, for example, *Free Briton*, 83 (1 July 1731), 94 (16 September 1731), 95 (30 September 1831), and 100 (28 October 1731).
Need: Even Lord Bolingbroke, if Fame says true, is wisely retired.” Bolingbroke had perhaps not quite retired as Pitt jibed, but had certainly taken a break from political writing. Here we suggest that these and other provocations from government journalists may have persuaded Bolingbroke to pen a defence of his long-time collaborator, who had suffered so much abuse because of his association with Bolingbroke since the launch of *The Craftsman* at the end of 1726.

To understand the immediate pressures felt by the opposition in late 1731, we need to look back to the Dunkirk affair nearly two years earlier. In 1728 Bolingbroke discovered that France had begun to erect fortifications in Dunkirk, in breach of the Treaty of Utrecht. Bolingbroke’s friend and *quondam* Jacobite Sir William Wyndham played a leading role in the debates, presenting evidence and witnesses before the House of Commons. Walpole identified Bolingbroke as the brains behind the opposition’s offensive on the Dunkirk matter, forcing Wyndham to defend Bolingbroke after Walpole attacked him “de la façon la plus cruelle,” in the words of Montesquieu who witnessed the debate. It has been noted that Bolingbroke spent a lot of his own money on investigating the goings on at Dunkirk. But Pulteney was also heavily involved in the debates. It is not inconceivable that he had also contributed some of his private funds on this occasion, which he could surely afford to do,

---


and to which the Character may seem to allude: “No Expence of Money was wanting that was necessary to forward any good purposes.” This remark appears calculated to urge Pulteney to keep funding the opposition. Ultimately, Walpole won the day by obtaining affidavits from two of Wyndham’s witnesses, revealing that “Mr. Will. Pulteney, Daniel Pulteney, Sir William Wyndham, and [. . .] Mr Sand[y]s, had a meeting with Lord Bolingbroke to prosecute the enquiry into the works carrying on at Dunkirk.”

The statements were handed to every MP as they entered the House and were sent to absentees. They had the desired effect of forcing Pulteney as well as Wyndham onto the defensive, “stifly deny[ing] their meeting with Lord Bolingbroke to concert the Dunkirk affair.”

A string of controversies followed early in the new year, starting with the so-called “Hague Letter” printed in issue 235 of The Craftsman on 2 January 1731, which assailed the ministry for its reversal on foreign policy. The letter is usually attributed to Bolingbroke, although his biographer denies any involvement and suggests Pulteney as a likelier candidate. Since the “Hague Letter” divulged classified details of preliminary discussions ahead of the second Treaty of Vienna—revealed to Pulteney and/or Bolingbroke through their contacts on the continent—The Craftsman’s printer Richard Francklin was promptly arrested on 8 January and “all his Papers and Manuscripts” seized. Later in the same month Pulteney and Hervey fought a duel, which originated in a spat between the two men about Hervey’s contributions to William Yonge’s pamphlet Sedition and Defamation Display’d (1731), attacking The Craftsman, and Pulteney’s Reply to the same pamphlet, which responded on

34 Egmont Diary, 1:83.

35 Egmont Diary, 1:85-6.

the one hand by attacking Hervey for his homosexual affair with Stephen Fox, and, on the other, by implying that Hervey was Walpole’s catamite. According to Thomas Pelham, doubtlessly biased towards Hervey, they both emerged “slightly wounded,” although the fight was cut short after Pulteney slipped when he had the chance to strike a more serious blow to his antagonist. In Pelham’s rendition it was Pulteney who had instigated the duel by saying that “whether he (Pulteney) was the author of The Reply, or not, he was ready to justifie and stand by the truth of any part of it, at what time and wherever lord Harvey pleased.” The reality was that Hervey had “sent the challenge,” leaving behind a written declaration that he had instigated the duel and asking the king to pardon Pulteney if Hervey was killed. Many in the opposition suspected that the duel had been contrived by Walpole as a means of killing Pulteney. In a print issued on 25 January 1731, Walpole is shown watching the duel from a doorway, saying “Let them cut one anothers Throats.” Another pamphlet, Iago Display’d (1731), identified a plot masterminded by Walpole to rid himself of his opponent: if Hervey killed Pulteney, good; if Pulteney killed Hervey, his execution for murder would achieve the

37 William Pulteney, A Proper Reply to a Late Scurrilous Libel (London, 1731), 5.
same result. In its portrayal of the duel as “attempt upon [Pulteney’s] Life contriv’d,” the Character is entirely consistent with these oppositional responses to the duel.

Matters continued to escalate after this incident. Bolingbroke’s “Vindication” of himself and Pulteney in The Craftsman was designed to counter the ministerial press campaign waged by Arnall in The Free Briton. Naturally, the “Vindication” provoked a flurry of attacks including Remarks on the Craftsman’s Vindication of His Two Honourable Patrons, probably written by William Arnall but often wrongly ascribed to Hervey.42 Pulteney actually thought that the Remarks on the Craftsman’s Vindication was written by Walpole himself, and responded with a pamphlet so bold that he lost his place in the Privy Council, and for the printing of which Francklin was once again arrested.43 Although Bolingbroke backed away from the limelight, his “Vindication” marked only the beginning of The Craftsman’s attempts to salvage Pulteney’s reputation. On 3 July Amhurst penned a leader stating that Pulteney “hath been most virulently attack’d in a continued Series of Court Libels, for above four Years past, without the least Proof of Corruption, Mismanagement, or dishonourable Practice.”44 Here Amhurst expanded on Bolingbroke’s “Vindication” and defended some of its statements which had since come under attack. So where Bolingbroke earlier wrote that Pulteney “might have done Honour to a Roman Citizen, in the best Times

---


43 BL, Add. MS 18915, fol. 7. The main reason given for Pulteney’s ejection was that his pamphlet divulged words of disrespect allegedly uttered by Walpole about George II when Prince of Wales: see Pulteney, Answer to One Part of a Late Infamous Libel (London, 1731), 55-6. Stressing that he had not seen the publication, even Swift took issue with “betraying private conversation”: Swift to Gay and the Duchess of Queensberry, 28 August 1731, in Swift, Correspondence, 3:429.

44 The Craftsman, 261 (3 July 1731).
of that Commonwealth,” now Amhurst defended that position against charges that “a Roman Citizen would have been ashamed of his self-interested Spirit, even in the worst of those Times.”

Such charges that Pulteney’s opposition to Walpole was privately motivated were among the most common levelled in the ministerial press. For this reason, Pulteney’s allies sought to present him as a principled man of unquestionable integrity; thus, in the Character, “when he saw his Country sinking to Ruine by all sorts of Mismanagements, he took upon him to oppose whatever practices he thought pernicious.” This was an essential argument not least because the charge that Pulteney held personal incentives for opposition was partly true. Pulteney and Walpole had once been allies and gone into opposition together in the Whig schism of 1717. The two fell out the following year because (with no little irony) Pulteney was against co-operation with the Tories in opposition. When Walpole rose to prominence, he left Pulteney in the cold. The major rift between the two occurred in 1724, when the Duke of Newcastle rather than Pulteney replaced Carteret as Secretary of State for the Southern Department. The following year Pulteney went into open opposition together with his cousin Daniel and a splinter group of Whigs. Philip Dormer Stanhope, fourth Earl of Chesterfield, joined the opposition to Walpole during the excise crisis. He described Pulteney as being driven by “resentment”: “He had thought himself slighted by Sir Robert Walpole, to whom

---

45 *Works*, 1:529; *The Craftsman*, 261 (3 July 1731).


47 *Commons*, 1715-54, 2:375.

he publicly avowed not only revenge, but utter destruction." The *Character* appears calculated to counter such charges.

The second most common abuse directed at Pulteney and at the opposition in general was that of Jacobitism by stealth. Naturally, Bolingbroke bore the brunt of this criticism. Pulteney was more often portrayed as a collaborator with traitors and as Jacobite by association rather than conviction. However, by the middle of 1731, Arnall and other ministry hacks had begun to insinuate that Pulteney was himself a traitor. Pulteney’s letters were now intercepted so frequently that he even joked to his friends: “I will be extremely careful what I say,” he wrote in one letter, “not to give offence and bring you into disgrace for continuing your friendship with such a Jacobite as I am.” The opposition responded. One anonymous pamphleteer writing under the sobriquet “Philalethes” quickly answered Arnall by setting forth “the Character of Mr. P[ulteney] fully cleared and justified” in *The

49 *Characters by Lord Chesterfield Contrasted with Characters of the Same Great Personages by other Respectable Writers* (London, 1778), 27. Chesterfield wrote for the oppositional *Common Sense* after 1737, and was often identified as a contributor to *The Craftsman*, although this is unlikely; see Varey, “Introduction,” xvii. He said he made his portrait of Pulteney “to the best of my knowledge, from very long acquaintance with, and observation of, the original”: Chesterfield, *Characters*, 28.

50 In private, however, ministerial Whigs must have known that Bolingbroke was no longer a principled Jacobite. Lord Hervey likened his mobility and flexibility to Handel: “His fortune in music is not unlike my Lord Bolingbroke’s in politics. The one has tried both theatres, as the other has tried both Courts. They have shone in both, and been ruined in both; whilst everyone owns their genius and sees their faults, though nobody either pities their fortune or takes their part”: Hervey to Digby, 25 November 1735, in *Lord Hervey and His Friends, 1726-38: Based on Letters from Holland House, Melbury, and Ickworth*, ed. Giles Stephen Holland Fox-Strangways, Earl of Ilchester (London, 1950), 239.

51 See, for example, *The Free Briton*, 83 (1 July 1731).

52 BL, Add. MS 27732, fol. 49r.
Examiner, published on 23 July 1731.⁵³ The connection of “Philalethes” to Bolingbroke and the opposition is unclear, although his defence of Pulteney in The Examiner proceeds in a similar fashion to the Character. For instance, “Philalethes” accuses Arnall of “many glaring Falsehoods, vile Glossaries, and scandalous Impositions” in his description of “what Mr. P. spoke in the House of Commons relating to the Act of Settlement.” “Mr. P.,” he writes, “has sufficiently explained and cleared himself of what has been basely imputed to him on that Score.”⁵⁴ More recently, during the Atterbury crisis of 1723, “Mr. P. was Chairman of the Committee of Secrecy, and drew up his famous Report against the late Bishop Rochester; this seems to give great Offence to Mr. Walsingham [i.e. Arnall]; but if he be that real Whig, which he would persuade the World to believe he is, why should he offended at the Report, or at Mr. P’s drawing it up.”⁵⁵ Bolingbroke in the Character similarly emphasizes Pulteney’s Hanoverian credentials. He is “firmly fixd to the Illustrious House, which he Submitted to,” although as we noted earlier, Pulteney was not yet an MP in 1701 and therefore played no part in ratifying the Act; hence, writes Bolingbroke, he “was not one of them who had the honour of fixing the happy Establishment.” This final statement may well have been designed to counter accusations of Jacobitism that continued to be slung at Bolingbroke, who had, unlike Pulteney, voted through the Act of Settlement during his first session as MP for Wootton Bassett. Arnall chose to ignore this fact in his Remarks on the


⁵⁴ The Examiner, 14.

Craftsman’s Vindication, where he alleged that Bolingbroke “was one of the Virtuous 117, who gave their Votes to throw out the Bill for settling the Protestant Succession in the Illustrious House of Hanover.”\(^{56}\) This is seriously misleading. Actually Bolingbroke had seconded a motion to introduce a bill for “the further security of the King and the Protestant succession,” including the imposition of a compulsory abjuration oath.\(^{57}\) As a final gambit to distance the opposition from Jacobitism, the Character drives a wedge between Pulteney and “the publick Pretenders to Jacobitism”—presumably the nonjuring clergy, University of Oxford, and perhaps the likes of William Shippen—by saying that they reckoned him “a Commonwealths-man.” Bolingbroke’s intention was not to describe his opposition colleague as a commonwealthman, but rather to emphasize the ideological gulf between Pulteney and the Jacobites.

The context of Jacobitism may also go some way towards explaining why the Character was never printed individually or in The Craftsman, because in it Bolingbroke also had the indiscretion to allude directly to the king when writing that “I doubt not but with K[ing] G[eorge] he is a reputed Jacobite, and then a private Incendiary with his Son to make difference betwixt them.” Bolingbroke may have felt that this criticism of the king was justified since George II had recently excluded Pulteney from the Privy Council. But it may also explain why he could have been persuaded not to print the piece as a letter in The Craftsman. Earlier in the essay he referred to the need for an “Ill or misguided Prince” to “perceive he errors, and, if he pleases […] amend them.” In aggregate, these statements may well have been judged as sailing too close to the wind. Nathanial Mist had been forced into

\(^{56}\) Arnall, Remarks on the Craftsman’s Vindication, 30.

exile as recently as 1728 after being convicted of libel against the king in his *Weekly Journal*. Although Mist was an unreformed Jacobite who had been arrested on numerous occasions, this was a time when fairly innocuous statements or innuendos could lead to conviction.\(^5\) Everybody remembered the execution of nineteen-year-old John Matthews for having printed a Jacobite pamphlet little over a decade previous.\(^5\) Referring to Bolingbroke and Pulteney in notes from his stay in England between November 1729 and 1731, Montesquieu commented that “on le fait conseiller par trois avocats avant de l’imprimer [in the *Craftsman*], pour savoir s’il y a quelque chose qui blesse la loi.”\(^6\) Bolingbroke could be certain that Walpole would pursue all legal options available to him in prosecuting the opposition leaders.

Moreover, the remark that George II suspected Pulteney of deliberately creating tension between him and his son would have been highly controversial. Although Prince Frederick did not go into formal opposition until 1737, when Pulteney proposed the motion demanding a £100,000 allowance for the prince, various opposition figures had courted his patronage since his arrival in England in the winter of 1728. Bolingbroke most likely referred to the prince as one of his “two beneficial projects” in a letter written to Bathurst soon after the prince landed.\(^6\) In 1729 a new English translation of Fénelon’s *Les Adventure de*


\(^6\) *Unpublished Letters*, 5:73.
Télémaque (1694)—originally hailed as a Jacobite document—appeared with a dedication to Frederick that looked forward “to your Reign, whenever it commences.” Association with the Hanoverian successor to the throne was useful for eighteenth-century oppositions, not only because of the so-called “reversionary interest”—that is, the jobs and favors that could be expected after their succession—but also because it reduced the credibility of charges that oppositional activity amounted to Jacobitism and treason. In the early days George’s suspicion of his son prompted him to keep the prince on a tight leash, restricting his income to £2000 per month from the civil list plus £9000 per annum from the duchy of Cornwall. The precise nature of Pulteney’s attempt in 1731 “to make difference betwixt” George and Frederick is somewhat of a mystery. However, Bolingbroke describes it as a “private Incendiary,” which suggests that the incident occurred behind closed doors, and in the context of baseless rumours about Pulteney’s alleged Jacobitism. The suggestion is that this accusation is either unfounded gossip or, worse, a deliberate attempt by counsellors to mislead the king. At a time when the printer of The Craftsman had repeatedly been arrested, it would have been extremely foolhardy to publish this sort of allegation.


63 This did not stop Walpole from commenting some years later that George II was confronted by two “Pretenders to the King’s crown [. . .] one at Rome, the other at Norfolk House”: A Selection from the Papers of the Earl of Marchmont, ed. Sir George Henry Rose, 3 vols. (London, 1831), 2:113.

Although *On the Character of a Great Patriot* remained unprinted, the text did, however, achieve a limited circulation in manuscript. We know this because the only scribal copy of the Character in Senate House MS 533 is written not in Bolingbroke’s hand, but rather in the professional script of one of the Duchess of Buckingham’s servants. Determining how the essay came to be transcribed here is not straightforward. It was perfectly normal in the early eighteenth century for politically subversive materials to be circulated in manuscript and not print, and for that circulation to occur in a closed network.\(^{65}\)

While the duchess and Bolingbroke certainly moved in the same circles, her friendship with Bolingbroke was fraught, as were most of her relationships.\(^{66}\) Horace Walpole later described her as “more mad with pride than any mercer’s wife in Bedlam” and ridiculed her habit of attending “the opera *en princesse*, literally in robes red velvet and ermine.”\(^{67}\) That vanity frequently resulted in alienation. Nonetheless, the duchess was sufficiently friendly with Bolingbroke to visit him at Aix-la-Chapelle with her son Edmund, the second Duke of Buckingham, in September 1723.\(^{68}\)

The duchess was, in many ways, *la grande dame* of the opposition. While her personal attachment was mostly to the Jacobite wing, she appears to have been on friendly

---


\(^{66}\) On the failure of the duchess’s friendship with Pope, see Hone, “Pope, Bathurst, and the Duchess of Buckingham.”


\(^{68}\) *Unpublished Letters*, 5:36.
terms with Pulteney, or at the very least his wife.\textsuperscript{69} She preserved Buckingham House as a centre of oppositional politics and culture long after her husband’s death in 1721, where she observed Stuart anniversaries such as the martyrdom of Charles I, for which, as Lord Hervey noted, she put the entire household into deep mourning.\textsuperscript{70} It does not seem too far fetched to assume that she gained access to the manuscript through one of her and Bolingbroke’s mutual friends among both Jacobites and oppositional loyalists. Although Pope spent “almost all my time [with Bolingbroke] at Dawley” around this time, he had quarrelled with the Duchess of Buckingham by 1730 and so could not have passed on the manuscript. While we cannot exclude the possibility that Pulteney may have done it himself, Bolingbroke’s friend Lord Bathurst, of whom the duchess remained very fond, is our prime suspect.\textsuperscript{71} Pope’s \textit{Character of the Duchess} on the preceding pages includes an addendum by Bathurst in the same hand as \textit{On the Character of a Great Patriot}.\textsuperscript{72} Although Bathurst remained aloof from the grubby business of anti-ministerial journalism, he appears to have acted as the duchess’s main contact in the opposition around this time. No other intermediary is more likely. It is entirely possible that the transcriber, Bathurst, or whomever communicated the \textit{Character} to the

\textsuperscript{69} Pulteney wrote to his diplomat friend Francis Colman in August 1731: “Mrs Pulteney has received a letter from the Duchess of Buckingham, it is filed with praises of you and Mrs Colman, and gives a long account of you civility.” BL, Add. MS 18915, fol. 9r. For discussion of additional manuscript evidence linking Pulteney and the duchess, see Eveline Cruickshanks, “Lord Cornbury, Bolingbroke and a Plan to Restore the Stuarts, 1731-1735,” \textit{Royal Stuart Papers} 27 (1986): 1-13 at 2-3.

\textsuperscript{70} Horace Walpole, \textit{Reminiscences} (London, 1818), 119.

\textsuperscript{71} On the quarrel and on Bathurst’s friendship with the duchess, see Hone, “Pope, Bathurst, and the Duchess of Buckingham” and Pope, \textit{Correspondence}, 3:91, 110, 116, 122, 295-6, 481.

\textsuperscript{72} Senate House Library, MS 533, fol. 17r.
Duchess of Buckingham tinkered with the text in some way, as was perfectly common in this period. But we have no doubt that Bolingbroke was the guiding spirit behind this essay.

III

We now turn from the political context of On the Character of a Great Patriot to its intellectual significance. Only one other text has been attributed to Bolingbroke between July 1731 and February 1733, namely issue 319 of The Craftsman published on 12 August 1732. Crucially, in that text Bolingbroke is once again defending Pulteney’s character against accusations and rumours. Why did Bolingbroke not write and publish more at this time? Politics may not have been Bolingbroke’s main occupation for much of this period, before the excise crisis gave the opposition a new occasion towards the end of 1732. Already in August 1731, he had expressed a sense of hopelessness to Swift about the fate of the opposition: “when all the information which can be given is given, when all the spirit which can be raised is raised, and all to no purpose, it is to no purpose to write any more.”

Contrary to this dispirited assessment of the opposition’s chances, Bolingbroke’s interest in philosophy and history had been rekindled. In fact, it appears as if Bolingbroke at this point diverted his attention to his philosophical projects and in particular his criticism of revealed religion, which would be published posthumously as “Fragments” and acquire a great deal of notoriety. Bolingbroke wrote to Swift the following March that “I have ventured to start a

73 Contributions, 139–40.

74 Swift, Correspondence, 3:423.

75 Samuel Johnson is reported by James Boswell as having said the following: “Sir, he [Bolingbroke] was a scoundrel, and a coward: a scoundrel for charging a blunderbuss against religion and morality; a coward,
thought, which must, if it is push’d as successfully as I think it is, render all your Metaphysical Theology both ridiculous and abominable.”

This was presumably also the time when Pope worked on *An Essay on Man* (1733-4), which he dedicated to Bolingbroke and which Bolingbroke heavily influenced.

This was also the period and environment in which Bolingbroke began to expand upon the local ideas conveyed in his polemics, and develop a more coherent theory of oppositional politics. In this context, *On the Character of a Great Patriot* is extremely significant as one of Bolingbroke’s earliest expressions of his theory about the necessity of a concerted political opposition. Bolingbroke is usually caricatured as the “standard anti-party writer” and the “fountain-head of anti-party thought.” And yet recent work has unearthed the extent to which Bolingbroke supported the formation of a systematic parliamentary opposition party in resistance to the government. Contrary to the view of John Gunn, who argues that Bolingbroke “contributed little to the understanding of party conflict,” we now

---

76 Swift, *Correspondence*, 3:458. Bolingbroke was so optimistic that he believed that Dean Swift would “come into my way of thinking on this subject,” but this may have been a joke. The first part of the letter is written by Bolingbroke and the second part by Pope (“Adieu: Pope calls for the paper”).


know that Bolingbroke’s theory of opposition represents a watershed in the history of political thought, since no formal opposition party existed at the time and opposition was widely considered illegitimate and immoral.\textsuperscript{80} Of course, Bolingbroke’s views on this subject were formed in practice. In \textit{Remarks on the History of England} he defended opposition implicitly by countering the cry of the ministerial press that such activities were necessarily “factious.”\textsuperscript{81} In the final part of the \textit{Remarks}—the “Vindication” published on 22 May 1731—he had made the case for a “constant and vigorous Opposition.”\textsuperscript{82} Not until \textit{On the Spirit of Patriotism}, written five years later and published eighteen years later, would Bolingbroke flesh out his ideas about the necessity of opposition. \textit{On the Character of a Great Patriot} provides crucial insights about the development of these ideas and about Pulteney’s role therein.

Historians have largely underestimated the extent to which Pulteney may have inspired Bolingbroke’s writings on opposition. Indeed, in \textit{On the Spirit of Patriotism} Bolingbroke appears to have given up his coalition with Pulteney—he claimed in letter of 1736 that he “quits with my friends, party friend I mean”—and to have turned his “eyes from the generation that is going off, to the generation that is coming on the stage.”\textsuperscript{83} \textit{On the Spirit} is addressed to the twenty-six-year-old Lord Cornbury, who, as Clarendon’s grandson and MP for the University of Oxford, was one of the most promising Tories in parliament. Bolingbroke may also have alluded to a group of young opposition politicians led by Lord


\textsuperscript{81} \textit{Works}, 1:439.

\textsuperscript{82} \textit{Works}, 1:524.

\textsuperscript{83} \textit{Unpublished Letters}, 5:168; \textit{Political Writings}, 208.
Cobham (the so-called “boy patriots”) which included William Pitt and George Lyttelton, who would later form an opposition group centered around Prince Frederick. The shift to the next generation has effectually eclipsed Pulteney’s role in the story. And yet, as the *Character* makes clear, Pulteney was Bolingbroke’s original model of an oppositional politician: “He did not sluggishly aim, only at a little opposition just enough to save his own Credit in this Country, but he served it effectually [. . .] He shew’d an uncommon Intrepidity against all fears of displeasing the greatest Power [. . .] [He] rowse[d] his Fellow Subjects from the most servile Submission to all the ill practices that were flourishing and successful to a firm, open, & spirited opposition. It was his Example & Eloquence that brought a Grumbling, useless Minority to become a bold, Generous, considerable sett of worthy Assertors of the Interest of their Country.” Pulteney had learned these tactics from his period with the Walpole-Townshend opposition between 1717 and 1720. And they are precisely the touchstones of Bolingbroke’s stance in *On the Spirit of Patriotism*. The *Character* demonstrates that these principles were inspired not by the actions of the new generation, but rather by Pulteney at the height of his opposition several years earlier.

Three other key Bolingbrokean techniques feature prominently in *On the Character of a Great Patriot*: the association of Walpole with the betrayal of Whig principles; the importance of political counsel; and the appeal to impartiality. The first of those tactics has received the greatest attention from scholars such as Quentin Skinner, and thus needs to be

---


addressed only briefly here. Walpole consistently appealed to Whig principles in his speeches. At the height of the excise crisis, for instance, Walpole professed that he was “not pleading [his] own cause, but the cause of the Whig party,” adding that “it is in Whig principles I have lived, and in Whig principles I will die.” In the *Dissertation upon Parties* (1733-4) Bolingbroke sought to demonstrate that Walpole and his cronies actually espoused the antiquated Tory doctrine of passive obedience, as they denounced all opposition as treasonous and labelled it Jacobite. Essays in *The Craftsman* were designed to remind the Court Whigs of the “Country” and popular roots of Whiggism and thereby, in Skinner’s words, “to establish that their behaviour as a government was gravely out of line with the political principles in which they professed to believe.” Pulteney, on the other hand, was said to have retained true Whig ideology in the face of the oligarchy. “The Whigs themselves owe to him the honour of having kept up & supported the true Spirit & Credit of their Party,” Bolingbroke wrote in the *Character*, “whilst so many under that denomination, were prevailed on some how to shew, though to their own dissatisfaction, the utmost passive obedience even to the Ministry.” His choice of phrase here was undoubtedly intended to undercut Walpole’s support among independently minded Whigs.

---


88 *Political Writings*, 6, 65, 66. For tactical reasons, Bolingbroke did not mention the high-water mark of Toryism that was the last four years of Queen Anne’s reign, when Bolingbroke led the more extreme faction within the Tories; for the same reasons, he appears to have discouraged Swift from writing his deeply partisan *History of the Last Four Years of the Queen*, first published posthumously in 1758. See Ashley Marshall, *Swift and History: Politics and the English Past* (Cambridge, 2015), 118-56.

If Walpole had failed to uphold the principles of his party, how could he be expected to counsel his sovereign? More than two years earlier, in issue 142 of *The Craftsman*, Bolingbroke had utilized the technique of pointing out “Parallels” in the past as a means to “forewarn all Ages against evil Counsels and corrupt Ministers.”90 This method of extracting political advice from historical commentary had been key to the most important historical works of Bolingbroke’s formative years and subsequently became an important part of the *Remarks on the History of England*.91 The *Character* is in many ways designed to counsel politicians towards the opposition. And yet Bolingbroke also takes a pot-shot at Walpole and other courtiers by suggesting that “An Ill or misguided Prince may perceive his errors, and, if he pleases, may amend them.” We find similar guidance in *The Idea of Patriot King* (1738), where Bolingbroke instructs his prince to “correct error” and “reform or punish ministers.”92 This brings us to the close of the *Character* and Bolingbroke’s appeal for “every Sensible, Impartial-Judging man” to “Esteem, Love, & to Admire this great Patriot; and adhere to him in all his future attempts for the Publick Good.” Needless to say, from the perspective of Walpole and the ministerial Whigs, this was not impartiality but partisanship in its purest form.93

90 *Contributions*, 82-3.


92 *Political Writings*, 261.

Although Bolingbroke expressed his dissatisfaction with the opposition in *On the Spirit of Patriotism*, it would be wrong to think that he stopped caring for Pulteney in exile. Hearing about his old colleague’s near-fatal disease in 1736, he wrote to Wyndham’s son, saying that he had “lived in great intimacy with Mr Pulteney of late years, and therefore cannot hear the bad account you give of his health without much concern.”

As far as evidence related to the protagonists themselves is concerned, Hervey’s assertion that in March 1734 “Mr. Pulteney and Lord Bolingbroke hated one another” makes little sense at that point in time. However, Bolingbroke certainly began to feel more dissatisfied with Pulteney towards the end of the decade. By this time, Pulteney had already been dispirited for some time; he wrote to his fellow opposition Whig George Berkeley in November 1735 to admit that “you may have perceived this resolution arising in me for some years, it is in vain to struggle against universal corruption, and I am quite weary of the opposition.”

Disappointment turned into dismay when Pulteney became a courtier on Walpole’s resignation at the start of 1742, accepting a seat in the Lords as the Earl of Bath and abandoning his Tory colleagues in

---

94 Bolingbroke to Charles Wyndham, 9 May 1736, in *Unpublished Letters*, 5:163-4. News of Pulteney’s illness also reached Swift in Dublin, who wrote to Pope: “Common reports have made me very uneasy about your neighbour, Mr. Pulteney. It is affirmed that he hath been very near death: I love him for being a Patriot in most corrupted times, and highly esteem his excellent Understanding”: Swift to Pope, 24 April 1736, in Pope, *Correspondence*, 4:12.


97 BL, Add. MS 22628, fol. 73r.
opposition. Pope made his discontent clear in a letter of December 1742: “I am sick of this World & the Great ones of it, tho they have been my intimate Acquaintance.” William King, the principal of St Mary Hall, Oxford, said that “NO INCIDENT in this reign astonished us so much as the conduct of my Lord BATH who chose to receive his honours as the wages of iniquity, which he might have had as the reward of virtue. By his opposition to a mal-administration for near twenty years, he had contracted an universal esteem, and was considered as the chief bulwark and protector of the British liberties. By the fall of WALPOLE, he enjoyed for some days a kind of sovereign power. During this interval, it was expected that he would have formed a patriot ministry, and have put the public affairs in such a train as would necessarily, in a very short time, have repaired all the breaches in our constitution. But how were we deceived! He deserted the cause of his country: he betrayed his friends and adherents: he ruined his character; and from a most glorious eminence sunk down to a degree of contempt.”

Even more saddened, however, was Bolingbroke. In November 1742 he penned a short attack on Bath in the form of an epistle. As Adrian Lashmore-Davies has pointed out, a version of this text was published in the Westminster Journal in 1747 with author, addressee, and Bath’s name suppressed. In this epistle Bolingbroke sought to shame Bath for apostasy, reminding him of his previous commitment to the opposition and how he had “resolutely continued the Battle” after Bolingbroke had retired. He slated Bath for now adhering to measures that he had formerly opposed, most notably septennial parliaments and

---

98 Pope, Correspondence, 4:431.

99 William King, Political and Literary Anecdotes of His Own Times (London, 1818), 42-3.

100 Unpublished Letters, 5:276.

the maintenance of the standing army. The biggest betrayal for Bolingbroke, however, appears to have been Bath’s abandonment of the Tories (and indeed the Cobhamite opposition Whigs). According to Bolingbroke, one week’s conduct had ruined ten years of fame as “Mr Pulteney was on a sudden against a Coalition of Parties which with me he had so often & often approved Prosecuted & determined to obtain, what could I say but in Imitation of Shakespear Frailty thy name is Man.”

But ultimately, as far as Bolingbroke was concerned, Bath’s failure to persist with opposition resulted from defects in his character; he had become “an Hipocritical Senator a False Friend & a Concealed Enemy of his Country.” Whereas Pulteney’s personal virtue was earlier said to have spurred him to lead the opposition in the Character, so now his tergiversation stems from his dishonesty.

Bolingbroke’s writings on opposition are often divorced from the context of contemporary political practice at the parliamentary level. To this end, historians have arguably underestimated the extent to which Pulteney may have inspired Bolingbroke’s theoretical writings. And yet, as the Character amply demonstrates, Bolingbroke appears to have based his theory of opposition to a great extent on Pulteney’s actions, in the same way as his earlier experience of working together with Harley in early 1700s may well have influenced his thoughts on a coalition of parties. When we study a thinker like Bolingbroke, political ideas cannot be separated from political actions. This is not to say that practice constitutes “reality” to which theory must be related, but simply that the separation between the two is artificial and makes little sense when writing history.

APPENDIX


Textual Note: The text printed here is transcribed from Senate House Library, MS 533, fols 17v-20v. This large folio volume was originally the account book of John Sheffield, Earl of Mulgrave and Duke of Buckingham, and contains expenses for the construction of Buckingham House. After Buckingham’s death, the duchess continued to use the book as a miscellany containing poems, recipes, and essays. In her will, the duchess left “All her private Papers & those of her Correspondents” including her “Treasonable Correspondence” to Lord Hervey, effectively spurning the opposition. Precisely how this manuscript volume became separated from the Hervey papers deposited in the Suffolk Records Office and ended up in Senate House Library is unclear. Goldsmith’s College, University of London, bought the volume from the antiquarian bookseller Horace Alexander “Barry” Duncan in 1961, whence it was procured for the central University of London library at Senate House. Duncan specialized in theatre history and owned a small bookshop in St Martin’s Court just off Charing Cross Road in the west end of London. Unfortunately his ledgers have not been preserved so we have no way of knowing how or from whom he purchased the manuscript volume.

Transcription preserves the spelling, punctuation, and capitalization of the original manuscript exactly, except for occasional end-line hyphenation, which has not been preserved. The text is copied out in a large but neat italic hand, probably the work of a professional scribe or secretary. The Character of Katherine, Duchess of Buckingham by Pope on the immediately preceding pages is in the same hand, making it likely that the scribe was a member of the duchess’s household. The following pages contain poems transcribed in various hands, dated between 1732 and 1735. One line (transcribed in bold below) has been

---

104 Pope, Correspondence, 4:446.
recopied in the manuscript over faded ink, probably by the original scribe. Presumably he ran out of ink.

[17v]

There is a Person amongst us of an age in which it might be expected, that he would indulge himself, like the Generality of mankind, in a Life of ease and pleasure: For his great Fortune & other uncommon Advantages, which he possesses in a greater degree than any one in this Country, and might entitle him to pursue & enjoy as entertaining a life a possible, without the least pretence of being wondered at, or objected to even by Enemys.

However this Person thought fit to take a more Noble Turn of Acting: For when he saw his Country sinking to Ruine by all sorts of Mismanagments, he took upon him to oppose whatever practices he thought pertinious to its Interest at home, & its Credit & Honour abroad. [18r]

He did not sluggishly aim, only at a little opposition just enough to save his own Credit in this Country, but he served it effectually.

He set a vigorous & noble Example for others to imitate. He shewed an uncommon Intrepidity against all fears of displeasing the greatest Power, in a worthy Cause which he has supported five or six years successively; Spending numerous fatigueing days in Parliament, Maintaining long Debates, the weight of which lay almost wholly upon himself: And Replying to the great & various Malices which were levelled peculiarly at him whom they look’d upon to be the Fountain head, the main Spring from which all that did not please arose. All gave publick admiration willingly or unwillingly.

This Person has not gone on in the usual slow Methods to Fame & Honour, but has shone out all at once upon his Country with various Talents for its Service; Such as are generally dispersed among other men Singly, who by Slow Steps & a Long Experience arrive
by degrees to be famous or Useful to their Country. But all these Advantages appear’d at once in him to please, Surprize & serve Great Britain. [18v]

He has with an Uncommon Resolution exerted a noble Spirit which no Violences of Powerfull Ill-will could sink. He was dayly exposed to malitious attacks of all sorts his reputation by various aspersions besides even attempts upon his Life contriv’d.

Notwithstanding all this, he persisted to give up his Ease and Time, whenever the business of the Publick was to be done. No Expence of Money was wanting that was necessary to forward any good purposes and great has been the charges he has many ways been put too.

At last by his own Example & Eloquence he brought almost the whole Nation (which was before seemingly, nay effectually, sunk into Indolence, Blindness & a Servile Tameness) to move out of the First by degrees; Secondly to open the eyes & Understanding of all who could read & hear; And Thirdly to rowse his Fellow Subjects from the most servile Submission to all the ill practices that were flourishing and successful to a firm, open, & spirited opposition. It was his Example & Eloquence that brought a Grumbling, useless Minority to become a bold, Generous, considerable sett of worthy Assertors of the Interest [19r] of their Country on many occasions, and even when it plainly dash’d with their own private advantages.

This is an impartial Relation of a Successful work, which is all of it owing to this Person noble behaviour. This Account is a Justice one owes to so Universal a Benefactour to Mankind, as such a man must be allowd to be.

Now whoever will make a proper use of Reflection & Observation of the Virtues & Practices of this, truly great man, will plainly perceive that all Men of all party’s, & of all Ranks, under all views, may find a peculiar advantage to themselves from his proceedings.
An Ill or misguided Prince may perceive his errors, and, if he pleases, may amend them.

A Well-designing Prince may hear and read the way to govern well, and thereby deserve & gain the affection of the People, and Learn the just difference between a worthy & an unworthy Counselour.

Great Britain might long ago have seen [19°] how their Trade, the Honour & their Glory were sinking all together.

The Whigs themselves owe to him the honour of having kept up & supported the true Spirit & Credit of their Party, whilst so many under that denomination, were prevaild on some how to shew, though to their own dissatisfaction, the utmost passive obedience even to the Ministry.

The Torys owe to him the having at last drawn them to a Worthy, active part in contradiction to the common Aspersion thrown on them, that they are a numerous but too unactive Sett of men to serve either themselves or others effectually.

So even those who have already, or may hereafter come in, like the Labourers in the Gospel, at the last hour, may find their Advantage various ways, with those who have borne the heat & burden of the day.

Now should ever a certain event happen it would appear as if this Persons Merits had been appointed some how by Providence as his [20°] Instrument to act upon Motives productive in the end of good purposes.

Observations from these plain Facts.
One should naturally conclude from all these plain Facts. That all people, under all views & Denominations, should unanimously concur to Esteem, Love, & to Admire this great Patriot; and adhere to him in all his future attempts for the Publick Good.

Yet it may possibly happen, though I hope it never will, that some of his side may grow envious & Jealous, to say no more, & fall back when he hath brought matters to a certain Crisis; and instead of joining more vigorously, may be prevailed upon to separate, & underhand act like Enemys, by spreading numerous & inconsistent motives for his plain & worthy actions.

I doubt not but with K— G— he is reputed a Jacobite, and then a private Incendiary with his Son to make difference betwixt them.

With the publick Pretenders to Jacobitism [20'] (whom I deny to be the assertors or assistant of the Cause they drink success to) he is a Commonwealthis-man, Or firmly fixd to the Illustrious House, which he Submitted to, “tis true, with others, but was not one of them who had the honour of fixing the happy Establishment.

In this manner do Artful, Indolent & Malitious people blast, poison & misrepresent the Motives & purposes of Worthy Actions which “tis impossible for them to come to the knowledge of; tho without hesitation they dare decide boldly & ignorantly.

But every Sensible, Impartial-Judging man must Conclude within himself, that a man possess’d of an uncommon good understanding & a known honour & Love to Justice must have a Tendency in his Actions consistent with them all, who soever they may appear to Ignorant Gazers.