At some point in 1694, John Toland frequented Jack’s Coffee House in King’s Street, London. Recently arrived from Oxford, he struck up conversation with two persons ‘wholly unknown to him’. Boldly he opened the discussion with a powerful statement of political identity: ‘I am a commonwealth’s Man, tho’ I live at Whitehall, and that is a Mistery’. Continuing in this vein he challenged his auditors, ‘if any man will give me Ten guineas, I will go to the King and Queen, and prove to their faces, that a Commonwealth is more fit for this Nation than Monarchy’.1 Writing a little later in 1695, the philologist Edward Lhwyd commented upon the same young man who had impressed scholars in Oxford with his learning and abilities as ‘being of excellent parts, but [with] as little a share as may be of modesty or conscience’. With the reputation as being ‘one of the best scolds I ever met with’ Lhwyd noted too that Toland ‘is eminent for railing in coffee houses against all communities in religion, and monarchy’.2 By October of 1695, Dr Arthur Charlett wrote to Archbishop Tenison condemning Toland’s notorious public behaviour that had prompted the Vice-Chancellor to banish him from the university. He was described as ‘trampling on ye Common Prayer Book, talking against the scriptures, commending commonwealths, justifying the murder of K.C. Ist, railing against priests in general’. His insolent carriage made him contemptible to all: his parting shot, proclaiming all sorts of intimacies with ‘some very great men’, was that ‘he should be a member of Parliament, and then should have an opportunity of being revenged on Priests and Universities’.

It is quite clear then that amongst a variety of contemporaries in the 1690s (in Scotland, London and Oxford), Toland’s reputation was as a violent and controversial firebrand, incautious in his enmity to the institution of monarchy, and disreputable in his religious conduct and beliefs. Although intelligent and pretending to learning, the violent nature of his temper had betrayed him in ‘all places and countrys he has been in’.4 It was no surprise then that...
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contemporaries (especially clergymen) reviled the ‘revived impertinences’ of Toland’s ‘commonwealth fictions’. Toland was a ‘spiteful young fellow’ who had disturbed the ‘sacred ashes’ of Charles I’s memory. In his assault on the Stuart monarchy and in particular on his attempted erasure of the commemorative sermons of 30 January, ‘Milton Junior’ executed ‘as fatal a stroke to the Royal Martyr’s reputation, as the Ax did his life’.5

Toland’s radical disposition against the orthodoxies of Church and State had been rapidly established by his first ventures into print. While Christianity not mysterious advanced the claims of reason in religion, he also set about defending the sovereignty of reason in politics by undertaking the adventurous project of republishing the canonical works of the commonwealth tradition between 1697 and 1700. In both public projects Toland was cautious to stress his decorous approach to established Christian orthodoxy and political authority. Despite the furious disapproval of these works of the 1690s he publicly denied his intentions were incendiary. The reported coffee-house conduct of a man who railed against revelation and flung Scripture to the floor in the same breath as scolding the monarchy gives us an insight into Toland’s less discreet aspirations. The starting point for this unorthodox political theory was a condemnation of divine right monarchy.

Printed in the ‘10th year of our redemption from Popery and Slavery’ the short pamphlet King Charles I. No such Saint, martyr, or Good Protestant as commonly reputed (1698) made extraordinarily clear the author’s commitment to an anticlerical republicanism. Vilifying Charles I as a ‘cruel and oppressive Tyrant’, Toland cast off the ‘gaudy name of Majesty’ as not only a religious but ‘a civil kind of idolatry’. The Anglican obsession with the reputation of the (so-called) martyred king, Charles I, enshrined in the commemorative services on 30 January, was au fond the cause of contemporary political corruption. The pernicious tyranny of the Stuart monarchy was forged by a corrupt conspiracy of King, courtiers and clergy. This confederation was on-going. Charles I had encouraged the ‘worst and corruptest sort of courtiers’ and ‘the most ignorant, profane and vicious clergy, learned in nothing but their pride, their covetousness and superstition’. Using the powerful resources of press and pulpit, the clergy reduced the people to the ‘bondage of Tyranny and superstition’ by inculcating a series of ‘abominable enslaving doctrines’ like passive obedience, non-resistance, and ‘Obeying without reserve’. Such ‘horrid notions’ were enough to corrupt ‘the best prince, and enslave the freest people’. Invoking the rights of the ‘freeborn English man’ and the injunctions of ‘salus populi est suprema lex’, Toland succinctly deployed the central aphorisms of popular sovereignty and resistance theory against divine right monarchy and passive obedience. His point was to hammer home that ‘rebellion consists in resisting of just Governors in their just Government, and not in defending legal rights against a Tyrant’. The causes of this tyrannous corruption were obvious: ‘why
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do the generality of the clergy and laity so much adore and idolise all Monarchy (whether good or bad) above the people? The answer was manifest: wicked priests. Far from being the ‘Christian advocates for the rights and privileges of millions of people’, the clergy made ‘miserable and lasting slaves’.

One of the persistent claims made by contemporaries about republicans like John Toland forged the connection with the ‘Calves-Head’ club. Republicans were conspiring, seditious regicides plotting the destruction of monarchy. Occasions like the 30 January anniversary became powerful platforms for fixing the image of regicide in public discourse. The memory of 1649 was a starting point from which to condemn any political ideology that deviated from the shibboleths of *de jure divino* accounts of monarchy. That such occasions clearly caused not only conceptual difficulties, but also problems of ‘image management’ to the mainstream Whig publicists can be seen as testimony to the success of the projection of the ‘Calves-Head’ conspiracy by figures like Edward Ward. The tradition was an ‘invention’ of conservative propaganda, akin to the processes of popular print culture that projected anxieties about religious heterodoxy onto a national canvas under the name of the ‘Ranters’ in the early 1650s. The origins of the literary tradition can be located in Edward Ward’s *The secret history of the Calves Head Clubb, or the republican unmasqu’d* published in 1703. Ward, sometime publican, was one of the marginal figures of London literary life who published a huge range of coarse anti-Whig material. Pilloried twice in 1705 for his attacks upon the ministry, Ward was an imaginative and satirical writer immersed in the popular political culture of London.

According to Ward, John Milton was the founder of the club. The republication of his works was a sign of resurgent regicidal aspirations. Ward cited the evidence of an ‘active Whigg’ who noted that although the meeting had taken place with a ‘great deal of precaution’ after the Restoration, by the 1690s it met ‘almost in a publick manner, and apprehend nothing’. Describing in detail the ceremonies of the club (meeting in Moorfields) Ward explained the republican meanings of the foods and anthems celebrated. The high point was the ‘Anniversary Anthem’ which was sung in combination with a ‘Calves-Skull fill’d with wine or other Liquor’ toasting ‘the pious memory of those worthy Patriots that had killed the Tyrant, and deliver’d their country from his arbitrary sway’. Added to this historical introduction were transcriptions of these republican ‘anniversary thanksgiving songs’. Between 1703 and 1714 the *Secret history* was published in at least nine editions in London, and two further in Dublin. More importantly the volume of the edition kept expanding from the slight pamphlet of 22 pages in 1703 to a more weighty book of over 220 pages. These subsequent editions ‘with large
improvements’ included more ‘anthems’, as well as supplementary vindications of the Royal martyr and polemics against ‘Presbyterians’ and ‘modern Whigs’. By 1707 a description of the Calves Head club ‘curiously engrav’d on a copper plate’ gave a more visual dimension to the tradition. This was the backcloth against which Toland had to paint his political theory.

The point of the Secret history was to rivet the connection between ‘the hellish mysteries of old republican rebellion’ and ‘the Whiggish faction’. Although there was little contemporary evidence for the existence of such a club the power of Ward’s writing was such that it created a powerful tradition for stigmatising any who advanced republican ideas. John Toland was right at the heart of this political project both in terms of the production of books and political patronage. Unpacking how Toland was able to balance his defence of commonwealth principles against these hostile assertions that all such argument was by necessity regicidal will be critical to establishing his intentions. Like Ward and his contemporaries, the general assumption that republicanism was by definition regicidal has penetrated deep into the seams of modern historiography. As Worden has established in the case of the works of the regicide Edmund Ludlow, the act of making republicanism respectable was achieved by editorial methods rather than by conceptual innovation. Toland packaged an older violent republicanism for a more respectable audience by wielding a keen editorial knife. Hostility towards the regicidal reputation of interregnum republicanism, cultivated by the rhetoric of the martyrdom of Charles I and the projection of the Calves-Head myth, meant that in order to promote an effective political ideology in the 1690s republicans were forced to distance themselves from the antimonarchical and regicidal elements of their legacy. After 1689, republicanism became a ‘language’ rather than a ‘programme’. As the politics of corruption replaced that of revolutions, the central issues became the campaigns against ministerial bribery, patronage, and the standing army, rather than opposition to kingship.

Republicanism then became more Tacitean, adapted to the political problems of life under a king, rather than those of the Republic. ‘Commonwealth’ language came to share many political objectives with the ‘country interest’ of the early eighteenth century. As the trajectory of political employment from the early 1690s to the 1700s turned oppositional voices into established ones, so the radicalism of republicanism became moderated. Tactical accommodation rather than covert incendiary principle became the byword of political ambition. The point to stress here is that in Toland’s hands ‘republican’ tradition became one of the most powerful ways of defending the Protestant succession. As we will see, Toland understood this republican discourse to be entirely compatible with virtuous monarchy (in the form of William III, or Sophia of Hanover), but fundamentally opposed to clericalist
accounts of the divinity of political authority. The sharp edge of republican thinking was to be turned against priests rather than kings. For Toland, the pursuit of respectability was not the result of conceding on true political principle, but a means to obtain a powerful instrument of civic reform.

Unsurprisingly, contemporary clergymen were profoundly apprehensive that a vibrant republicanism did persist into the 1700s. Toland did little to assuage their fears. Far from avoiding regicidal tradition, he deliberately set out to make the works of the 1650s available to a new audience. Despite the association with the regicidal memory of 1649 he devoted considerable time and effort to republishing works, which by their very nature, would reinforce rather than fracture such a link. Admittedly, especially in the case of Ludlow, many of the ‘puritan’ elements of his subject’s prose were purged. As Worden has explained, the result of this editorial work was that ‘far from converting country Whigs to republicanism, Toland helped to adapt republicanism to country Whig ends’. This process of editorial appropriation requires some further scrutiny. During the course of the 1690s Toland published editions of works by Harrington, Sidney, Milton, Holles and Monck. Very little attention has been paid to the production, editorial intervention, and (perhaps most importantly) reception of these works. Many scholars agree that Toland’s labours were critical in the transmission of republican ideas to the eighteenth century. As John Pocock has put it, Toland was the myth maker of English republican theory.

As archivist of republican tradition, Toland made the eighteenth-century canon of writings that were later repeatedly republished through Europe and America. It was his editions that lined the shelves of many country house libraries. The act of making these editions involved the editor (and presumably printer-publishers) in a considerable amount of labour. Copies of the original texts (either printed or scribal) had to be located, identified and then prepared for publication. Coupled with this administrative work were intellectual and political decisions about which texts would be produced, when, and in what form. Appropriation of texts from the 1650s involved an element of political imagination. Publishing them into a context that embraced traditions of monarchical authority was an act of courage. So Toland confronted, as editor, intellectual, textual and political problems. He was not simply recovering and refurbishing a tradition, but trying to do something practical in political terms.

Toland set out to compose republican arguments in the times of kings. In order to be effective he needed to accommodate his politics to circumstance. To do this without sacrificing his commitment to principle was a skilful achievement. Like those who wrote under the Protectorate, Toland and his friends had to engage with the figure of the legislator or prince within the constitution. The irony that the safety of Protestantism was only secured by the British monarchy had not escaped Toland. Indeed the integrity of the
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regime became an increasingly delicate political question. Toland’s response was to design ‘republican’ defences of the monarchy against the divine right claims of the tyrannous Stuarts.

John Toland was critical to the survival and persistence of republicanism after 1689. From the early 1690s to the early 1720s Toland was intimately involved with the public circulation of republican writings, ranging from the so-called ‘Ludlow’ pamphlets, through the canonical editions and anti-corruption works of 1698–1700, to the later writings defending the legitimacy of the ‘limitations’ upon monarchy and the programmatic manifestos of works like the tremendously popular State anatomy of Great Britain (1717). At different moments in his life Toland engaged with the tasks of politics and political communication in different ways. Sometimes he wrote detached works of political theory (or at least edited them); at other times, he engaged in polemics over particular political issues or debates. He also contributed a variety of practical ‘memorials’ reflecting upon the state of politics for men like Harley, Molesworth and Shaftesbury. Whether in print, in conversation, or in works of scribal advice, Toland projected himself as committed to the principles of liberty and toleration in both civil and religious matters. As he was to admit in private correspondence he would collaborate with any political figure to achieve the ends of liberty and freedom.

Collaborating with men of political stature like John Trenchard, Walter Moyle, Robert Molesworth and Lord Ashley on the production of pamphlets attacking mercenary parliaments, standing armies, and the dangers of courtly patronage, Toland was intimate with the elite of republican politicians. At the very time when he was preparing his printed defence against the prosecution of Christianity not mysterious by Convocation, Toland was also working upon the editions of Milton, Ludlow, Sidney and Harrington. In terms of the sheer number of words and pages produced this was a Herculean task. The Sidney and Harrington volumes (1698, 1700) totalled together a sum of over a thousand pages of folio print. The Ludlow papers ran to over four hundred octavo pages, while the Holles memoirs were over two hundred quarto pages. One printer-publisher, John Darby (d.1704) convicted in 1684 for printing the libel Lord Russell’s speech and regarded as a ‘true assertor of English liberties’, was responsible for the majority of this publication (the works by Ludlow, Milton, Sidney and Harrington). The remaining item, the Memoirs of Denzil Holles, were published by Tim Goodwin, an associate of Darby and also publisher of Robert Molesworth’s controversial An account of Denmark (1694).

The Holles memoirs were regarded as useful contextual material for comparison with Ludlow’s account. Certainly, advertising material in (for example) later editions of Sidney’s Discourses (1704) suggested that all these works were available through Darby’s shop, even though initial imprints suggested other
Rewriting the commonwealth

locations for their origins. The works did good business although they did not make Toland’s fortune.

It was clear Toland needed collaborators to make these editions. As he acknowledged in both the editions of Harrington and Milton he had received rare or unpublished materials from families or contemporaries. There is evidence to suggest that scribal copies of such republican material were in circulation in the 1690s. Sir Robert Southwell, Hans Sloane and Robert Harley owned copies of versions and extracts from Oceana. Toland knew Southwell’s son, and Robert Harley was supposed to have been one of the sponsors of the Harrington edition. How the ‘original’ manuscript for the reproduction of Algernon Sidney’s Discourses, came into Toland’s hands is unknown. The papers had been preserved by the printing community surrounding John Darby and Richard and Abigail Baldwin. Whether they had been kept by Sidney’s intimate Benjamin Furly and passed on to Toland by Shaftesbury is impossible to know. There is clear evidence to suggest that, at least in the case of the works of Harrington, both Shaftesbury and Furly collaborated in distributing the works amongst like-minded men in Holland.

The dedications of these editions establish a circle of influence in which Toland operated. The Milton edition was dedicated to Thomas Raulins of Herefordshire, an intimate with whom Toland corresponded until 1714. He was directly involved in the printing contract between Toland and John Darby. Possibly a member of Shaftesbury’s ‘independent club’, Raulins was a trustee with John Trenchard of the Irish Forfeitures. He was also named as one of Toland’s London circle in the later 1690s by William Simpson, and associated with the radical Whig alderman Sir Robert Clayton. The Holles Memoirs were dedicated to John, Duke of Newcastle, staunch Whig and Williamite, one of the wealthiest men in the kingdom who had encouraged Toland to publish the work. In 1705 Toland was to describe Newcastle as ‘my true friend’ who had ‘been constantly infusing into me sentiments of peace and moderation, the profoundest respect for the Queen’s Majesty and Government, and a largeness of soul towards all denominations of Englishmen’. Newcastle, a friend of men like Somers, Shaftesbury, and the young James Stanhope, was also the dedicatee of Toland’s important work Anglia Libera (1701). Throughout the 1690s and 1700s he was a key political figure in the elite sociability of the Whig party. Publishing the memoirs of the ‘famous Lord Holles, Your Great Uncle’, a man who ‘took up arms, not to destroy the King, or alter the constitution, but to restore the last, and oblige the former to rule according to Law’, was intended as an incentive to Newcastle. The Harrington volume was dedicated to the ‘Lord Mayor, Aldermen, Sheriffs and Common council of London’: the key figure here was Sir Robert Clayton (d. 1707) former Exclusionist MP, Lord Mayor of London and successful banker. Clayton’s Whig credentials were unimpeachable, he also attempted to
encourage support for Toland and possibly finance for the publication. In December 1698 Toland exchanged letters with Clayton consoling him on the death of his nephew with whom Toland had studied at Oxford. It is possible that Clayton contemplated using his parliamentary interest in Surrey to get Toland elected to the House of Commons.

It is important to stress then that Toland’s project was not solitary but collaborative. In publishing these works he was not alone. The point of publication was as much to expose and identify the common political interest, as the ideas of the texts themselves. The production of the works involved a community of individuals of a variety of social and political status: dukes, earls, lords and MPs, as well as printers and publishers were involved. Whether providing the textual material for publication, financing the printing costs, typesetting the words, advertising the books, or lending cultural status by being identified as willing recipients of dedications, the publications are not simple evidence of Toland’s singular role, but of his involvement in a much broader political community. Some of these men were also part of a more private circle of influence and conversation. Although the works were produced with significant public support from leading political figures like Shaftesbury, Newcastle, Molesworth and Harley they courted immediate controversy. In particular, Toland’s edition of Milton ‘the great Anti-monarchist’, and more specifically his biography of the apologist of the Republic, sparked off a fierce response from Churchmen concerned to defend divine principles in Church and State.

It is important to be clear here about Toland’s editorial role. Unlike the case of Ludlow’s memoirs in the major editions of Milton and Harrington’s works it seems that Toland exercised very little systematic textual intervention. In the case of Harrington, as we will see he achieved his adjustment by the intrusion of supplementary texts not necessarily by the original author. In the case of Milton’s work the bulk of his subject’s prose works were prepared by other ‘Calves-Head’ editors – it was Toland’s role (probably at the request to the printer John Darby) to provide a prefatory biography that shaped the way the prose was read.

Toland’s approach to biography was both narrative and thematic. The Life made Milton’s writings relevant to the political concerns of the 1690s. Milton the apologist for regicide, the critic of the Eikon Basilike, and the putative founder of the Calves-Head club was an unambiguous and radical figure. Translations and editions of separate items from Milton’s work were one means by which radical Whig polemicists attempted to rebut de jure divino Jacobite challenges. Toland’s method was to observe ‘the rules of a faithful historian’ in reconstructing Milton’s life and thought in precise detail: ‘I shall produce his own words, as I find ‘em in his Works’. Authentic citation allowed Milton to speak for himself, but also freed Toland from blame ‘of
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such as may dislike what he says’. As he noted sometimes historians were accused of making ‘their Hero what they would have him to be, than such as he really was’. To this end Toland used historical method to justify the reproduction of Milton’s arguments. Some historians might ‘put those words in his mouth which they might not speak themselves without incurring some danger’: Toland (in general agreeing with Milton’s ideas) justified the re-articulation of Milton’s republican sentiments by the injunctions of the *ars historica*. 40

Milton was presented as a man of learning and eloquence with a ‘laudable passion for letters’.41 Combining learning with travel, Milton was struck by the decline of Rome from the height of ‘liberty and learning’ to the ‘most exquisit Tyranny’: importantly, Toland suggested that the root of such civil corruption (according to Milton) was to be found in the power of ‘effeminat priests’ for ‘deluding men with unaccountable Fables, and disarming ‘em by imaginary Fears’.42 These themes, of the defence of liberty and the critique of priestcraft, were the motors of Toland’s biography, subtly focusing the republican tradition away from a straightforwardly regicidal quality to a hostility to a tyranny composed of both civil and spiritual deviance. Returning to England in the early 1640s Milton engaged in a learned and fundamental attack upon the agents of tyranny. His objective was (in his own words from the second defence) ‘to rescue his fellow citizens from slavery’. Justifying his interpretation with long extracts from Milton’s works, Toland commented that he was ‘very severe upon the clergy’. All the corruptions of civil government came from ‘the craft of prelates’; episcopacy by definition was ‘always opposite to Liberty’. The idea of primitive and apostolic church government, as well as the veneration for patristic tradition was assaulted.43 Milton’s views on divorce became for Toland an opportunity to reinforce his commitment to ‘domestick liberty’ freeing men from ‘a kind of servitude at home’: importantly the distinction was made between this form of liberty and the licentiousness of libertinism.44

Throughout the *Life* all forms of attempted clerical domination are regarded as agencies of servitude and bondage whether Protestant or popish, Presbyterian or Anglican. Religious persecution was the starting point for civil tyranny. So *Areopagitica* (in Toland’s reading) became a republican critique of tyranny: censorship was ‘unjust in itself, and dishonourable to a free government’. Here the account of Milton’s attack upon licensing had an obviously contemporary context for Toland and his audience. The suspension of the Licensing Act in 1695 and the attempted re-imposition of restraints upon liberty of religious expression, was as Toland put it ‘more dangerous even than a standing army to civil liberty’.45 The lengthy extracts from *Areopagitica* were not only part of the historical reconstruction of Milton’s thought but were a direct commentary upon contemporary political problems: here the republican
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language of the interregnum had quite precise and direct application to the culture of the 1690s.46

The question of the regicide (and Milton’s powerful justification) was dealt with in a short and simple account. Having been judged an enemy by Parliament and made a prisoner by ‘their victorious Army’, the King was ‘judicially try’d and condemn’d, and the form of government was chang’d into a Democracy or Free State’.47 Importantly, Toland made no reference to the execution of Charles, but took the opportunity to expose the hypocrisy of the Presbyterians who ‘did tragically declaim in their Pulpits, that the King’s usage was very hard, that his person was sacred and inviolable’. Rehearsing Milton’s Tenure of Kings and Magistrates, Toland pointed out ‘that such as had the power might call a Tyrant to account for his maladministration, and after due Conviction to depose him or put him to death, according to the nature of his crimes’. If the ‘ordinary Magistrates’ refused to execute this justice, ‘then the duty of self-preservation, and the good of the whole (which is the supreme law) impowers the People to deliver themselves from Slavery by the safest and most effectual methods they can’.48 The resonance between these unambiguous assertions of the legitimacy of regicide and the defence of a radical account of 1689 is clear. This assertion of republican political theory was reinforced in the eulogy of the Defensio pro Populo Anglicano a work that, according to Toland, equalled ‘the old Romans in the purity of their own Language, and their highest notions of liberty’. Rather than reproduce extracts of the work, Toland insisted that since ‘it deserves so much to be consider’d at length in the Original, or in the English version ... that I will not deprive any body of that pleasure’. The English translation of the work had been made by Joseph Washington in 1692, republished in 1695 and included in the collected edition of 1698. The invitation to read the text was further encouraged when Toland could not resist extracting two passages from the work that reinforced (in Milton’s words) ‘the common Rights of the People against the unjust domination of Kings, not out of any hatred to Kings, but Tyrants’.49 Toland did not compromise Milton’s ideas, but endorsed them for contemporary readers.

While Toland did not shrink from applauding and commending Milton’s explicitly republican texts, he also paid very close attention to the ecclesiastical writings. One of the recurrent themes of the Life was the conspiracy of tyranny and superstition as the most pernicious threat to the liberty and virtue of a nation. Milton expressed hope that Cromwell would settle a ‘perfect form of a free state’ where no single person ‘should injoy any power above or beside the Laws’ but also where an ‘impartial Liberty of Conscience’ would be established.50 ‘Tyranny’ was defined not only by deviant Stuart kingship, but also by the domineering ambition of clerical hirelings. Starting from Milton’s rhetorical question ‘what Government coms nearer to this precept of Christ, than a free Commonwealth?’, Toland surveyed Milton’s critique of all forms of
priestly corruption: tithes, benefices, liturgies, and intolerance. This survey resulted in the assertion that ‘no true Protestant can persecute any persons for speculative Points of Conscience, much less not tolerat his fellow Protestant, although in som things dissenting from his own judgement’. Ultimately, Toland argued, Milton embodied a ‘disinterestedness and impartiality’ about religious confession. This liberty of expression was linked directly to his defence of ‘true and absolute freedom’ which was the greatest ‘happiness of this life, whether to societies or single persons’. Constraint was misery, thus he used his ‘strength and faculties in the defence of liberty, and in direct opposition to slavery’. Although Milton had a reverence for ‘the Deity as well in deeds as words’, Toland pointed out that ‘he was not a profest member of any particular sect among Christians, he frequented none of their assemblies, nor made use of their rites in his family’. Toland hesitated to ‘determine’ whether this ‘proceeded from a dislike of their uncharitable and endless disputes, and that love of dominion, or inclination to Persecution, which, he said, was a piece of popery inseparable from all Churches’. For Toland, then, Milton’s ‘republican’ project included both civil and mental liberty: the war against tyranny was to be fought in the debates about ecclesiastical power as much as monarchical authority. Religious superstition, persecution, censorship and intolerance were a form of ‘tyrannical faction’ that oppressed a free state.

This delicate shift of emphasis in Toland’s biography can be seen most explicitly in his treatment of Milton’s *Eikonoklastes*. Here Toland’s reworking of the ‘meaning’ of Milton’s republicanism was carefully and deliberately tailored for the political needs of the 1690s. One of the staple strategies of monarchist public discourse was the exploitation of Charles I’s martyrdom in the powerfully emotive contexts of 30 January sermons (delivered in commemoration of his execution). An important constituent of the construction of Charles as a martyr was the print success of the *Eikon Basilike* (1649). Milton had made a commanding response to the work that attempted to counter its affective quality, and importantly cast doubt upon the authorship of the text. As Toland explained, Milton had ‘discovered a piece of Royal plagiarism, or (to be more Charitable) of his Chaplains priestcraft’. Exposing the use of passages from Sidney’s *Arcadia*, and the ‘stile’ of the composition, Toland suggested that Milton perceived the work as the ‘production of som idle clergyman, than the work of a distrest Prince’. It had the rank smell ‘of a System of the Pulpit’. Toland intruded a supplementary account of the ‘imposture’ drawn from sources discovered after Milton’s death. Using the so-called ‘Anglesey memorandum’ which suggested that Gauden had composed the *Eikon*, Toland implicated not only the Restoration Church but both Charles II and James II in a conspiracy to sustain the pretence. That the cheat of such a ‘supposititious piece’ could be foisted upon the public so effectively
made Toland ponder how many forged pieces might have been attributed to Christ and the Apostles. As will be discussed in chapter 8, this was to form a platform for a radical deconstruction of scriptural canonicity, which Toland distributed in a clandestine work.

Even in its initial form this reflection sparked off a savage response in defence of the authenticity of Christian revelation. Toland’s exposure of this fraud not only compromised the *Eikon Basilike* and the pious reputation of the martyred Charles, but also implicated the established clergy in the perpetration of a deception. Milton’s *Eikonoklastes* became a text for the 1690s exposing the ideal of a divinely appointed monarch and the corruption of aspiring priestcraft. The subtlety of this narrative was to be seen in the emphasis placed upon the machinations of the clergy and the passivity of the monarch: kings could be tyrants but they were habitually prompted to such oppression by the ambition of priestly hirelings. Readers in the 1690s were aware of the debates over the authorship of the *Eikon*, and would also have experienced the sermonising on 30 January. Importantly, in one of the few editorial additions to Milton’s prose, material concerning the Royal plagiarism and the ‘Anglesey memorandum’ (which exposed the forgery), was intruded into the collection between *Eikonoklastes* and the *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*. In Toland’s edition of Milton late seventeenth-century readers could find an effective way of understanding the political significance of such matters and map them on to the contemporary struggle between liberty and slavery.

Many of Toland’s contemporaries were more than disgruntled with his *Life of Milton*. In his 30 January sermon (1699) John Gilbert, Canon of Exeter, assailed the work for its defence of ‘execrable traytors and proscribed regicides’. Although clerical hostility was directed at the remarks Toland cast against the canonicity of Scripture, the republication of Milton’s works was reviled as ‘tending to promote the design of lessening and reproaching monarchy’. Another reply condemned Toland for trying ‘to turn the Gospel against Kingly government’. Toland was (as he predicted) accused of twisting Milton’s reputation to his own ends. Just as Italian artists were notorious for painting pictures of the Virgin Mary according to the features of their mistresses, ‘in truth I am of the opinion that the author design’d the like compliment to himself in forming Mr Milton’s Character’. Toland had in particular modelled his account of Milton’s religious identity (‘an hypocrite in his youth, a libertine in his middle age, a deist a little after, and an atheist at last’) ‘so exactly [to] the authors own temper’. The main criticism was that Toland had twisted Milton’s words to attack the contemporary Church: ‘to run down Fathers, Councils, Universities and publick maintenance for the min-
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Never shy of controversial exchange, Toland published a robust defence of his biography, *Amyntor* (1699). Milton was a model of virtue. Far from misrepresenting his life or ‘discovering truth not fit to be known’, as he had stressed in the original *Life* he had simply reproduced Milton’s own words ‘to prove I had neither injur’d him nor abus’d my readers’. Toland reacted badly to being told that ‘I ought not to meddle with Milton’s books, nor revive his sentiments’. He had no intention of stirring up controversy, but simply gave a truthful account of Milton’s opinions; if this prompted doubts about the legitimacy of kingship or the virtue of the Church so be it. He actively encouraged the critics to ‘defend your castles and territories against him with all the vigour you can’. Defending his historical duty, and reiterating the concluding points of the *Life*, Toland insisted whether writing a study of Tarquin or Brutus, the ‘historian ought to conceal or disguise nothing; and the Reader is to be left to judge of the virtues he should imitat, or the vices he ought to detest and avoid’. Again the injunction to the reader to ‘judge’ of the merit of Milton, and his works, is clear evidence that Toland was expecting the edition to have an edifying effect upon contemporary readers. The bulk of Toland’s defence turned against mercenary churchmen who ‘remember me oftener in their sermons than their prayers’. Importantly the defence of Milton’s conduct was made by a much more active restatement of the case against the royal authorship of the *Eikon Basilike* and the debate about the canon of scripture. The martyrdom of Charles was a fiction, the ‘relicues’ of this tradition, whether material or ideological were ‘popish legends’. There was a fundamental objection to hearing Charles I described as the ‘best of kings, and the best of men’, when there were many more suitable figures for admiration from antiquity or even the present.

If Toland’s edition of Milton was a means for reinvigorating the attack upon *de jure divino* accounts of Church and State, his handsome folio collection of James Harrington’s works was an even more pronounced attempt to make republican texts suitable for contemporary consumption. Unlike the edition of Ludlow (where he adjusted the language of the text), or the collection of Milton’s prose (where he showed the reader how to understand the meaning of the text by including a biographical guide), with Harrington’s canon, Toland used a more subtle approach involving iconographical presentations, as well as inclusion of non-original work. Prominently on the title page Toland cited Cicero’s *de republica*, ‘That a commonwealth only exists where there is a sound and just government, whether power rests with a monarch or with a few nobles, or with the people as a whole’, with the intention of underscoring the point that republican government was the rule of justice and reason, not necessarily a specific form of rule. This emphasis upon just government without reference to specific institutional form was also indicated in the
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sophisticated iconography of the frontispiece. Inscribed with the tag ‘I. Tolandus libertati sacravit’ the iconography illustrates how Toland remodelled Harrington’s thought for the 1700s. The structure of the emblem is built in architectural form, reflecting classical republican ideas that the art of government is architectonic.66 The centrepiece has the female form of Liberty clothed in Roman robes holding a hat on a stave of manumission, symbolising a state of freedom from slavery restored. Surrounding Liberty is an architectural monument, four Corinthian columns supporting a plinth and resting on a wall. At the top of the monument are representations of military prowess, glory and victory: drums, spears, arrows, axes, cannon, standard-flags, body armour and a plumed helmet. Behind the monument, a vista of a seascape is described complete with an armed fleet and evidence of military fortification. Liberty has been victorious on land and sea, but also has defensive qualities. Beneath the seat upon which liberty is seated are (left and right) representations of civic buildings and an agrarian scene named ‘Commercio’ and ‘opificio’. Indicating the foundational components of civic freedom, commerce and land are seen as the ‘balanced’ premise of the free state.

The remainder of the engraving has three related levels of illustration. Most obvious is the joined symbols of ‘Great Britain’, Scotland, England and Ireland: the thistle, the rose and the harp. Linked to these images of national identity are portraits of Junius Brutus and William III (significantly wearing the laurels of victory). The relationship between these two facing portraits suggests that just as Brutus acted to restore liberty, so too did William III, the expulsion of the Tarquins and the Stuarts being commensurate acts of national liberation. This marriage of republican hero and regal authority was shorthand for the editorial ambitions of the entire volume. Reinforcing this ideal of the ‘monarchy’ of William III as a form of republican government, the last level of representation has five portraits of Moses, Solon, Confucius, Lycurgus and Numa. This canon of ancient figures invokes the celebration of classical political legislators encountered in key texts such as Machiavelli’s commentaries on Livy’s Discourses. Solon, the founder of Athens, Lycurgus founder of Sparta, and Numa, second king of Rome, were the staples of republican historical admiration. The addition of the Chinese philosopher legislator and the Hebrew prophet made the recommendation of the tradition of political legislators more complex, specifically highlighting the introduction of a religious relativism. While Machiavelli, and some of his contemporaries, had been content to represent Moses as a suitable pattern for republican government, little had been said about Confucius.67

To many late seventeenth-century readers the tradition of Solon, Lycurgus and Numa was fundamentally problematic because their politics were non-Christian. Certainly the accounts of their use of ‘politic religion’ found in Machiavelli’s Discourses tended to underscore the impiety of the republican
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tradition against the *de jure divino* models of government. By the 1690s and 1700s the transformation of ‘political legislators’ into ‘political impostors’ had been made by the various clandestine works of European *libertins erudits*: describing Moses as a legislator was not therefore only a politically deviant act, but fundamentally an irreligious one too. One iconographical meaning of this engraving, then, suggests a lineage between the tradition of the ancient political legislators and William III. Just as Brutus restored liberty, so did William; just as Lycurgus laid the foundations for republican Sparta, so did William III for Britain; if Numa and Moses employed ‘religion’ to make laws more effective, so would William III. The frontispiece was then an invitation to readers to explore Harrington’s works with a ‘present-centred-ness’ which was constructed as a legacy of the ancient prudence of Athens, Rome and Sparta.

Toland reinforced these themes in his dedication and introduction to the edition. London was described as ‘a new Rome in the West’. The liberty of the city was built upon ‘Trade and Commerce’ which had elevated the citizens of London ‘to so high a degree of Riches and Politeness’. The establishment of liberty, and especially the ‘impartial liberty’ of religious toleration, meant the city combined ‘union, wealth and numbers of people’. Drawing attention to the city’s reputation as a refuge from ‘the glittering pomp and slavery, as well as [from] ... the arbitrary lust and rapine of their several tyrants’, London had become ‘everyman’s country’. A source of liberty for the entire nation, it pumped liberty ‘into all quarters of the land’.68 The ‘power’ and ‘freedom’ of the national government was reflected in city institutions like the Bank of England, which was ‘like the Temple of Saturn among the Romans’. Indeed, according to Toland, the constitution of the Bank ‘comes nearest of any Government to Harrington’s model’. Buttressing this republicanising of contemporary institutions, Toland imagined the government of the City of London as a republican foundation. The Lord Mayor was more than an ‘Athenian Archon’, the equivalent of a ‘Roman Consul’. The solemnity of his election, the magnificence and extent of his authority was such that ‘during a vacancy of the throne he is the chief person of the nation’. Extending the constitutional analysis of city government, as the common council was ‘the popular representative, so the court of alderman is the aristocratical senate of the city’. The eldest alderman, Toland’s erstwhile patron Sir Robert Clayton, was equivalent to the ‘prince of the senate’ at Rome. Indeed Toland’s eulogy of Clayton was undertaken in republican terms: ‘he universally passes for the perfect pattern of a good citizen’ and just as Cicero was called the father of his country so was Clayton ‘the father of the City’.69

Turning to Harrington’s works, Toland reiterated the position he had adopted in the edition of Milton. He transmitted ‘to posterity the worthy memory’ of Harrington’s ideas, which were in his view the best account of government, justice and liberty. Many ‘roaring and hoarse Trumpeters of
Detraction’ would ‘proclaim that this is a seditious attempt against the very being of Monarchy, and that there’s a pernicious design on foot of speedily introducing a Republican form of Government into the Britannic islands’. Toland countered by accusing them of the ‘raging madness of superstition’. All those ‘who talk by rote’ attempted to make the name of ‘commonwealths-man’ invidious by foisting a false account of monarchy onto public discourse. Republicans had ‘valiantly rescued our antient government from the devouring jaws of arbitrary power’ and placed the crown under ‘such wise regulations as are most likely to continue it for ever, consisting of such excellent laws as indeed set bounds to the will of the king, but that render him thereby the more safe, equally binding up his and the subjects hands from unjustly seizing one anothers prescrib’d Rights or privileges’. If a king was ‘the man of his people’ (like William III), he would be capable of ‘uniting two seemingly incompatible things, Principality and liberty’. English government was ‘the most free and best constituted in the world’ because it was a government of laws ‘enacted for the common good of all the people, not without their own consent or approbation’. Just as Aristotle wrote under the government of Alexander, Livy under Augustus and Thomas More under Henry VIII, Toland felt that he was empowered to write ‘freely, fully and impartially’ with ‘honour and safety’ under a ‘king that is both the restored and supporter of the Liberty of Europe’. Republicans could work with good kings. Just as Cremutius Cordus had spoken honourably of ‘the immortal tyrannicides of Brutus and Cassius’ regardless of the condemnation of Tiberius, so Toland reprinted Harrington’s works for the ‘public good’. Oceana, a work of ‘so much learning and perspicacity’, was a perfect model of a commonwealth. He encouraged Harrington’s works to be read alongside a ‘study of other good books, but especially a careful perusal of the Greec and Roman Historians’ as a ground-work of liberty. Explaining the key principle of the work, that ‘foundation of all politics’, that empire followed property, Toland drew attention to the fact that this principle was not ‘form’ specific. As he clarified, ‘all that is said of this doctrine may as well be accommodated to a monarchy regulated by laws, as to a democracy or more popular form of government’. It was perfectly possible then to be a republican and operate within a monarchical form without compromising fundamental principles. Toland was adamant that the role of ‘legislator’ was a more effective way of establishing and remodelling a commonwealth than the instruments of a popular assembly. The ‘legislator’ had to have ‘a refin’d and excellent genius, a noble soul ambitious of solid praise, a sincere lover of virtue and the good of all mankind’ if he was to be ‘capable of executing so glorious a undertaking as making a people free’. This was a preamble to describing the aspirations for William III, although the consensual origins of his government were underscored with the succinct phrase ‘we made him King’.
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Rethinking the nature of monarchy was central then to the intentions of the publication of Harrington’s works. This element can also be seen in Toland’s editorial advice. He specifically recommended the preliminary discourses to Oceana and its epitome, The art of lawgiving, as encapsulating Harrington’s ideas. Neither ‘private speculations’ nor ‘impracticable chimeras’, Harrington had ‘authoriz’d’ his understanding by ‘a world of good learning and observation’. To digest these fundamental principles was the point of reading the edition. To this end Toland had deliberately not attempted to produce a complete collection, including some scribal works (like the ‘System of politics’ and ‘The mechanics of nature’), but omitting the more trivial pamphlets which were ‘solely calculated for that time’. Editors who included everything wanted judgement. Not making a distinction between ‘the elaborate works which an author intended for universal benefit, and his more slight and temporary compositions, which were written to serve present terms’ was a mistake. Many of the more marginal works were not only unintelligible, but ‘useless’. The corollary of this editorial advice was that the published work still retained pertinence for contemporary politics.

That Toland exploited a number of literary strategies in his editions has become commonplace. Toland prepared his text for his readers. Attention has been drawn to the fact that Toland included in Harrington’s works by another writer. It seems unlikely that Toland was attempting to pass off John Hall’s The grounds and reasons of monarchy, originally published in 1650, as Harrington’s work since he pointed out the real author in his preface. Hall was a defender of the regicide. Toland adjusted Hall’s work to contemporary purposes. By the insertion of new words, changes of punctuation (in particular the substitution of full stops, for a maze of subordinate clauses) and the replacement of archaic expression Toland adapted the text to the 1700s. This skill was employed to make the text a defence of the legitimacy of William III’s kingship. The rewritten Hall text was still hostile to corrupt monarchy and the bewitching qualities of courts and priests. Divine right accounts were specifically condemned as superstitious prejudices clung to by the ‘generality of mankind’. Corrupt monarchical rule was ‘diametrically opposite’ to civil happiness. The welfare of the people was ‘the sovereign law and end of all government’ because all men were naturally born equal. The contextual thrust of the reprint was to critique Stuart monarchy rather than the Williamite commonwealth. Passages that attacked the role of the clergy who ‘borrow the face of Divinity’, could be very well applied to those churchmen who used January sermons to dazzle the community. Just as ‘slavery enfeebles their minds’ many people preferred temporary ease to ‘real happiness’. A belief in ‘succession’ placed matters of government ‘into the hands of fortune’ rather than prudence. Such a monarchy was a ‘disease of government’ which ought to be replaced by ‘pristine liberty and its daughter happiness’.
The war against tyranny and prejudice

carefully integrated Harrington’s works within Williamite discourses, it seems unlikely that Toland would have so deliberately compromised his own editorial aspirations by the inclusion of a rabidly anti-monarchical text, unless he intended to make a profound distinction between kingship and tyranny. The inclusion of Hall’s work, suitably edited, showed readers that it was possible in 1700 to be both a republican and loyal to a virtuous monarchy.

This distinction was also at the heart of Toland’s edition of Sidney’s *Discourses* in 1698. He published the work so ‘that nations should be well informed of their rights’. Denying that this was a seditious enterprise, Toland countered ‘that as man expects good laws only from good government, so the reign of a Prince, whose title is founded upon the principle of liberty which is here defended, cannot be but the most proper’. The use of a vocabulary of ‘princes’ rather than kings was a significant attempt to avoid the implications of a regal language. Later Toland defended himself from the charges of heresy and sedition. He ‘freely’ owned that ‘I am a great common-wealths-man … and value myself upon being so’. Far from distancing his editorial project from republican charges, Toland embraced them: ‘I have bin wholly devoted to the self-evident principle of Liberty, and a profest enemy to slavery and arbitrary power’. The abusive use of ‘commonwealthsman’ was the result of the vindictiveness of ‘court flatterers and pensioners’ whose objective was to insinuate that such men were ‘irconcileable enemies’ to regal government. Acknowledging that it was lawful ‘to resist and punish tyrants of all kinds’, Toland insisted that although *in extremis* he preferred a democracy over tyranny, his support was for a commonwealth. This was defined as having no ‘particular form’ but as ‘an independent community, where the commonweal or good of all indifferently is design’d and pursu’d’. Since all magistrates were made ‘for and by the people’ so with the settlement of the crown on William III, England became a commonwealth ‘the most free and best constituted in all the world’. Invoking the authority of Cicero, Toland simply argued that ‘all free governments’ were commonwealths regardless of institutional form. The images of ‘anarchy, confusion, levelling, sedition and a thousand other terrible things’ were wrongly associated with a republic, which ‘really signifies Liberty and Order, equal laws, strict and impartial justice’. Explicitly denying a continuity with the ‘tyrannical usurpation of Oliver Cromwell’ Toland defended ‘the antient and present constitution of England under Kings, Lords, and Commons’ reiterating his ‘untainted loyalty to King William’. This loyalty he insisted ‘will argue me to be a staunch commonwealthsman’ and as such ‘I shall continue all my life a friend to religion, an enemy to superstition, a supporter of Good Kings, and (when there’s occasion) a Deposer of Tyrants’. For Toland, it was clear that republican principles of good government were entirely compatible with the rule of William.

This theme was also found in Toland’s poetic work *Clito: a poem on the force*
of eloquence (1700) which as Nigel Smith has commented ‘out Miltons, Milton’.83 Premising his arguments upon a amalgam of Lucretian and Spinozist materialism, anticlericalism and the promotion of the ‘good old cause’, Toland presented himself as an active republican, as a ‘fatal scourge of slavery. / Ambitious Tyrants, proud and useless drones, / I’ll first expose, then tumble from their thrones’.84 Eulogising ‘Godlike Brutus’ for his defence of liberty, Toland intruded a celebration of William III, in very similar terms as the dedication to Harrington’s works, as ‘a matchless Hero ... / that freedom he restor’d he will maintain, / incourage merit, and leud vice restrain. / Our Laws, Religion, Arms, our coin and trade, / All flourish under him, before decay’d’.85 William would bring both the ‘branch of peace, and thunderbolt of War’: the free state of Britain would become an anti-tyrannical force ‘to free those who slavish fetters wear’.86 For Toland the more urgent war was to be fought against the instruments of spiritual slavery, the ‘swarming herds of crafty priests and monks, / the female orders of religious punks, / Cardinals, Patriarchs, Metropolitans, / Franciscans, Jesuits, Dominicans’. Although anti-papist in idiom this war against priestcraft was against all deviant churchmen: ‘all holy cheats / of all Religions shall partake my threats’.87 While contemporaries reviled the work as both irreligious and treacherous, it is important to note that Toland, content with the regulated government of William III, turned the full force of his polemic against false religion as the urgent enemy of republican virtue. The war against priestcraft was more necessary than that against kings.

Although many contemporaries deliberately fashioned William III as a ‘Godly’ and providentially legitimated ruler, Toland was not alone in imagining William III within the tradition of republican legislators.88 For example, ‘An essay on publick virtue’, one of the scribal works of Shaftesbury written in the mid-1690s, before he became Toland’s intimate, indicates how even the most principled republican could envisage virtuous government being the product of monarchical rule. Composed as a plea to reform public service from the degeneracy of private interest, William III was defended as ‘a virtuous prince’ who laboured hard for the ‘publick good’.89 William III, like Dion who restored ‘the Sicilians to their freedome’, had renovated religion and civil rights.90 William’s rule was a ‘kingship limited and circumscribed by laws, or a king at the head of ye commonwealth’.91 The important theme to note in this discourse, as in much of the ‘true Whig’ polemic of the late 1690s, was that the focal points of anxiety were civil institutions other than the monarchy. In the person of William, republicans like Toland and Shaftesbury seemed confident in the security of commonwealth virtues and justice. While they ‘would not spare the monarchy’, men like Toland when dealing with ‘his present Majesty’s person ... would deal gently with the monarch’.92

Toland’s editorial efforts were subtle attempts to redefine legitimate
monarchical government. The legality of the regicide, and of the right of resistance, was not abandoned. As Toland clarified, he was ‘a supporter of Good Kings, and (when there’s occasion) a Deposer of Tyrants’. Legitimate monarchy was one circumscribed by institutional limitations. From the republican perspective the most pressing political problem was the legitimacy of succession. The consequences of 1689 had established a legitimate form of government that coincided with a dynastic succession. While William III was a powerful example of the political legislator with whom republicans could work, the future in the late 1690s looked bleaker with the alternatives being the rule of the dangerously clerical Anne, or a return to the dangers of Jacobite restoration. Turning arguments that were calculated to defend rights of resistance and regicide into an intellectual defence of a dynastic succession involved considerable intellectual contortion. As we will see in the next chapter, Toland actively defended this limited form of monarchy by fusing it with a defence of Protestantism. Fresh from his editorial efforts in the late 1690s Toland became one of the staunchest defenders of the Hanoverian succession. This liberty was a language built as much out of Protestant languages of conscience as anti-monarchical sources. As Toland insisted in Vindicus Liberius, ‘the greatest glory of a free government’ was liberty of the understanding which was ‘yet a nobler principle than that of the body, if this be not a distinction (as they say) without a difference; and where there is no liberty of conscience there can be no civil liberty’.93
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