

SWIFT'S POLITICAL "CONVERSION" AND HIS "LOST" BALLAD ON THE WESTMINSTER ELECTION OF 1710

By GEORGE P. MAYHEW, M.A., Ph.D.

PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH, CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

I

IN his *Journal to Stella* for 20 October 1710, Jonathan Swift mentioned his recent composition and the subsequent publication and reception of "a Ballad, full of puns, on the Westminster Election, that cost me half an hour: it runs, though it be good for nothing". Characteristically, the authorship of this ballad, like that of his recent *The Virtues of Sid Hamet the Magician's Rod*, a verse lampoon, and of his prose *Tatler*, no. 230, Swift went on to say, "is likewise a secret", but he added, of the two poems, "if you have them not [in Dublin], I'll bring them over".¹ Earlier, on 12 October 1710, exactly five weeks after his arrival in London, Swift remarked in his *Journal* that "they have fixt about fifty things on me since I came: I have printed but three", namely, the two poems and the prose *Tatler*.² Saturday, 7 October 1710, a month after his arrival at London, was a momentous day for Swift, since he was then

¹ *Jonathan Swift: Journal to Stella*, ed. Sir Harold Williams, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1948), i. 65. Hereafter referred to as *Journal*. In mid-October, 1710 Swift still expected to return soon to Dublin, once his dealings with Harley about the First Fruits were completed. But also, evidently as early as 20 October, Swift had sent ahead to Stella in Dublin a copy of his recent poem from *Tatler*, no. 238, "The City Shower", which was printed at London on 17 October (*Journal*, i. 62). On that date Swift wrote: "Tell me how my *Shower* is liked in Ireland: I never knew any thing pass better here." He was more circumspect about sending over poems on political subjects, however. On 13 October he wrote: "if I write long letters, I must write you news and stuff, unless I send you my verses; and some I dare not . . ." (*Journal*, i. 55-56). Yet *Sid Hamet's Rod*, printed at London between 12-14 October, evidently appeared at Dublin soon after. See HEH 355346a and *The Poems of Jonathan Swift*, 3 vols., 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1958), hereafter referred to as *Poems*, i. 132.

² *Journal*, i. 53. On 12 October Swift also noticed that on that day he had "finished my poem on the *Shower*, all but the beginning, and am going on with my *Tatler*". The *Tatler* mentioned is now unidentifiable. See *Journal*, i. 41, n. 29.

scheduled to hold a second long private meeting with Robert Harley, the Tory Chancellor of the Exchequer and soon to become Lord Treasurer and the Earl of Oxford. At 4 p.m. on the afternoon of 7 October, Swift was to call at Harley's house in Buckingham Street, in order to present his credentials and a memorial about the First Fruits for the Church of Ireland, a matter upon which Harley, unlike the lords of the Whig Junto, acted at once, to Swift's great satisfaction.

Swift has also recorded that earlier on 7 October, he called to take his midday meal with Benjamin Tooke II, his bookseller and publisher: "so I went to Tooke, to give him a ballad and dine with him; but he was not at home." The likelihood is that Swift, not finding his bookseller in, then left the manuscript of his ballad at Tooke's home or shop; and that, as Sir Harold Williams surmised, the work "may have been the lost 'ballad full of puns on the Westminster election'."¹ With Sunday, not a workday, intervening, and with the Westminster election for Parliament concluding upon Monday, 9 October 1710, Saturday, 7 October, was the last possible date upon which Swift could have delivered the manuscript of his ballad to Tooke and still expect to see it in print and on the streets in time for it to have the maximum political effect on Monday, 9 October, the last day of polling. Evidently, then, the ballad was one of three pieces by Swift in print on 12 October, and it was still circulating ("it runs") and was of continuing personal interest as late as 20 October. But, until recently, Swift's ballad "full of puns" of October 1710, had disappeared, although diligent search was made for it, and these three references to it in the *Journal to Stella* have been, hitherto, our chief and practically our only verifiable source of information about that "lost" work of Swift.

In the "Advertisement" (p. vii) prefacing his quarto *Supplement* of 1779 to the *Works* (vol. xiv) of Swift, that indefatigable editor, John Nichols, concluded regretfully that "there are *still* some pieces by the Dean, which have eluded [my] most diligent researches". On the following page Nichols listed fourteen such "lost" works, fourth among which was "A

¹ *Journal*, i. 46 and n. 46. See also *Poems*, III. 1087.

Ballad (full of Puns) on the *Westminster* Election, 1710". But, Nichols added, "See p. 563". Pages 563-7 of his *Supplement* reprinted twenty-five quatrain stanzas of "The Glorious Warriour: Or, a Ballad in praise of General *Stanhope*. Dedicated to all who have Votes for Parliamentmen, in the City of *Westminster*. To the tune of, *Fair Rosamond*." Yet, in a note to page 563, Nichols very honestly admitted that "that which is here printed is not likely to be what Swift alludes to [in his *Journal* for 20 October 1710]; but it probably occasioned what he wrote".¹ Since the ballad is a panegyric upon Stanhope, one of the two Whig candidates at the Westminster election of 1710, it is only remotely possible that Swift wrote the poem printed by Nichols; it also seems to me doubtful that this ballad occasioned Swift's poem, except in the most general way. But what is of importance is that this ballad is the first (and most unlikely) of three that have been advanced between 1779 and 1957 as Swift's "lost" poem. And that Nichols' publication seems to have next led in turn Sir Charles Firth (1927), F. Elrington Ball (1929), and Sir Basil Williams (1932)² to put forth instead as Swift's "lost" poem "An Excellent New Ballad, being the Second Part of the Glorious Warrior. Writ by an Eminent Soldier at Home", a satiric Tory reply in ballad form of October 1710. The late Sir Harold Williams, however, in successive editions of Swift's *Poems* (iii. 1087) of 1937 and 1958, and elsewhere, has firmly rejected this second attribution, and upon excellent grounds. Thus, in his 1948 edition of the *Journal to Stella* Sir Harold once more concluded that "the ballad has not been traced" and was still "lost".³

There the matter stood for nine years, until 1957, when Professor Charles Main, in an essay upon "Defoe, Swift, and

¹ The final stanza (XXV) is typical of the rest of *The Glorious Warriour*:
Let neighboring cities know likewise
That you have wit and brains;
And won't prefer to brave Stanhope
A man that selleth grains.

² Sir Charles Firth, "The Canon of Swift", *Review of English Studies*, iii (1927), 73-74; F. Elrington Ball, *Swift's Verse* (London, 1929), p. 110; Sir Basil Williams, *Stanhope: A Study in Eighteenth-Century War and Diplomacy* (Oxford, 1932), pp. 125-7.

³ *Journal*, i. 65, n. 5.

Captain Tom", advanced another ballad of 1710, "A Dialogue Between *Captain Tom and Sir H—y D—n C—t*", as "the work of Swift", in part basing his case upon "the style . . . with its clever rhymes and burlesque tone", which he found "reminiscent of Swift, although hardly of Swift at his best".¹ Since Professor Main discussed his attribution against a background of five other pamphlets which employed the *persona* of "Captain Tom", two of them surely by Daniel Defoe, he had, of necessity, to be brief about the ballad he attributed to Swift and his reasons for doing so. Possibly it was for this reason that Joseph Horrell, in his "Muses Library" edition of the *Collected Poems of Jonathan Swift* of 1958, Sir Harold Williams, in the second edition of 1958 of the *Poems of Swift* for Clarendon Press, as well as Herbert Davis, in his *Swift: Poetical Works* for the "Oxford Standard Authors" series of 1967, do not mention Professor Main's attribution nor do they include the ballad among Swift's poems.

Recently, however, I have come upon what may be a unique reprinting and a variant copy of "A Dialogue" among some English and Irish broadsides acquired by the Henry E. Huntington Library, San Marino, California, from the F. Barry Brown collection of Dublin. This reprinting, apparently unknown to Professor Main in 1957, seems to me to be a reprint—possibly a Dublin reprint—of the London original and further evidence that the ballad may be by Swift. In his *Journal to Stella* Swift had promised "to bring over" to Dublin a copy of his ballad when he came, but he may instead have sent over a copy as soon as it became clear to him that because of Harley's solicitation he was destined to remain in London for longer than he had at first planned. A close examination of the reprinted ballad seems to me abundantly to justify Professor Main's claim that "A Dialogue" was Swift's "lost" ballad upon the Westminster election of 1710. If that is so, the poem should therefore be added to the canon. But it is also true that a stronger case still has to be made in detail for its inclusion among Swift's works than Professor Main was able to do, in the limited space avail-

¹ *Harvard Library Bulletin*, xi (Winter, 1957), 71-79. See especially pp. 76-77.

able and within the broader context of his essay. I believe that such a case can be made, arguing from external as well as internal evidence; that the poem and any variations need to be printed in full, so that the interested reader can, finally, make up his own mind; and that, in the context of the particular temporal circumstances of its publication, as well as in the significance of its publication as a consequence of Swift's political "conversion" to the moderate Tory position of Robert Harley, it can be shown that the poem is, in fact, the "lost" ballad which Swift mentioned upon three occasions in his *Journal to Stella* for October 1710. I believe that the publication of "A Dialogue" not only marks the precise moment at which Swift's political "conversion" to the Tory party took place; I believe that its publication was also arranged by Swift so as to be something of a literary hoax, not unlike the publication of the Bickerstaff Papers in 1708, or the hoax perpetrated upon Ebenezer Elliston in 1722. And like those two hoaxes which preceded and followed the ballad upon the Westminster election of 1710, I believe that in his punning poem and the circumstances connected with its publication Swift was once more striking out in a new direction, this time one that indicated a new political commitment on his part.

II

Jonathan Swift arrived in London from Dublin on 7 September 1710. Thanks to the day by day (almost hour by hour) method of writing his earlier *Journal to Stella* we know in considerable detail how quickly Swift plunged once more into the then rapidly changing social, cultural, and—especially—the political life of the capital. As a result, the month between 17 September and 17 October 1710 was an exceptionally busy one for Swift, both as an author and as a political creature. As we have seen, by 12 October Swift was able to boast to Stella that he had composed and published three pieces. The first was his prose *Tatler*, no. 230, written between 18-23 September 1710 and published on the 28th as an essay on abuses in language. His second piece was *Sid Hamet's Rod*, a personal attack in verse, with some political overtones, upon the former Whig

Lord Treasurer, Sidney, Earl of Godolphin, whom the Queen had only recently dismissed from office, on 8 August 1710. Immediately after his arrival at London, and probably a month after Godolphin's dismissal, on 8 September, Swift called upon Godolphin about the business of the First Fruits. Swift was shocked by the "very unexpected" reception he received; Godolphin had been "altogether short, dry, and morose" with him, he wrote to Archbishop King of Dublin the next day, 9 September.¹ On that same date Swift also wrote in his *Journal to Stella* that he was "almost vowing revenge" for such treatment. His revenge—" 'twas only a little revenge " he wrote on 14 October—took the form of his verse lampoon, composed between 26 September and 4 October, about midway in that tumultuous month, but, for some reason, it was not in print until the 12th of October, nor praised by the Tories until Saturday, 14 October 1710.² Swift's third piece, his ballad on the Westminster election, was therefore the first to be printed of his overt political compositions on behalf of the triumphant moderate Tory faction, led by Harley, and against the despondent Whigs, his former friends. F. Elrington Ball has surmised that Swift's ballad was "begun on 5 October" the day after *Sid Hamet's Rod* was finished, "and [was] given to the printer on the 7th".³ As we have seen, it was probably printed and distributed on Monday, 9 October 1710, several days before *Sid Hamet's Rod* appeared. Swift then rounded out the month as he began it, with another non-political composition for the *Tatler*, this time one in verse, his poem on "The City Shower", composed

¹ *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift*, 5 vols. (Oxford, 1963, 1965), i. 173. Hereafter referred to as *Corresp.*

² *Journal*, i. 6, 59. See also p. 30, n. 19 and p. 41. On 14 October Swift said of *Sid Hamet's Rod*, "I'll remember to bring it over." It probably appeared in print about the 12th and was certainly in everyone's hands and being read appreciatively by the Tory chiefs on 14 and 15 October. Swift passed his manuscript to the printer on 4 October, and he appears to have included it among those three things of his own in print (or about to be?) mentioned in the entry quoted above for 12 October. I cannot explain why the printer delayed for a week or more before printing it. Its scurrilous, possibly libellous, nature may have held it back, or it may have given place to the more urgently required and more immediately applicable "Dialogue", discussed below.

³ *Swift's Verse*, pp. 108, 110.

between 10-13 October and published in *Tatler*, no. 238 for Tuesday, 17 October 1710.

It is worth remarking that only one of these four compositions was in prose, the medium which very shortly came to dominate Swift's political life, when he soon after assumed responsibility for the *Examiner* with no. 13, published on 2 November 1710. During this crucial month, and for personal, partisan, or public statements, Swift seemed to prefer poetry three to one. Although it is now difficult to determine precisely how much of *Sid Hamet's Rod* was motivated by political partisanship, and how much of it arose from personal pique, it is clear that the lampoon, as well as the ballad upon the Westminster election, were politically slanted in a way that *Tatler*, no. 230 and "The City Shower" of *Tatler*, no. 238 were not. Further, during this period in which Jonathan Swift's political "conversion" was taking place, one might surmise that his "lost" ballad upon the Westminster election must have contained the most clear-cut Tory sentiments of anything Swift was to write between his arrival at London and his first *Examiner*. In such a case, the ballad—if it could be found—might very well mark a decisive turning point in Swift's political sentiments and the first "public" acknowledgement of his "conversion" to Harley and the moderate Tory party.

For during this month between 17 September and 17 October 1710 Swift divided his time almost equally between political and non-political compositions in verse and prose. In this respect he was probably following the alternately detached and committed political attitudes he also reflected regularly in his correspondence at this time, at least until he had held his first two meetings with Harley. For example, on 9 September he wrote to Stella that "the Whigs were ravished to see me", but on 10 September he wrote of having that day "talked treason heartily against the Whigs" and of "framing schemes of revenge" against them.¹ On 20 September he spoke of remaining "an indifferent spectator" to party struggles during the coming winter, but on 30 September, in preparation for his once postponed but eventual first brief meeting with Harley

¹ *Journal*, i. 5, 13.

on Wednesday, 4 October, Swift allowed himself to be represented "as a discontented person, that was used ill for not being Whig enough", and as "one extremely ill used by the last Ministry".¹ Both attitudes of mind are brought together for practically the last time in the same paragraph of his *Journal* for 1 October 1710: "I have almost finished my lampoon [*Sid Hamet's Rod*], and will print it for revenge on a certain great person." Yet, in the next sentence but one, Swift went on: "I laugh to see myself so disengaged in these revolutions."² On 7 October, the day upon which he left the manuscript of his political ballad with Tooke in the forenoon, and then visited for four hours with Harley in the afternoon and evening, he self-consciously recorded that "'tis fatal [fated] to me to be a scoundrel and a prince the same day".³ Thereafter nothing more is heard of his being "disengaged", or of his remaining "an indifferent spectator". On 13 October he wrote decisively, of the Whigs, "I have done with them, and they have, I hope, done with this kingdom for our time".⁴ If, at such a distance in time, one may point to the exact date upon which Swift's political "conversion" was completed, then Saturday, 7 October 1710 must be that date, what Swift called "this important day" in his life.⁵

Moreover, if one were to point to the precise moment on that day when Jonathan Swift finally left the disgraced Whigs and Godolphin and came over to the side of Harley and the moderate Tories one would probably have to settle upon Swift's four-hour afternoon and evening conference with Harley at the latter's house on Saturday, 7 October 1710.⁶ It seems to me

¹ *Journal*, i. 24, 36; *Corresp.*, i. 183.

² *Journal*, i. 37.

³ *Ibid.* i. 46.

⁴ *Ibid.* i. 55.

⁵ *Ibid.*, i. 47. On 7 October 1710 Swift self-consciously concluded his unusually long and detailed account of the various excitements of that day by writing: "And so I think this important day has made a great hole in this side of the paper."

⁶ *Journal*, i. 45-46. Swift's appointment was for 4 p.m., but when he arrived he was turned away at the door and asked to come back "an hour hence", which he did, grumbling and suspicious, about 5 p.m. But Swift was then very well received and entertained. For the first two hours he sat and sipped excellent wine with the company, which included William Penn, the Quaker, and Harley's son and son-in-law. The last two hours, Swift wrote, "he and I [were] alone".

to be significant that his second meeting was held only three days after Swift had handed the manuscript of *Sid Hamet's Rod* to the printer, two days after he began composition of his ballad upon the Westminster election, and upon the very day that he turned over the manuscript of that poem to Ben Tooke to be printed. It also seems to me to be significant that on this very same day, indeed, it appears, at the very same hour—4 p.m.—that Swift was scheduled to have his second and most important (for both men) interview with Robert Harley, Richard Steele was also scheduled to hold his last conference with the new Tory chief minister, exactly a week after which Steele was dismissed from his position as *Gazeteer* for partisan reasons.¹ It is possible that in this meeting Steele may have wished to bargain with Harley about giving up the *Tatler* (which he soon did) in exchange for being allowed to keep his sinecure as Commissioner of the Stamp Office.² It is certain, however, that at this meeting with Swift Harley opened with him the question of his taking over the *Examiner*. Off with the old, on with the new! Evidently, at 4 p.m. on 7 October Steele was turned away by Harley's awesome major domo, but Swift, with some awkwardness that momentarily aroused his suspicions, was asked to return in an hour's time, which he did. When next Swift called upon Harley on Tuesday, 10 October, the bitterly fought Westminster election had ended in a decisive, if somewhat anomalous, Tory victory,³ and Swift was seen to have contributed his part to the

He came away just after 9 p.m., and Harley saw to it that Swift was then "set . . . down at St. James's Coffee-house, in a hackney coach".

¹ *The Correspondence of Richard Steele*, ed. Rae Blanchard (Oxford, 1941), p. 43:

[Steele to Robert Harley]

October 9, 1710

I presume to write to you lest your servant should omit letting you know I was, according to your commands, a little after four at your house on Saturday [7 October].

See also *Journal*, i. 57 (14 October) and Narcissus Luttrell, *Brief Relation of Historical Affairs of State*, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1857), hereafter referred to as *Luttrell, Brief Relation*, vi. 643.

² *Journal*, i. 67. The *Tatler* had recently carried attacks upon Harley and his policies.

³ "Anomalous" because Thomas Crosse and Thomas Medlicott, the Tory victors, were middle-class City merchants and not country squires, and also

victory by the timely publication of his ballad "full of puns". By the time that *Sid Hamet's Rod* came out next, about 12 October, and on 14 October, when it was in everyone's hand, and was, the next day, being praised by such people as Prior and even by Harley himself,¹ the way, which had been prepared by Harley at the meeting with Swift on 7 October, was at last clear to offer Swift the post of *Examiner*, with strong expectations that he might now accept it. To this end, then, the composition and publication of Swift's ballad upon the Westminster election must have been decisive finally in determining his own political views of the moment, as well as those of Harley and St. John about him, as a disaffected former Whig.

III

Almost from the moment of his arrival at London Jonathan Swift, and even his feckless Irish servant, Patrick, who was in touch with the street mobs, as Swift was not, remarked upon the tumults and the revolutionary air of violence that were everywhere apparent, after the fall of the Whigs and Godolphin in August 1710, and before the Tory victories at the polls in October 1710. According to such Whiggish journals as the *Observer* and Daniel Defoe's *Review*, the violence began with the Reverend Henry Sacheverell's inflammatory Guy Fawkes' day sermon at St. Paul's on 5 November 1709, the anniversary also of William of Orange's landing at Torbay in 1688, a sermon which, accord-

because they had won overwhelmingly in Westminster, normally a Whig stronghold. See Geoffrey Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne* (London, 1967), p. 171. It should also be noted that Daniel Defoe was scheduled "to Attend [Harley] in the Evening According to your Order" presumably at his house, on the night of 10 October 1710 (*The Letters of Daniel Defoe*, ed. George H. Healey (Oxford, 1955), p. 290.) Thus, within a three or four day period at the time of a crucial national election Harley seems to have had at his call the services of three of the most brilliant or persuasive masters of the new art of journalism and political propaganda—Defoe, Steele, and Swift.

¹ *Journal*, i. 60. In his *Memoirs Relating to the Change* (*Prose Writings of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Herbert Davis, 14 vols. (Oxford, 1939-68), viii. 123), (hereafter referred to as *Prose Writings*), Swift later recorded that about this time, "Mr. Harley told me, he and his friends knew very well what useful things I had written against the principles of the late discarded faction . . .". Surely "A Dialogue" must be included among those "useful things" if it be by Swift.

ing to the Whigs, had set the country ablaze.¹ Sacheverell's subsequent impeachment for sedition before the House of Lords during February-March 1710, a trial held by public demand at Westminster Hall and conducted by eighteen Whig M.P.s as "Managers" or prosecutors, had ended with a moral victory for Sacheverell and the higher-flying Tories, but it had done little to calm the passions of the nation. In the *History of His Own Time* Bishop Burnet recalled that at the conclusion of the trial, when the common hangman was ordered publicly to burn Sacheverell's offending sermon, the Tory mob, in revenge, had pulled down five Dissenting meeting-houses, "burning all the pews in them", and they even threatened Burnet's house, since he too had been one of the "Managers".² What Burnet, a Whig, failed to mention, was the fact that the Whig mob in the city was often as furious as the Tory mob. It was "a time when dearth and scarcity" left "the poor . . . much pinched",³ because of heavy taxes and loss of trade connected with a long and increasingly unpopular foreign war, a time when the franchise was not very widespread. It was a time when the political situation sometimes took on the appearance of class warfare, a time when political pamphleteering and popular journalism were just coming into their own as modern political propaganda.

In his *Journal* for 9 September 1710 Swift noted that "every thing is turning upside down . . .; and we shall have such a winter as hath not been seen in England", and he called it "this shaking season for places",⁴ On 11 September he recorded that "Patrick observes that the rabble here are much more inquisitive in politicks, than in Ireland", and he added, "I never saw so great a ferment among all sorts of people".⁵ On 20 September Swift wrote that the glorious news of "Madrid taken" by Lieutenant-General James Stanhope, Commander-in-chief of British forces in Spain, had just reached town, but he also wrote prophetically that "we shall have a strange Winter

¹ *The Observer*, ix, no. 72 for 20-23 September 1710. See also ix, no. 79 14-18 October 1710.

² *Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time*, ed. Sir Thomas Burnet, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1833), v. 444-5.

³ *Ibid.* v. 439.

⁴ *Journal*, i. 7, 12. In this last utterance Swift may have had Steele and his sinecure of *Gazeteer* prophetically in mind.

⁵ *Ibid.* i. 14.

here between the struggles of a cunning provoked discarded party, and the triumphs of one in power".¹ The next day Swift moved his lodgings from Pall Mall to Bury Street, St. James's, deeper into Westminster, and that night Parliament was dissolved by Royal proclamation. On 26 September writs were issued for summoning a new Parliament to meet on 25 November 1710, and polling began soon after almost everywhere, including the City and Liberties of Westminster, where Swift resided. On the 26th Swift wrote to Dean Sterne and noted that "*Patrick* assures me his acquaintance are all very well satisfied with these changes, which I take for no ill symptom".²

On the morning of 5 October 1710, soon after his removal to Bury Street, and the day after his first brief meeting with Harley, Jonathan Swift first encountered the Whig mob in action, and the experience appears to have shaken him and to have stuck in his memory :

This morning Delaval came to see me, and we went together to Kneller's, who was not in town. In the way we met the [Whig] electors for parliament-men : and the rabble came about our coach, crying A Colt, a Stanhope, &c. we were afraid of a dead cat, or our glasses broken, and so were always of their side.³

On the previous evening Swift had remarked in his *Journal* that "to-night I will read a pamphlet, to amuse myself".⁴ The pamphlet may have been the *Whig Examiner*, no. III of 28 Sept-

¹ *Journal*, i. 24-25.

² *Corresp.*, i. 177.

³ *Journal*, i. 42. See also Mary Ransome, "The Press in the General Election of 1710", *Cambridge Historical Journal*, iii (1939), 220 [quoted from the *Daily Courant* for 4 October 1710] :

All Gentlemen and others who will do General Stanhope the honour to appear for him in Tuthill-Fields, as one of the Candidates for the City [of Westminster] at the next Election are desir'd to meet on Horseback on the East-side of St. James's Square on Thursday 5th of this instant October, at 8 of the Clock in the Morning.

It was this Whig gathering and its attendant mob which Swift encountered on the morning of 5 October.

⁴ *Journal*. i. 42. On this same day (*Journal*, i. 41) Swift recorded that he had passed over to the printer the manuscript of *Sid Hamet's Rod* "to be printed". He then continued, "I have more mischief in my heart ; and I think it shall go round with them [with Delaval, Nicholas Rowe, 'and other friends'] all, as this hits, and I can find hints." The "pamphlet" Swift planned to read that same night "to amuse myself" may also have furnished a necessary "hint" for the composition of the Westminster ballad, begun the next day, 5 October.

ember, probably written by Arthur Mainwaring, which contained "The Speech of Alcibiades" [General Stanhope] against "Taureas, or, as the Doctor [Bentley] rather chuses to call him, Toryas . . . an Athenian Brewer [Thomas Crosse]".¹ Mainwaring's "Allegory", or historical parallel from classical times, a device Swift had employed himself in *The Contests and Dissentions* of 1701, and was to use once more with even greater effect in the *Tory Examiners*, adopted the supercilious tone of an aristocratic Greek [English] general, the victor over the Lacedaemonians [Spaniards], speaking contemptuously of his plebian opponent, an Athenian [London] brewer. The "Speech" afterward drew fire from Swift in his *Examiner*, no. 17 for 30 November 1710,² and he seems also to have had it fresh in mind when he came to write about the bitterness of laurels *vs.* hops in his ballad upon the Westminster election.³ This Whig prose pamphlet, and Swift's personal encounter with the Whig mob on the morning of 5 October, may therefore have been the immediate occasions for Swift's poem, the composition of which he appears to have begun that very afternoon or evening.

In summing up the initial Tory victories which led to "The Great Ministry, 1710-14", Sir Keith Feiling has noted that the Whigs lost 270 seats in the Parliamentary elections of 1710, and G. M. Trevelyan has remarked that it was the greatest revolution in English politics since 1688.⁴ Normally Westminster was a Whig stronghold, although its recent elections—like those of 1708—were notorious for causing disturbances. The ousted Whig Junto was, quite rightly, much concerned about the City elections in 1710, since London could set the pattern for voting in other parts of the country. Feiling has noticed that "Newcastle's agents assisted Stanhope at Westminster", and yet "Stanhope was beaten . . . , [and] four Tories carried all the City

¹ The *Whig Examiner*, no. III for Thursday, 28 September 1710, pp. 28-32. John Oldmixon, *The Life and Posthumous Works of Arthur Mainwaring, Esq.* (London, 1715), p. 163, attributes the *Whig Examiner*, no. III to Mainwaring and furnishes a key to its historical parallels or "Allegory" (p. 164).

² *Prose Writings*, iii. 26-27.

³ See lines 31-32 of the Westminster ballad, printed below.

⁴ Keith Feiling, *A History of the Tory Party* (Oxford, 1924), p. 422; George M. Trevelyan, *England Under Queen Anne*, 3 vols. (London, 1930-4), iii. 73.

seats".¹ The Westminster election preceded the election in the City of London by a day, and the return of the London voting, although it was adjourned for several days, and finally protested, seems finally to have been influenced by the earlier outcome at Westminster, since two more Tories were eventually declared to be the winners.² The Westminster election of 1710, into the midst of which Jonathan Swift was almost literally thrust on the morning of 5 October, was therefore no mere local affair; as a crucial indicator of what was to come it commanded the attention of the entire nation.

The two Whig candidates who were therefore engaged by the Junto to enter the Westminster contest about mid-September 1710 were a carefully balanced pair. The strongest locally, as well as nationally, was Lieutenant General James Stanhope, afterward created Earl Stanhope, the popular victor of Pamplona in the dragging war with Spain, and the recent captor of Madrid, who ran *in absentia*. His proxy or stand-in was his cousin, General Davenport. His running-mate was a shrewd local man and staunch Whig wheelhorse, the aged, ugly, but wealthy Sir Henry Dutton Colt (1646?-1731), who had been born in Westminster, was created a baronet on 2 March 1693/4, and afterward fell heir to his eldest brother's estate at Letton, Herefordshire.³ Colt had previously served as M.P. for Newport, Isle of Wight, in 1695-8, and for Westminster in 1701-2 and 1705-8.

By way of contrast, their two Tory opponents were both middle-class City merchants. One was Thomas Medlicott or Medlycot, an experienced M.P. who was said by his contemptuous opponents to have done no more than to have "regulated Quart pots and Measures". Yet Medlicott had beaten out Colt for Parliament by a shrewd manoeuvre in the disputed Westminster election of November-December, 1708, and he soon after re-election became a strong candidate for election chairman of the victorious Tory Party about 29 November 1710, as Swift reported to Archbishop King in a letter of that

¹ Feiling, *History of the Tory Party*, pp. 422-3.

² Luttrell, *Brief Relation*, vi. 639-41.

³ Cockayne, *Complete Baronetage*, iv. 162.

date.¹ In 1724-6, Medlicott, then Commissioner of Customs in Ireland, was a good friend to Swift in Dublin and did him many professional favours. Swift then reported that Medlicott went regularly to church and dined with the Dean on Sundays.² The other Tory candidate was Thomas Crosse or Cross (1663-1738) of Westminster, a prosperous brewer who was destined to serve as a Tory M.P. for Westminster in six Parliaments, those of 1700-5, and uninterruptedly, those of 1710-22. On 11 or 13 June 1713, he was created a baronet.³ It was on behalf of the moderate Tories, and especially to support the relatively weak Crosse, the brewer, who had been so contemptuously treated in the *Whig Examiner*, no. III of 28 September, that I believe that Swift composed the following ballad "full of puns", which probably appeared upon the streets of Westminster early on the morning of 9 October 1710.

IV

In order to put before the reader the actual ballad which appeared upon the streets of Westminster on the morning of 9 October 1710, it is best to present first the original printing as it is found, for example, preserved now in Lord Rothschild's collection at Trinity College, Cambridge, from which I take my copy text,⁴ supplemented by notes of variant readings as found

¹ Basil Williams, *Stanhope*, p. 126; Geoffrey Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne*, p. 305. Cf. p. 42; *Corresp.*, i, 196-7.

² *Corresp.* iii. 54, 56.

³ Cockayne, *Complete Baronetage*, iv. 16. "The Speech of Alcibiades" [Stanhope] in the *Whig Examiner*, no. III contained the following slurs upon Crosse, the brewer:

It is then possible, O ye *Athenians*, that I who hitherto have had none but Generals to oppose me, must now have an *Artisan* for my Antagonist? That I who have overthrown the Princes of *Lacedaemon* [Spain], must now see myself in danger of being defeated by a Brewer? (p. 28.)

Let it not avail my Competitor, that he has been tapping his Liquors while I have been spilling my Blood; that he has been gathering Hops for you, while I have been reaping Lawrels. Have I not born the Dust and Heat of the Day, while he has been sweating at the Furnace? . . . Has he any other Wound about him, except the accidental Scalding of his Wort, or Bruises from the Tub or Barrel? (pp. 29-30.)

⁴ Rothschild, no. 276 (R); BM C. 121.g.9 (no. 159) (B.M.); Harvard Negative (H) of B.M.

in the British Museum copy. In general, variations in capitalization, spelling, italicization, and punctuation show that the Rothschild copy (R) and the Huntington reprint (HEH) agree three times more often with each other than does R with the British Museum copy (B.M.). In the half dozen places (11, 12, 29, 30, 36, 47, 62) where HEH differs from R, however, it differs also from B.M. It may be, therefore, that the Huntington reprint was set from a copy of the Rothschild version. On the other hand, the type of R very closely resembles that employed in printing B.M., and thus both may have been produced by the same press, although it is now difficult if not impossible to say which may have come first. Some of the more than a dozen places where B.M. differs from R readings, as listed below, suggest to me that B.M. was more carelessly set, as with the misspelling "Mischef" for "Mischief" (line 23). Therefore R may be closer to Swift's original manuscript than any other printed copy now surviving. I wish to thank Mr. David Woolley of London for help in collating B.M., Miss Nora Crow of Cambridge, Massachusetts for providing me with a copy of the Harvard photostat of B.M., and Lord Victor Rothschild for permission to use R.

Rothschild No. 276 (*The Rothschild Library*, 2 vols. [Cambridge Univ. Press, 1954], I. 50), now at Trinity College, Cambridge.

A DIALOGUE BETWEEN

Captain Tom and Sir H—y D—n C—t.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1 Come, Fair Muse, of <i>Grub-street</i>, The Dialogue write, Betwixt Captain <i>Tom</i>, And a goodly old Knight.</p> <p>5 Quoth ancient Sir <i>Harry</i>, My dear Captain <i>Thomas</i>, Sure you and your Subjects Will not depart from us. Then hold Hat and Heart,</p> <p>10 And Right Hand ev'ry Man up, And Bawl out old C—t, And brave General <i>St—nh—p</i>. Let the General's Merits And mine be maintain'd ;</p> | <p>Turn off the old <i>Brewer</i>, 15 And be not <i>Cross-Grain'd</i>. In a Protestant Country, Why are you for <i>Crosses</i>? And <i>Brewers</i> will poison you All with <i>Molosses</i>. 20 Besides, Are not all The damn'd <i>Jacobites Brewers</i>, Still brewing of <i>Mischief</i>, And so may be yours? And <i>Papists</i> are <i>Brewers</i>, 25 With <i>Faggots</i> to burn us ; But if you love <i>Brewing</i>, You may have a <i>FURNESE</i>.</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>30 Then <i>St—nh—p</i> shall send you Each Laurel he crops, And <i>Laurels</i> are sometimes As bitter as Hops.</p> <p>When comely Sir <i>Harry</i> Had thus shot his Bolt,</p> <p>35 Then reply'd Captain <i>Tom</i>, God-a-mercy, old <i>C—t</i> : You had better have been At your <i>Spade</i> and your <i>Club</i>, Than take up our Time</p> <p>40 With a <i>Tale of a Tub</i>. You shall be discarded, I say't to your Face ; We'll play <i>all the Game</i>, And not bate you an <i>Ace</i>.</p> <p>45 Then let me advise you No longer to stay ; But <i>pack</i> up and <i>shuffle</i>, And <i>cut</i> it away. And tho' you have Wit,</p> <p>50 Youth, Beauty, and Parts, While we Keep up our <i>Clubs</i>, You shall ne'er win our <i>Hearts</i>. Brave <i>St—nh—p</i> for Fighting Will have his Reward,</p> | <p>And the Queen, when she pleases, 55 Can make him a <i>Lord</i>. But we are true Friends Of the <i>Church</i> and <i>Sacheverel</i> ; And vote for a <i>Manager</i>, Surely we never will ! 60 Besides, we have found Too much Heat in some Rulers, And will give them a <i>Brewer</i>, Because they want <i>Coolers</i>. If Christians love <i>Crosses</i>, 65 Why should they be blam'd? You shall see us <i>bear</i> ours, And not be asham'd. But we know what you aim at ; You all would engross, 70 And not leave the Church Or the Nation a <i>Cross</i>.</p> <p>When the Captain had finish'd, Away went old <i>Numps</i> ; He had got a <i>bad Game</i>, 75 And could not turn up <i>Trumps</i>. His Eggs they are addle, And Dough was his Cake ; So fairly he left them To <i>Brew</i> as they <i>Bake</i>. 80</p> |
|--|---|

Printed for the Consolation of those who can bear a Cross in the Year 1710.

Notes : Line numbers above and in what follows have been added for convenience of reference.

Title : [A] cropped at top. *Captain Tom and Sir H— —y D— —n C— —t.*

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| L.1 : B.M. : fair | |
| L.2 : B.M. : the | L.41 : B.M. : <i>discarded</i> , |
| L.3 : B.M. : <i>Tom</i> | L.42 : B.M. : <i>Face</i> : |
| L.10 : B.M. : Right-Hand | L.43 : B.M. : <i>All</i> |
| L.11 : B.M. : bawl . . . <i>C— —t</i> | L.46 : B.M. : stay, |
| L.14 : B.M. : maintain'd : | L.69 : B.M. : at : |
| L.23 : B.M. : Mischef, | L.74 : B.M. : <i>Numps</i> : |
| L.31 : B.M. : sometimes, | L.75 : B.M. : <i>Bad</i> |

Colophon : B.M. : *Printed for the Consolation of those who can bear a Cross, in/the Year 1710.*

The seemingly unique Huntington copy of the reprint, HEH 355350, is a folio broadside ballad 12×7½ inches. Its top is a trifle cropped ; its right edge and bottom are deckled. It bears eight vertical chainlines but no other watermark. The

leaf contains eighty lines of verse in double column ; its verso is blank. HEH is numbered in ink at the top right " 48 ", in series with other London and Dublin broadsides, some of them surely by Swift,¹ that are bound into the same volume, recently purchased from the F. Barry Brown collection of Dublin. It is dated " 1710 " at the end, but there are no other indications of its printer or place of publication. " *Re-Printed* ", the first word of the colophon, and several other variant readings and differences between this broadside and copies of the original London edition, suggest that HEH is not just a re-issue, and that it may in fact be a Dublin reprint.²

¹ For example, the Dublin reprint of *Sid Hamet's Rod* (HEH 355346a), numbered " 43 " and bound into the Barry Brown volume just ahead of " A Dialogue ". On the recto is printed " *The Devil a Barrel better Herring* " (HEH 355346), another dialogue poem between the outgoing Lord Mayor of London, Sir Samuel Gerrard, and the incoming, Sir Gilbert Heathcote, about the London mob. *Sid Hamet's Rod* is said to be " *London Printed, and Re-Printed in Dublin, 1710* ", but no printer is given, and the type does not resemble that of " A Dialogue ".

² There is no way to prove that the Huntington reprint is or is not of Dublin origin, since only chainlines are visible and a comparison of types, for example, with the Dublin reprint of *Sid Hamet's Rod*, bound into the same volume, is inconclusive. Yet, as Professor Main has noted, " Swift expected that Stella would see it " (*HLB*, xi. 76), and in his *Journal* (i. 65), Swift had promised to " bring over " a copy. When he discovered that he was not to return to Dublin as quickly as he had expected, he might, of course, have sent her a copy of the London original by a safe hand. But that copy, or one like it sent from London, of a work known to be from the hand of Swift, would have been justification enough for the Dublin reprinting of " A Dialogue ", even some time after the event for which he had been writing was past. On the other side, once the polls closed on 9 October 1710 there would have been less reason for a London reprinting, and had there been need for additional copies on that date, they could easily have been struck off from type set but not yet broken up. There would have been no occasion to reset the type completely (in the process departing in several respects from the London original), as appears to have been done in the case of HEH 355350, nor for designating it as " *Re-Printed* ", as the colophon has it. The logic of the circumstances seems to me to argue that HEH 355350 is therefore a Dublin reprint published some time after 9 October 1710, as much for the fact that it was known locally to be from the hand of Swift as for any current political interest or influence the ballad might have with the people of Dublin. Since this essay was accepted for publication I have learned, through correspondence with Miss Mary Pollard of Trinity College Library and Miss Eithne Browner of the Pearse Street Branch of the Dublin Public Library, whose help I gratefully acknowledge here, that No. 58 in Volume III of the Newenham Pamphlets from the Sir John T. Gilbert Collection is identical with HEH 355350.

A DIALOGUE BETWEEN

Captain Tom, and Sir H—y D—n C—t.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1 Come, Fair Muse, of <i>Grub-street</i>, The Dialogue write, Betwixt Captain <i>Tom</i>, And a goodly old Knight.</p> <p>5 Quoth ancient Sir <i>Harry</i>, My dear Captain <i>Thomas</i>, Sure you and your Subjects Will not depart from us.</p> <p>10 Then hold Hat and Heart, And Right Hand ev'ry Man up, And Bawl out old C---t, And brave General <i>St---nh---p</i>. Let the General's Merits And mine be maintain'd ;</p> <p>15 Turn off the old <i>Brewer</i>, And be not <i>Cross-Grain'd</i>. In a Protestant Country, Why are you for <i>Crosses</i>? And <i>Brewers</i> will poison you</p> <p>20 All with Molosses. Besides, Are not all The damn'd Jacobites <i>Brewers</i>, Still brewing of Mischief, And so may be yours?</p> <p>25 And Papists are <i>Brewers</i>, With Faggots to burn us ; But if you love Brewing, you may have a <i>FURNESE</i>. Then <i>St---nh---p</i> shall send you</p> <p>30 Each Laurel he crops, And <i>Laurels</i> are sometimes As bitter as Hops.</p> <p>When comely Sir <i>Harry</i> Had thus shot his Bolt,</p> <p>35 Then reply'd Captain <i>Tom</i>, God-a-mercy, old C---t, You had better have been At your <i>Spade</i> and your <i>Club</i>, Than take up our Time</p> <p>40 With a <i>Tale of a Tub</i>.</p> | <p>You shall be discarded, I say't to your Face ; We'll play <i>all the Game</i>, And not bate you an <i>Ace</i>.</p> <p>45 Then let me advise you No longer to stay ; But <i>pack</i> up and <i>Shuffle</i>, And <i>cut</i> it away. And tho' you have Wit, Youth, Beauty, and Parts,</p> <p>50 While we Keep up our <i>Clubs</i>, You shall ne'er win our <i>Hearts</i>. Brave <i>St---nh---p</i> for Fighting Will have his Reward, And the Queen, when she pleases,</p> <p>55 Can make him a <i>Lord</i>. But we are true Friends Of the <i>Church</i> and <i>Sacheverel</i> ; And vote for a <i>Manager</i>, Surely we never will !</p> <p>60 Besides, we have found Too much heat in some Rulers, And will give them a <i>Brewer</i>, Because they want <i>Coolers</i>. If Christians love <i>Crosses</i>,</p> <p>65 Why should they be blam'd? You shall see us <i>bear</i> ours, And not be asham'd. But we know what you aim at ; You all would engross,</p> <p>70 And not leave the Church Or the Nation a <i>Cross</i>.</p> <p>When the Captain had finish'd, Away went old <i>Numps</i> ;</p> <p>75 He had got a <i>bad Game</i>, And could not turn up <i>Trumps</i>. His Eggs they are addle, And Dough was his Cake ; So fairly he left them</p> <p>80 To <i>Brew</i> as they <i>Bake</i>.</p> |
|--|---|

If this ballad is by him, a measure of Jonathan Swift's innate political shrewdness and his keen sense of the correct tactics to be employed may be found in the facts that, in his ballad, he did not bother to mention Medlicott, the incumbent Tory M.P., whose re-election by a wide margin was pretty well assured in advance; and that Swift, unlike the author of "The Second Part", whoever he was, treated the currently very popular military hero, General Stanhope, with all due respect and deference. Swift did not, however, fail to remind his readers adroitly that Stanhope had been one of the hated "Managers" at Sacheverell's trial (line 59), and he also prophesied cunningly—and correctly—that Stanhope's triumphant laurels in Spain might quickly turn "as bitter as Hops" (lines 31-32), as they did indeed, soon after, and not quite in the manner the speaker, Sir Henry Dutton Colt, meant, when Stanhope suffered a crushing defeat and was himself captured by the Duke of Vendôme on 9 December 1710 (N.S.) at Brihuega. For as Swift well knew, or as he shrewdly surmised, the real contest was between Sir Henry Dutton Colt and Thomas Crosse, the despised Westminster brewer, and the results bore him out. When polling had ended, and the votes were counted and announced on Tuesday, 10 October 1710, it was found that Medlicott had won handily. Crosse stood below his fellow Tory but above Stanhope, who received the most Whig votes. Colt came in a poor fourth.¹ According to Francis Dickson's *Dublin Intelligence*² and other sources, in true Westminster fashion the Tory

¹ Frederick W. Wyon, *The History of Great Britain During the Reign of Queen Anne*, 2 vols. (London, 1876), ii. 253-4. See also Luttrell, *Brief Relation*, vi. 639; *The British Apollo*, vol. iii, no. 85 for 9-11 October 1710.

² No. 679 for Tuesday, 17 October 1710:

London, October 10. Yesterday in the Morning the Poll for the Election at Westminster was shut up, and the Election was declared for Mr. Cross and Mr. Medlycote: The Mob was so insolent and rude, that they Beat and Wounded many of those that came to Poll for General Stanhope and Sir Henry Dutton Colt.

See also the *Observer*, ix, no. 77 for 7-11 October 1710:

They insult and mob such as came to vote for General *Stanhope*, who had done his Country so much Honour. . . .

In his *Review*, vii, no. 88 for Tuesday, 17 October 1710 Defoe mentioned "Mr. *Damarie*, and Mr. *Purchase*, the two Heads of the Rabble", evidently his identification of the respective "Captain *Toms*" of the Whig and Tory mobs of Westminster.

mob and its Captain Tom, or mob leader, had gone vigorously to work upon the last day of polling, just as Swift must have foreseen they would.

Like the panegyric "The Glorious Warriour", which John Nichols printed but did not really believe was by Swift, and like the scurrilous "Second Part", which Firth and Ball, without giving any reasons, and Sir Basil Williams, by a circular argument, believed to be Swift's "lost" poem, "A Dialogue Between Captain Tom and Sir H—y D—n C—t" is also in ballad form, and it is also about the Westminster election of 1710, as Swift had specified that it must be. And yet, far better than the adulatory Whig "The Glorious Warriour", and much more so than the rather humorless Tory "Second Part", "A Dialogue" fulfils precisely the third criterion which Swift had laid down about his "lost" poem: that it was to be "full of puns". In comparison with, say, "The Second Part" this fact alone should make us look very closely at "A Dialogue" as a better possibility. But, as may also be shown, in terms of such internal characteristics as its dialogue structure, which has, however, a proper Aristotelian beginning, middle, and end, its slangy diction, ironic tone, comic rhymes, in terms of the *persona* or mouthpiece of the poem, as well as in the peculiarly Swiftian nature of the many puns and proverbial expressions employed, "A Dialogue" much better fits the qualities required of Swift's "lost" ballad than does "The Second Part", the only other serious contender, as Sir Harold Williams long ago pointed out that it does not.¹

What is more, if "A Dialogue" is by Swift, and if it came out upon the streets on the morning of Monday, 9 October 1710, then the timing of its publication and distribution suggests that Jonathan Swift may once more have set up consciously in advance as a hoax his punning ballad in much the same way that he did his recent hoax upon John Partridge in 1708, and as he was later to do with his hoax upon Ebenezer Elliston in 1722, and with similar happy results, in so far as Stanhope and Colt were concerned. But in order to do so successfully, Swift, if he was the author, would have had to make his ballad, at first glance, look

¹ Basil Williams, *Stanhope*, p. 127, n. 2.

like something else, perhaps a *Whig* or a "Captain Tom" throwaway. And in order for verisimilitude to work and for his potential reader to become entrapped Swift would have had first to mimic with precision the speech and manner of one of his victims, Sir "Harry" Colt, the first of two speakers in the broadside. About the accuracy with which the author made Colt speak like himself we can only guess now. But even at this distance in time we can recognize that his speech (lines 5-32) is a masterpiece of subtly destructive self-characterization in miniature: it begins in a most ludicrously over-formal and comically deferential manner ("My dear Captain *Thomas*"); and yet it ends with thinly veiled and ominous party threats ("And *Brewers* will poison you"; "You may have a *FURNESE*").¹ Along the way the speech moves with astonishing ease from hearty, old-fashioned Whig back-slapping and exhortation (lines 9-12), to increasingly partisan and insistent rhetorical questions (lines 17-18, 21-24), and finally (lines 21-25) to the outrageous suggestions that all Tories were Jacobites and Papists, and that a Tory victory would re-ignite Smithfield fires for more Protestant martyrs (lines 25-26). Up to this point in the ballad an innocent reader or a Whig voter on the morning of Monday, 9 October 1710 would find little to complain of in Sir Harry's pitch: it said, after all, what many a Whig partisan must have felt *was* the case, and it said it, as well, exactly as Sir Henry Dutton Colt would or did express it in person.

¹ This last threat seems to be that at the next election the strong and notoriously avaricious Whig, Sir Henry Furnese, formerly a draper, would be thrust upon them. In the Parliamentary elections of 1710 a Furnese was elected from a country constituency (Luttrell, *Brief Relation*, vi. 639), and in the aldermanic elections of 1711 he was elected Alderman of Bishopgate. See A. B. Beaven, *The Aldermen of London*, 2 vols. (London, 1908, 1912), ii. 122, 195. Swift has Sir Harry play also upon the word *furnace*, as "*Furnese*" was evidently pronounced, and *Farnese*, the name of an ancient Italian family which supplied princes and military leaders, as well as the reigning Queen, to contemporary Spain, where Stanhope was then waging war. In the *Examiner*, no. 40 for 10 May 1711 (*Prose Writings*, iii. 151-2), Swift himself pointed up the pun intended upon the two surnames; of Sir Henry Furnese he wrote: "I know a *Citizen* who adds or alters a Letter in his Name with every *Plumb* he acquires: He now wants only the Change of a Vowel, to be allied to a Sovereign Prince in *Italy*. . . ."

The same deceptive verisimilitude was probably also at work on behalf of the second speaker in the ballad, the character of "Captain Tom", the leader of the mob. He was an earlier creation in prose of no less a writer than Daniel Defoe, who had employed his *persona* with great effect on behalf of the Whigs in a prose pamphlet from the Sacheverell affair of February-March 1710.¹ He was to be revived by Defoe with equally good effect in a prose pamphlet upon Guiscard's attempt upon Harley's life in May 1711.² In his *Review* for Tuesday, 17 October 1710 Defoe seems to have returned the favour by echoing some of "A Dialogue's" punning plays upon terms from a game of cards.³ Since Mainwaring or whoever was the author of the *Whig Examiner*, no. III had cleverly "stolen" Swift's method, in *The Contest and Dissentions* of 1701, of employing parallels from Greek or Roman history, Swift, as was often the case also in his other more famous hoaxes, was not above borrowing the style and manner, even the *persona*, of his enemies and victims, tit for tat, as here. The main differences in "A Dialogue" were, however, that this "Captain Tom", unlike Defoe's, spoke in verse rather than in prose (and it may be recalled that Swift preferred verse to prose at this period); and that, as leader of the mob, he soon revealed himself to be a Tory sympathizer, rather than a friend of the Whigs. But by the time that verisimilitude had done its work, as in the speech of Colt, and by the time that expectations had been frustrated, that the next speaker

¹ "A Letter From Captain Tom To The Mobb, Now Rais'd for Dr. Sacheverell . . . London, Printed for J. Baker at the Black Boy in Pater noster-Row. 1710." See John R. Moore, *A Checklist of the Writings of Daniel Defoe* (Indiana University Press, 1960), no. 165.

² "Captain Tom's Remembrance to his Old Friends the Mobb of London, Westminster, Southwark, and Wapping" (n.d., n.p. 1711). See Moore, *Checklist*, no. 201.

³ Vol. vii, no. 88:

And there are Red-hot *Tories*, Mad Cutthroat Bloody *Tories*, when ever these last get the Game in their Hands, they generally spoil it, they run at all, play off all their Trumps, and spoil their Game, no Gamester in his Wits, can play to their Hand—

The Circumstances of Things are now Chang'd, the Publick Affairs have taken a new turn; the *Tories* think their Knave is a Trump; the *Whigs* throw up the Cards, and cry they are lost—And 'tis plain both are mistaken—

was to be someone like Defoe's Whig mouthpiece, rather than a Tory partisan, the tables had been turned, and the innocent reader was so far gone into the ballad that he could not turn back. As an added measure of verisimilitude (and to further the deception) the ballad was very carefully headed "A Dialogue", which it was, superficially, but it was not at all like many similar partisan dialogues in prose with which the Whigs were then also flooding the market at the time of the Westminster election.¹

Even the structure of "A Dialogue" was cleverly shaped so as to lead one on, unsuspecting, into the ballad: after a brief mock-epic invocation to the comically anticlimactic "Fair Muse, of *Grub-street*" (line 1) the harangue of Colt, the first speaker, began and went on for what seemed like a modest enough length to suggest that a real exchange of views might follow. But after three brief lines of transition (lines 33-35) to the extensive speech of the second speaker (lines 36-72), a reader begins to understand that this is not so much a dialogue as it is a pair of successive monologues that make up together the Aristotelian middle of this poem: the first a self-revealing and self-characterizing plea for votes; the second a cutting rejection of the first speaker's plea and a punning rejection of himself, followed by an assertion of the right and justice of the Tory position. The ending (lines 74-80) is more leisurely and twice as long as the brief beginning and invocation, but it reinforces what "*Captain Tom*" has said, and, by echoing his particularized slangy diction and use of proverbial expressions, it "distances", concludes, and—by implication—prophecies a Tory victory and a Whig defeat. The ending makes clear finally, if ever there was any doubt, that its author sees eye to eye—one might almost say, tooth for tooth—with his mouthpiece, "*Captain Tom*".

The rhythm and tones of "A Dialogue" are as carefully controlled and as artistically manipulated for effect as are its structure, its "dialogue", and its use of *persona*, especially if

¹ See, for example, "A Dialogue betwixt Whig and Tory", advertised in the *Observer*, ix. no. 75 for 30 September-4 October 1710, and "*Dick and Tom: A Dialogue About Addresses*", advertised in the *Observer*, ix. no. 72 for 20-23 September 1710. The *Observer* itself employed a dialogue form for its political propaganda.

one compares this ballad with "The Second Part". There the ballad meter is much more conventionally employed, and its rhythm is pedestrian; there is very little variety of emphasis, and few subtle shifts of tone; and the scurrilous *persona* or speaker is, throughout, Stanhope's proxy, presumably his cousin, General Davenport. By contrast, in "A Dialogue", Colt, in his brief speech, adopts something of the tone of aristocratic scorn for a mere mechanic tradesman rival with which Stanhope was also made to speak in the *Whig Examiner*, no. III. Colt is also made to pun rather heavy-handedly and clumsily upon Crosse's name (lines 16, 18) and his trade as a brewer (lines 22, 25). Swift himself, it should be noted, also delighted in such puns upon surnames, not the least upon his own, and also upon terms and technical expressions from particular trades and occupations.¹ After his most far-fetched and allusive pun, what may be an attempt at a triple play upon "*FURNESE*" (line 28),² a reader might almost supply as a stage direction a guffaw upon Colt's part at his own cleverness. His speech then modulates once more into the quieter tones of cajolery with which he began, and then into prophecy, ironically enough to come true all too soon in historical time. Colt's last words, "As bitter as Hops" (line 32) have about them a proverbial ring,³ as well as being unconsciously prophetic, and they immediately anticipate the proverbial way of speaking that is more appropriate to "*Captain Tom*". And since Colt was "ancient" (line 5), "old" (line 36), and not possessed of either "Beauty" or "Parts" (line 50), to say nothing of "Youth" or "Wit" (lines 49-50), the sarcasm of "comely" in the first line (line 33) of the transition passage may at first be a delayed action effect, at least until a reader arrives at the more obviously sarcastic, or extendedly ironic lines 49-50 as spoken by "*Captain Tom*". In contrast to Colt, "*Captain Tom*", when he begins his speech,

¹ George Mayhew, *Rage or Raillery: The Swift Manuscripts at the Huntington Library* (San Marino, California, 1967), pp. 144-5.

² That is to say, upon *Furnese-furnace-Farnese*. See p. 418, n. 1, above.

³ Morris P. Tilley, *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England In the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (University of Michigan Press, 1950), hereafter referred to as Tilley, p. 319, H 595, "As Fast (Thick) As Hops".

appears to be a blunt fellow who is not afraid to call a spade a spade (line 38).

"*Captain Tom's*" puns, for the most part, play upon terms and expressions from card-playing, and, more particularly, as the word "*Trumps*" (line 76) suggests, upon terms from some such game as the currently fashionable one of Ombre.¹ The allusion to Colt's "*Spade and . . . Club*" (line 38), as with the similar pun upon "*Clubs*" of line 51, may refer to the literal objects, a delving instrument or a stick to beat one, or else to the two suits in a game of cards. In the former case "*Spade*" would then also be a sly allusion to Colt's inherited estate in Herefordshire, a reminder to the reader that although Colt was born in Westminster, he no longer had roots there and was, in fact, more of a countryman than a city dweller. The puns upon "*Club*" and "*Clubs*" may also have a third dimension; they may refer to the respective party organizations or associations to which Colt, as a Whig, and "*Captain Tom*", as a Tory, belonged. The main play of the puns, however, is upon the terminology from card-playing, as it is thereafter consistently and cleverly carried out in such puns as "discarded" (line 41), "play *all the game*" (line 43), "an *Ace*" (line 44), "*pack*" and "*Shuffle*" (line 47), "*cut*" (line 48), and the "*Clubs*" and "*Hearts*" of lines 51-52. After such extensive punning upon terms from a game of cards the topical allusion to "the Queen" (line 55) may be unconscious. "*Captain Tom's*" subsequent puns upon "*Brewer*" (line 63; cf. line 80) and "*Crosses*" (line 65) and upon "bearing a Cross" (line 67 and colophon) are of the same order as Colt's puns upon the same surname and trade. Like his "*FURNESE*" (line 28), however, the "*Cross*" of line 72 may also be a triple pun: upon the candidate's name; the Christian symbol; and a current coin worth about two shillings, or a coin generally. This last allusion would thus appear to be another cut at the high cost of the war, which had impoverished so many ordinary men.

As befits a popular leader, or a man of the people, as "*Cap-*

¹ *Journal*, i. 43, n. 35. Here the editor notes that "the ace of spades is always first trump . . . the ace of clubs is always third trump". Hence the association of spades with clubs in what follows.

tain Tom" was meant to be, he often is characterized, or else characterizes himself, by frequent use of proverbial sayings, some of them combined with his puns. The use of proverbs and folk-sayings, like punning, and especially puns that play upon surnames, trades and occupations, or technical expressions is another characteristic of Swift's art.¹ The most striking, of course, is "Captain Tom's" term, "a *Tale of a Tub*" (line 40), in the sense of a cock-and-bull story, used here in much the same way that Swift used the proverbial expression at least once elsewhere.² More daringly, it seems to be a covert reference to Swift's famous work of 1704, the fifth edition of which would very likely have been published at just about the moment this ballad came out.³ The expression "To have shot one's bolt" (line 34) is also proverbial,⁴ and it teams up with the sarcasm of "comely" and the familiar nickname, "Sir *Harry*" of the previous line of the transitional passage to set the overly familiar tone of the mob leader's speech to follow. "Bate you an *Ace*" (line 44) is also proverbial,⁵ as well as being a pun, and it is a proverb which especially interested Swift, since according to John Ray,⁶ Queen Elizabeth, when presented with a collection of proverbs by one of her subjects, who boasted that he had included all known proverbs, exclaimed "Bate me an *Ace*, quoth Bolton", an expression of incredulity, implying that an assertion is too strong. Unfortunately, the boastful subject of Elizabeth had not included it in his collection. "To bear a cross", or "to bear one's cross" (line 67 and colophon) is another proverbial expression with which "Captain Tom" makes great punning play.⁷ His pun upon "play *all the Game*" (line 43), as well as the expression in the conclusion, "He [Colt] had got a *bad Game*" (line 75), probably have behind them the proverb,

¹ Mayhew, *Rage or Raillery*, p. 132.

² Tilley, p. 651, T 45. See Swift's use of the term in this sense in an Anglo-Latin letter to Dr. Sheridan of 1735, "Swift's Games with Language in Rylands English MS. 659", BULLETIN, xxxvi (1953-54), 437, 447.

³ A. C. Guthkelch and David Nichol Smith, *A Tale of a Tub*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1958), p. xx. ⁴ Tilley, p. 57, B 512. ⁵ Ibid. p. 2, A 20.

⁶ John Ray, *A Collection of English Proverbs* (London, 1670), p. 163. See also *Poems*, iii. 888, line 47, and iii. 1002, line 2. Cf. iii. 1091.

⁷ Ray, pp. 75, 170.

“ At the Game’s end we shall see who gains.”¹ In the conclusion the proverbial expressions come thick and fast: “ turn up *Trumps* ” (line 76); “ His Eggs they are addle ” (line 77); “ And Dough was his Cake ” (line 78), as well as the expression of the last line “ To *Brew* as they *Bake* ”,² continue the puns from card play or from brewing, and they also extend the terms and puns to the related trade of baking as well,³ all of them now deflating Colt’s political pretensions in a prophetic but derisive fashion.

As is often the case also with Swift’s other political ballads the diction of this poem, especially the speech of “ *Captain Tom* ”, is slangy and colloquial, consistent with his punning and his use of so many proverbial expressions. For example, he punningly and slangily advises Colt to “ *pack* up and *Shuffle*,/ And *cut* it away ” (lines 47-48), and he threatens that the Tory mob under his control “ will give them [the Whigs] a *Brewer*,/ Because they want *Coolers* ” (lines 63-64). A “ *Cooler* ” is what we would now call “ a chaser ”, an ale or beer drink put down on top of wine, whiskey, or some other spirits.⁴ Swift was always fascinated by the effects of what he called “ Putting the Churl upon the Gentleman ”.⁵ The very title of the hero of this piece, “ A *Captain Tom* ”, is but a slangy way of identifying a leader of a mob.⁶ In the introduction (line 5) and in the transitional passage (line 33) Colt is also familiarly called “ *Sir Harry* ”, his nickname, another device often employed by Swift in satiric name-calling,⁷ and he is also called “ old *Numps* ” (line 74), or an old dolt, in the conclusion. Colt himself waxes colloquial at one point, when he punningly urges “ *Captain Tom* ”

¹ Tilley, p. 251, G 23.

² Ibid. p. 684, T 544; p. 76, C 12; p. 66, B 654.

³ For his puns upon expressions from the trade of a baker in 1713 see *Prose Writings*, iv. 260. For Swift’s bi-lingual pun of about this same time upon *Custos Rotulorum*, Keeper of the Rolls, see Ball, *Corresp.*, ii. 407, and *Rage or Raillery*, p. 132.

⁴ John S. Farmer and W. E. Henley, *A Dictionary of Slang and Colloquial English* (London, 1912), p. 114.

⁵ *Prose Writings*, iv. 186 (*Polite Conversation*).

⁶ *Tom*, OED, first meaning: “ any male representative of the common people ”.

⁷ *Prose Writings*, viii. 15 (*The Importance of the Guardian Considered*), and Mayhew, *Rage or Raillery*, p. 145.

to "be not *Cross-Grain'd*" (line 16), or difficult to handle. His allusion to brewers poisoning people with "Molosses" (lines 19-20) is probably a topical allusion to some current reprehensible practice of the brewing trade, and not a conscious pun, perhaps some such practice as that to which Swift refers as "the notorious cheat of the Brewers of *Portsmouth*" in his *Examiner*, no. 38 for 26 April 1711.¹

V

Thus, from an examination of the internal evidence of the nature of the ballad's *persona*, borrowed from Defoe, its "dialogue" structure, the sometimes sarcastic tone, the subtly varied speech rhythms, the characteristically Swiftian puns upon surnames, upon technical expressions from card-play, or from particular trades and occupations, the satiric use of nicknames, the slangy diction, the number of proverbial sayings as a method of characterization, and such peculiarly Swiftian rhymes as "man up/*Stanhope*" (lines 10, 12), "burn us/*FURNESE*" (lines 26, 28), or—especially—"Sacheverell/*never will*" (lines 58, 60), one could argue that "A Dialogue", far better than "The Second Part", for instance, has a very strong claim to be accepted as Swift's "lost" ballad upon the Westminster election of 1710. A similar examination of all of the available external evidence tends also to bear out this supposition, I believe.

Swift's own testimony in his *Journal to Stella* for 20 October 1710 is the first and most important external evidence, and the third criterion there listed, that this work, to be his, should be "full of puns" has been sufficiently illustrated above, I believe. In respect to the number and quality of its puns "A Dialogue", far better than "The Second Part" or "The Glorious Warriour", fits the bill. Two other bits of external evidence are also to be found in Swift's *Journal*. On 29 September 1710 he wrote to Stella to say that he had "never thought of a pun since I left Ireland", for Swift a strange and unusual condition and admission.² But, inspired by Stella's example, in one of her

¹ *Prose Writings*, iii. 138.

² *Journal*, i. 33.

letters to him, and by the practice of his friend Darteneuf, "the greatest punner of this town next myself", by 1 October Swift had once more resumed his old habit, just in time to apply his skill upon the ballad of the Westminster election.¹ The second and more important entry is another literary hoax, this time a private one, aimed at Stella's card-play and her love of the then fashionable game of Ombre, which Swift began, significantly enough, on 5 October 1710,² the day upon which he encountered the Whig mob, and the day also upon which he probably began composition of "A Dialogue", which may also be thought of as a literary hoax, but a public one. He wrote that Stella had "played bad games" the night before at Mr. Isaac Manley's house at Dublin, and he went on with knowing talk about "Manilio", "Basto", "ten-ace", "diamonds", and "spades". It may be recalled that Swift, possibly on this same day or evening, was putting similar expressions from Ombre and card-play into the mouth of his *persona*, "Captain Tom", who was also made to say, about Sir Henry Dutton Colt, that finally "He had got a *bad Game*" (line 75). On 10 October 1710 Swift called Stella's attention to his little hoax upon her :

Did you smoak in my last how I told you the very day and the place you were playing at ombre. But I interlined and altered a little, after I had received a letter from Mr. Manley, that said you were at it in his house, while he was writing to me ; but without his help I guess'd within one day.³

Two other bits of external evidence concern the strong possibility that "A Dialogue" was "*Re-Printed*" (as the colophon on the Huntington Library copy has it) at Dublin, and soon after it was published at London. Swift, in a letter to Archbishop William King of Dublin of 30 December 1710, had reported the defeat and capture of Stanhope, through his own obstinacy, at Brihuega. In a reply of 9 January 1710/11 Archbishop King wrote skeptically, "As to what is reported of Mr. *Stanhope's* obstinacy, I demur, till satisfied how far the kindness to him, as a manager, influences the report".⁴ Since "the report"

¹ *Journal*, i. 36.

³ *Ibid.* i. 51.

² *Ibid.* i. 43.

⁴ *Corresp.*, i. 206.

had come from Swift, this sounds like a side-glance at "A Dialogue", lines 59-60, where "Captain Tom" was made to refer to Stanhope and say :

And vote for a *Manager*
Surely we never will !

If this allusion by Archbishop King is to Swift's ballad, then this may have been King's way of letting Swift know that he had read the ballad, recognized the author, and recognized also that its author was now on the side of the moderate Tories. And if, as the colophon on what may be a unique copy of "A Dialogue" now at the Huntington Library implies, that ballad, unlike the other "Captain Tom" pamphlets examined by Professor Main and written by Defoe, was reprinted at Dublin, then this last fact, in itself, would seem also to argue that "A Dialogue" was Swift's work. Once election time had passed at Westminster, there would have been little need to reprint the ballad there, and had there been such a demand on election day, there would not be so many variant readings, since the same setting of type would no doubt have been used to strike off additional copies. Thus the combination of both the internal and the external evidence available, when examined in detail, seems more than ever to confirm Professor Main's assertion of 1957 that Jonathan Swift was the author of "A Dialogue", and that it is, in fact, his "lost" ballad of the Westminster election of 1710.