

An inquiry into the death of Swift's printer, John Harding: Part 1: evidence through to August 1725

© Craig Pett 2022

Abstract

John Harding, the printer of the seditious *Letters* written by Swift under the pseudonym 'M.B. Drapier' during the controversy of Wood's halfpence, died in April 1725, five months after a three-week imprisonment the previous year, and it has always been assumed that the cause of his death was jail fever. This paper argues that this assumption, like so many made by historians that are protective of Swift, is mistaken. The paper presents never-before-seen evidence suggesting that Harding, who had been due to appear in court, was the victim of a beating carried out on the order of the Lord Lieutenant, Carteret, Swift's friend, and probably with tacit knowledge on Swift's part. The evidence is seen by returning to the primary sources and discarding the assumption that Swift was without fear throughout the episode of Wood's halfpence.

Introduction

In his preface to his fifth *Letter* written under the pseudonym 'M.B. Drapier' in late 1724, Swift made an odd remark. Entitled *A Letter to the Right Honourable the Lord Viscount Molesworth*,¹ Swift wrote this fifth *Letter* during the days following the release from prison of his printer, John Harding, on 28 November. Harding had endured a three-week imprisonment for his printing of the previous *Letter* of the Drapier, the fourth, and had emerged from prison in a deteriorated physical condition. He had been struck down in some way whilst incarcerated and he died five months later. The preface to this fifth *Letter* took the form of a short letter to Harding entitled 'Directions to the Printer'. Addressed personally to Harding but intended for reading by the people of Ireland, it included this postscript: 'For want of intercourse between You [Harding] and Me, which I never will suffer, your People are apt to make very gross Errors in the Press, which I desire you will provide against'.² Why did Swift feel the need to say these things publicly? Why did he go so far as to say that Harding was the type of person whose company he could never suffer? Swift, and indeed all of Ireland, was indebted to Harding at this time, and as Swift directly acknowledged in the opening line of 'Directions to the Printer', Harding had emerged from prison in a 'Hurt' condition. Swift should therefore have been offering his moral and material support to his printer at this time. Why instead did he go out of his way to give Harding this public snub, and, in an off-handed manner in this post-script, send a message indicating that he and Harding had never known each other personally?

An answer to this question is offered in this paper. It is a paper that presents a new line of inquiry into the circumstances of Harding's death. He died at age twenty-seven on 19 April 1725 and it has always been assumed that the cause of death was jail fever, which is an assumption that consigns Harding's death to the realm of 'accident' and which leaves Swift's reputation unquestioned. But there is no evidence to support this assumption. There are no primary sources indicating that he died this way. Even amongst all of the secondary sources I have studied, there is no direct statement that he died of jail fever.³ It is simply an anecdotal assumption that has been in place up to and including today on an issue that no one has ever investigated.

My new line of inquiry suggests that Harding's death was no accident. As the accused printer in the prosecution of the fourth *Letter*, Harding had been due to appear in the Court of King's Bench where he would have been interrogated as to the true identity of 'M.B. Drapier', and if one mention of the words 'Jonathan Swift' or 'Dean of St. Patrick's' was forced from him, Swift himself would have been brought before the court to face a charge of sedition or possibly treason. Independent of this scheduled court appearance, pursuant to a royal Proclamation there was a reward of £300 on offer to anyone who came forward with evidence of the identity of the author. The giving of this evidence would have had the same effect of bringing Swift before the court, and whilst there is nothing to suggest that Harding would have betrayed Swift in this voluntary manner, for Swift, in the heightened state of anxiety he was in at the time, Harding was a potential claimant of that reward once released from prison.

The motive for the crime is self-evident and the evidence clearly suggests that it was translated into action. It suggests that, shortly before his release from Newgate, Harding was beaten in such a way as to render him incapable of giving evidence either orally or in written form. It was a beating that appears to have been intended only to maim him, but which came to cost him his life five months later. The evidence indicates that the order for this beating came from Swift's friend, Lord Lieutenant Carteret, and that Swift acquiesced in the plan.

Culpability on the part of Swift in relation to Harding's death has been suspected before. 'If all the circumstances of that case were known', wrote Richard Robert Madden in 1867, 'a serious imputation of neglect, and something worse, on the justice and generosity of Dean Swift might not unjustly lie'. Madden proceeded to exculpate Swift, saying that all of the circumstances cannot be known and that, if they were, something could surely be said 'for a man of Swift's genius and character'.⁴ But the circumstances of the case *can* be known, at least to an extent sufficient to establish that nothing exculpatory can in fact be said for Swift. On the contrary, the circumstances lead to the probability that Harding was murdered and the possibility, if not the likelihood, that the brutal deed was carried out with some form of constructive knowledge on Swift's part. The evidence supporting this is dispersed in different places but has otherwise been hiding in plain sight amongst the primary sources. The pieces come together when one particular assumption is discarded. This is the assumption, which has been entrenched all along, that throughout the events of 1724 Swift was fearless and infallible.

How can this surface now, almost three hundred years later? Much could be written in answer to that question but here is a brief mention of a few matters that have conspired to keep the issue of Harding's death out of the field of historical vision. First and foremost, from the very beginning, the truth concerning Harding's death was suppressed. It was suppressed by Swift, who was the one person who should have offered an explanation, but did not. It was also inadvertently suppressed by the surrounding silence throughout Dublin. Out of fear, no one said a word, not publicly at least. Swift at the time was feted in Ireland like few if any national heroes had ever been and no one was going to touch on an issue that challenged him. In this way, Harding, despite all he had done for Ireland, became the invisible man. Further, although Harding emerged from prison as he did, for much of Ireland it was inconceivable that what had happened to him could have been connected to Swift anyway. Take this comment by John Starratt in the *Irish Quarterly Review* from 1852. Made 127 years later, it is the only comment I am aware of that directly states Harding's cause of death: 'John Harding, the humble instrument of the saviour of his country, died from the effects of the treatment inflicted on him by the government officials'.⁵ Harding died at the hands of government officials, says Starratt, which shows that this fact lingered in public consciousness at least until 1852, but Starratt is seemingly oblivious to the fact that the order for this treatment inflicted on Harding can only have come

from the Lord Lieutenant, John Carteret, Swift's friend. His comment demonstrates how the truth concerning Harding's death has all this time been out-of-sight and out-of-mind.

This paper progresses chronologically from 1713 through to the end of the controversy of Wood's halfpence in August 1725. The first section presents a review of relevant events through the preceding years. The second section, from the commencement of the prosecution against Swift's fourth *Letter as the Drapier* in October 1724, presents the evidence relating to the crime, and a concluding section discusses some final matters up to August 1725, where this paper leaves off.⁶

1. 1713 to 1724: the preceding years

Swift was forty-six when he was forced to return to his country of origin in 1713. Throughout the previous three years he had been at the height of his power and influence in London as the propagandist for the Tory ministry. He was an Irish absentee during these years in London. He was employed as an Irish clergyman and whilst living in London his income, consisting of tithes paid by Irish parishioners, was remitted to him across the channel. He had been hoping to rearrange these affairs by obtaining a Church living in London, where he would have much preferred to live the remainder of his life, and he had hopes of receiving such a position given the services he had provided for the Tory ministry during his time there. With his anonymous satires, however, he had also acquired enemies, and with the collapse of the Tory ministry in 1713, he found himself 'rewarded' with the Deanery of St. Patrick's, Dublin.

Upon his return to Dublin, he spoke openly of his despondency and inability to write.⁷ As his biographer Patrick Delany later observed, 'he considered Ireland as a scene too little for his genius'.⁸ He also met with a cold reception from the people of Dublin who saw him as conceited and, given his seniority in the former Tory ministry, probably a Jacobite. But public opinion gradually turned and in early 1720, finding himself in popular favour as his witty observations did the rounds, he wrote *A Proposal For the Universal Use Of Irish Manufacture, in Cloaths and Furniture of Houses, &c. Utterly Rejecting and Renouncing Every Thing wearable that comes from England*.⁹ This pamphlet was replete with the irreverent brand of humour for which he was now known as it urged the Irish people to support the local economy, and it was printed for him by Edward Waters, who was operating from the New Post Office Printing House on the corner of Essex Street and Sycamore Alley. Waters represented a different kind of printer for Swift. In London he had worked with establishment printers but Waters was a lowly-ranked Tory stationer who was known for his risk-taking. It is a choice of printer that demonstrates that Swift was intending to embark on a dangerous course of publishing. That said, he does not appear to have anticipated any problem with this particular pamphlet, which was essentially his announcement to the town that he was embracing the Irish cause.

As was his custom, Swift did not put his name to this pamphlet. It was his practice to only ever write anonymously or under a pseudonym.¹⁰ He had his critics for this¹¹ but for Swift the province of the author was one that was rightfully detached. He considered it beneath the dignity of authors, especially the gifted ones, to personalise their work by appending a name. Driven by what Irvin Ehrenpreis described as a 'hunger for anonymous fame',¹² he wanted the world to know the work was his without it having to be said. He also bore an expectation that his immunity in this regard would be upheld by those in power, as seen in this episode from 1714 when he was back in London for a time in an effort to repair relationships in the Tory ministry. His pamphlet, *The Publick Spirit of the Whigs*,¹³ became the subject of a Proclamation offering a reward of £300 for the discovery of the author. Swift, however, was all along protected. It was reported at the time that, 'if the worst comes to the worst, I hear they have found out a man that will own, which will save the Doctor's Bacon'.¹⁴ That is, if evidence of

Swift's authorship was to be obtained by the court, his friends in power had someone ready to falsely claim authorship and take the fall for him.

Perhaps unluckily, *A Proposal For the Universal Use Of Irish Manufacture* was prosecuted for sedition on account of its anti-English sentiment. This King's Bench prosecution came to be protracted over fifteen months and was characterised by its brutal treatment of the printer, Waters. Swift would later describe the prosecution on different occasions as one of 'utmost Violence',¹⁵ or 'utmost Zeal',¹⁶ or 'utmost Virulence',¹⁷ and would remark, "The *Printer* was prosecuted in the Manner we all remember; (and, I hope, *it will somewhere be remembered further*)".¹⁸ This violence was overseen by the presiding judge, Chief Justice William Whithed. Swift would later say that Whithed was 'as venomous as a Serpent'¹⁹ in his conduct of this case, which clearly he was. Irish judges, however, did not have tenure. They held office at the pleasure of Westminster. As such, Whithed, who was highly regarded for his judicial skills in cases that did not involve a government interest, used this prosecution to showcase his loyalty to his employer, the Crown. At the trial, the petty jury returned a verdict of 'not guilty' but Whithed refused to accept it and ordered them back to reconsider. Again, the petty jury returned a verdict of not guilty. Again, Whithed sent them back. And so on into the night. On nine occasions, Whithed ordered them to reconsider before eventually scheduling a retrial for the following Law Term. During the days and weeks after this trial, Swift sought to intervene by writing to highly-placed friends in London asking them to do what they could to have the case quashed. He was ultimately successful in this but the order for a *noli prosequi* could not be entered until the arrival of the incoming Lord Lieutenant, Charles Fitzroy, Duke of Grafton, which was scheduled for August 1721, more than a year away. In the meantime, the case came back before the court at every Law Term, and at each of these appearances, the case was deferred to the next term. On each occasion, though, Whithed interrogated Waters as to the identity of the author, and the evidence suggests that, upon Waters's refusal to divulge, Whithed subjected him to corporal punishments that included the pillory with ears nailed to the posts.²⁰ Whithed ordered these punishments after the trial and on each occasion that the matter came before his Court, until the entering of the *noli prosequi* in August 1721.

Swift later described himself as 'mortified'²¹ by his experience with *A Proposal For the Universal Use Of Irish Manufacture*. His good intentions for Ireland had been met with a brutal prosecution which he had been forced to endure vicariously through his printer, and he vowed never to write for the Irish cause again. The stress of the prosecution also took its toll on the author-printer association itself. In March 1721, between Hilary and Easter Terms, for reasons that are not precisely known, Swift and Waters brought their association to an end, and Swift's Dublin printer became John Harding, who had previously been apprenticed to Waters and was in all likelihood recommended to Swift by his former master.

Harding was twenty-three.²² Having completed his indentures under Waters in 1717 or 1718, he leased a portion of the New Post Office Printing House for a year or so before setting up shop on Dirty-Lane,²³ a narrow laneway that ran south from Dame Street over Temple Bar down to a ferry station at the river. He began producing newspapers, pamphlets and broadsides, and from the outset was a risk-taker like his former master. Indeed, there was a culture of bravado amongst the small band of Tory stationers in Dublin at the time, with prison terms considered badges of honour, and the young Harding showed himself intent on becoming the most audacious of them all. He was also married by this time. His wife, Sarah, n e Sadlier, three years younger than him,²⁴ was from the family of Ireland's first typefounders and was herself proficient in the craft of printing. They would have two children.²⁵

From April 1721, Harding became the printer-on-stand-by for all of Swift's private and public printing requirements. Swift used him exclusively from this time with the exception of one pamphlet which was printed by another stationer²⁶ whilst Harding was in prison for a separate indiscretion. Soon after starting in the role, Harding moved from Dirty Lane to new premises in Molesworth's Court, which appear to have been owned by Swift's friend, Viscount Molesworth, and which were half the distance from the deanery than the shop on Dirty Lane had been. Most of the communications between Harding and Swift would have been by messenger but, as will be discussed later, they are likely to have met in person several times.

Harding's first publication for Swift appeared on April Fool's Day 1721, which was a bad omen if ever there was one. The work was *An Epilogue to be Spoke at the Theatre-Royal This present Saturday being April the 1st. In the Behalf of the Distressed Weavers*. This *Epilogue* was specifically written for a performance of *Hamlet* performed that night at the Theatre Royal on Smock Alley, a charity performance to support the starving weavers. Thomas Sheridan wrote a Prologue, Swift wrote an Epilogue, and Harding printed them on either side of a broadsheet with his imprint at the foot of the sheet and sold them outside the theatre on the night.²⁷ Other works he produced for Swift in this early period include the handful of tracts Swift wrote in the course of the controversy over a proposed Irish national bank during November and December 1721. Indeed, Harding found himself personally drawn into this controversy after printing Swift's *Subscribers to the Bank Plac'd according to Their Order and Quality with Notes and Queries*.²⁸ In this tract, rather than argue the merits of the proposal, Swift simply pointed that the supporters of the bank proposal were people of low or no rank, and in the course of their retort, the supporters of the bank jeered at Swift for his choice of such a lowly-regarded printer. 'Is the suppos'd Printer a real Printer, or a dispenser of Pye; Some body, or no body, or a John o' Stiles in the Clouds,²⁹ seen no where but at the tail of a Street Ballad?'. And, 'Do's the Author think to escape Scot free if an English half Crown can tempt his Printer to discover him?'.³⁰ Then, another tract Harding produced in this early stage was Swift's hoax *Last Speech* of Ebenezer Elliston.³¹ Posing as the condemned thief, Swift, or 'Elliston', wrote that he had put the names and addresses of all of his accomplices on a document and had left that document in the keeping of an honest man. 'Elliston' then said he had instructed that that honest man to the effect that, should any one person on that list be caught for committing another crime, he was to hand the entire list over to the authorities for every person listed there to be prosecuted for their previous crimes.³² Harding printed this hoax *Last Speech* and sold copies at the hanging of Elliston at St. Stephen's Green on 2 May 1722.

The episode that became known as the 'controversy of Wood's halfpence' had its origins in July 1722 when the mistress of King George granted a patent to a Bristol man, William Wood, authorising him to coin new farthings and halfpence for Ireland. There was in truth a shortage of coin in Ireland at the time but Ireland was not consulted on the matter and the nation's grievance deepened as information began making its way across the channel that this new coin was being made of an inferior metal, namely copper. It was feared that this new coin would have the effect of draining Ireland of its better coin, because only 'good' money would be accepted in the payment of remittances to the Crown. Irish anger simmered and the first publications on the subject, written by various writers, began to appear from August 1723.³³ On the standards of the day, these first publications clearly surpassed the common law test for sedition, which was defined as inciting disaffection towards the Crown or its ministers, but the Lord Lieutenant, Grafton, was floundering under the pressure of the nation's opposition to the patent and failed to act.³⁴

Throughout 1723, Swift and Harding undertook little publishing work together. Harding, for his part, spent much of this period in prison on account of the persistent insolence he displayed towards the government in his newspapers. In May 1723, in direct defiance of a

specific government order, he published a false statement that the value of gold currency would be raised.³⁵ An order was issued for his arrest but when the messengers came for him, he had gone into hiding. Throughout the following weeks he remained at large but was able to sneak back unseen because in late June his *Weekly Impartial News-Letter* printed the judges' assize with incorrect dates and times, which was done by Harding for no other reason than to create confusion in the legal system.³⁶ On this occasion, he was seized and imprisoned and would remain incarcerated for seven months, until February 1724. It was the longest term he would ever serve.

For very different reasons, Swift was also otherwise occupied for part of 1723. On 1 June, his semi-secret lover, Vanessa Vanhomrigh, died at the age of thirty-five. His relationship with Vanessa had come to be the gossip of the town and her death was a consequence of having been spurned by Swift. On 2 June, the day after she died, Swift left Dublin to escape the scandal, saying to friends that he was suddenly bringing forward a long-planned journey through Ireland's south.³⁷ This was not the first occasion in which Swift had run from a situation that had the potential to bring scandal upon him. It was indeed a habit of his and one which had been remarked upon by the clergyman Jonathan Smedley as early as 1714. In a mock-diary in which he impersonated Swift, Smedley made references to flight and fleeing, and made a note of a resolution to write an historical account on the proverb, 'Burn the House and run away by the Light of it'.³⁸ Two never-before-seen instances of Swift fleeing in this way, both related to John Harding, will be seen in subsequent events.

On this occasion of Vanessa's death in early June 1723, Swift journeyed through the south-west for three months, returning to Dublin in early September. This was a time when anxiety over the threat of Wood's coin was building by the day, and, with the experiences of *A Proposal For the Universal Use Of Irish Manufacture* now a few years in the past, it presented him with a second opportunity to take charge in Ireland. Harding was released from his long imprisonment on or about 10 February 1724 and Swift celebrated the event with a poem, *Harding's Resurrection. From Hell Upon Earth*, which Harding published in his *Weekly Impartial News-Letter* for 18 February 1724. Then, soon afterwards, Swift sent Harding a manuscript for a pamphlet to be entitled *A Letter to the Shop-keepers, Tradesmen, Farmers, and Common-People of Ireland, Concerning the Brass Half-Pence Coined by Mr. Woods*. It was described as having been written 'By M.B. Drapier'. The 'author', that is, was a draper with initials 'M.B.'. It was a fictional authorial identity but, for the first time in this episode of Wood's halfpence, the printer stated his real name and place of business on the title page: 'Printed by J. Harding in *Molesworth's-Court*'. In terms of ideas, there was nothing original in this pamphlet from Swift. All of Ireland's strategies on the issue of Wood's coin, including the boycott, had already been enunciated by others, but this *Letter* was written with a power that only Swift could infuse.

This first *Letter* was not an immediate success. With readers troubled by the ease with which it dealt with matters of law and constitution, it was necessary for Swift and Harding to promote it. They did this with efforts that included lengthy notices from Swift inserted into Harding's newspapers for 21 April and 11 May.³⁹ Within a few months, however, the *Letter to the Shop-keepers* had taken a hold and in August Swift wrote again. In response to a set of 'proposals' announced by Wood, which were printed in several newspapers including Harding's, Swift wrote *A Letter to Mr. Harding the Printer, Upon Occasion of a Paragraph in his News-Paper of Aug. 1st. Relating to Mr. Woods's Half-Pence. By M. B. Drapier*. Published by Harding on 6 August, this second *Letter* breathed fire as it raged against Wood's proposals and, demonstrating to the people that the power was theirs to take, transformed the nation overnight. As the Earl of Orrery later wrote, 'At the sound of the DRAPIER'S trumpet, a spirit arose among the people, that, in the eastern phrase, was *like unto a tempest in the day of the whirlwind*'.⁴⁰

Within a month Swift had written for a third time. In London, the Committee of the Privy Council which had enquired into the Irish complaints had produced a report absolving Wood. Swift's response was entitled *Some Observations Upon a Paper, Call'd, The Report of the Committee of the Most Honourable the Privy-Council in England, relating to WOOD's Half-Pence. By M.B. Drapier*. Published by Harding on 5 September, this third *Letter* sustained the delirium that had enveloped the country, and Swift, suddenly, was revered like a deity within Ireland, as evidenced by the circulation around the town of these lines from scripture: 'And the people said unto Saul, Shall Jonathan die... there shall not one hair of his head fall to the ground, for he hath wrought with God this day'.⁴¹

The three *Letters* to this point were all unquestionably seditious but no action was taken against them. Grafton had been recalled by the First Minister at Westminster, Robert Walpole, in April. His replacement, John Lord Carteret, was not due to arrive in Ireland until the next Irish Parliamentary session, which was more than a year away, and in the interim the country was being governed by the three Lords Justice, who were as opposed to Wood's patent as everyone else. In September, however, in a measure designed to restore order, Walpole directed Carteret to head over in the coming weeks.

Carteret was twenty-three years younger than Swift.⁴² Their friendship had had its origins in London in 1711 when the twenty-one-year-old Carteret assumed his seat in the House of Lords, starting his parliamentary career, due to his royalist ancestry, as a Tory. Swift became a mentor to the younger man, and, to an extent given Carteret had lost his father in infancy, a father-figure. In 1714, Swift had departed for Ireland and over the ensuing years Carteret, now a Whig, served terms as Ambassador-Extraordinary to Sweden and England's Secretary of State for the South. Accordingly, by 1724 there had been no communication between Carteret and Swift for a decade, but after Carteret's appointment to the vice-regal office, Swift wrote to him with a letter that became the first in an important exchange of correspondence between them.

Dated 28 April, Swift's first letter told Carteret what was expected of him in relation to Wood's patent and enclosed copies of two of the current publications on the matter, including his own *Letter to the Shop-keepers*, which he described as 'entitled to a Weaver, and suited to the vulgar, but thought to be the work of a better hand'.⁴³ Piqued by this letter, Carteret did not reply, so Swift wrote to him again in a letter dated 9 June,⁴⁴ upbraiding him for not having answered his first letter. At this point, Carteret, as he would do again on subsequent occasions, succumbed to the pressure from Swift. With a letter dated 20 June,⁴⁵ Carteret said he hoped their friendship was unharmed and, with respect to Wood's patent, went a long way to saying what Swift wanted to hear when he said that he was conscious of Ireland's aversion to it and hoped he would be able to contribute to the nation's happiness. Content with this reply from the incoming Lord Lieutenant, Swift, in a letter dated 9 July,⁴⁶ confessed himself to have been a 'bully' and assured Carteret that he was a person whose qualities would quickly win the kingdom over. Then, although Swift had said there was no need to, Carteret replied again with a short letter dated 4 August. He reciprocated Swift's warmth and concluded:

I am not altogether insensible of the force of that Genius, wth has outshone most of this age, & when You will display it again, can convince us that its lustre & strength are still the same. Once more I commit myself to Yr censure and am S^r wth great respect. Yr most affectionate humble servant. Carteret.⁴⁷

This was a mistake on Carteret's part. He yielded to Swift's paternalistic affection and ceded authority in what for all effects and purposes was an invitation to Swift to exercise his genius once more.

Swift planned accordingly. He prepared a fourth *Letter* entitled *A Letter to the Whole People of Ireland. By M.B. Drapier*. Whether this was more seditious than the previous three, as has always been said, is debatable. The real danger with it lay in its personal provocation to Carteret. In the *Letter*, Swift introduced Carteret to his readers as essentially a well-mannered young man from whom they could expect no trouble. Then, knowing from newspaper reports the details of Carteret's journey to Ireland, Swift co-ordinated with Harding to have it published hours before the docking of Carteret's ship in the Liffey. As such, with the *Letter* published on Wednesday 21 October, Dubliners had it in their hands as the ship docked the next morning and as the Lord Lieutenant was escorted through the streets with a military regiment.⁴⁸ Copies were being sold by Harding even within the gates of Dublin Castle during the swearing-in ceremony.⁴⁹

Swift can only have known that Carteret would respond in some manner but probably envisioned nothing worse than the 'standard' prosecution whereby the printer was arrested and imprisoned briefly, with no prospect of the author being affected. Swift's actions, however, were too much of an affront to the incoming Lord Lieutenant and Carteret responded in a way that Swift did not foresee. Having consulted other leaders who confirmed him in his opinion that the pamphlet was seditious and possibly treasonous, Carteret summoned a meeting of the Irish Privy Council for the coming Tuesday, 27 October, with the intention of issuing a royal Proclamation offering a reward for the discovery of the author. It was a measure which, if the reward was to be claimed by someone with knowledge of Swift's authorship, would bring Swift before the court to potentially face a charge of treason. Swift was given advance notice of Carteret's intention to summon this meeting and issue this Proclamation and reward. It was on Friday, 23 October, that Carteret formulated his decision and called the meeting for the subsequent Tuesday. This information was 'leaked' to Swift that same day, the Friday.

Swift hunkered down immediately to write a *Letter* of defence. It was a *Letter* he initially intended to have printed and in the hands of the Privy Councillors themselves ahead of the meeting. Addressed to Lord Chancellor Midleton, the *Letter* argued for the innocence of everything he had written previously and endeavoured to persuade the Privy Councillors that this was *not* an affair of state. In his uncertainty, however, he held this *Letter* back and the meeting on Tuesday 27 October proceeded without his intervention. That meeting was an all-day event. According to one person present, Carteret 'harangued' the Privy Councillors as to the identity of M.B. Drapier but, in farcical scenes, all of them feigned ignorance,⁵⁰ and with the author thereby continuing 'unknown', Carteret's proposed Proclamation was passed. In order not to dampen public opposition to the patent, the Proclamation was directed only against certain paragraphs, which were not specified, rather than the publication as a whole, but it declared these paragraphs to be seditious⁵¹ and offered a reward of £300 to any person with evidence of the identity of the author, with this reward to remain open for six months from the date of the Proclamation, through to 26 April 1725. The meeting also directed the Chief Justice of the King's Bench, William Whitshed, to prosecute the publication for sedition, with this prosecution to be directed in the first instance against the printer whose name and place of business appeared on the title page.

This King's Bench prosecution was instigated immediately. The messengers came to Molesworth's court that same evening, but Harding, clearly fearing for his life, had fled.⁵² As a consequence, the messengers arrested his wife instead,⁵³ taking her effectively as ransom. Never before in a prosecution for sedition in Ireland was a wife known to have been taken in her husband's stead.⁵⁴ She seems to have remained in prison until Saturday 7 November, when her husband would eventually be arrested. Thomas Sheridan would later describe the respective imprisonments of Sarah and John Harding as 'iniquitous',⁵⁵ and Sarah Harding would say of the prosecution that 'she suffer'd by it much shame, and Disgrace',⁵⁶ although what this signifies

about Sarah Harding's imprisonment is uncertain. Maybe she was subjected to indignities by the jailors.

From the time of the onset of this prosecution, however, John Harding was at large and, theoretically at least, able to save himself by informing on Swift. As indicated already, Harding was never going to do this. Swift was worshipped in Ireland at the time, and, indeed, the irony is that Harding would have put his personal safety more in jeopardy by betraying Swift, than not. Nonetheless, under the law at the time, by informing on Swift, Harding was able to acquire immunity from prosecution.⁵⁷

2. October 1724 – April 1725: the crime

In commentary on events from this point, it has always been assumed that Swift was without fear. Swift promoted this self-image himself. 'I was no further affected with *their Proclamation*, and subsequent Proceedings, than a good Clergyman is with the *Sins* of the People', he wrote as the Drapier the following year, whilst maintaining, 'I will suffer the most ignominious and torturing Death, rather than submit to receive this *accursed Coin*'.⁵⁸ He portrayed himself as the unflinching champion of the Irish people and, given what he had wrought as the Drapier, it was also how the people *wanted* to see him. It was an image that complemented the glory of the triumph in the episode of the halfpence and which preserved the reputation of Swift as a person of noble character. It was an image, therefore, that acquired an instant place in Irish folklore. Contemporaneous songs celebrated him as Ireland's stoic warrior⁵⁹ and, for the rest of his days, Swift furthered the same vainglorious perception. 'For her [Liberty] he stood prepar'd to die/ For her he boldly stood alone/ For her he oft expos'd his own', he declared in his *Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift* in 1731,⁶⁰ and in the epitaph he composed for himself, which remains carved in stone on the walls of St Patrick's Cathedral to this day, he challenged posterity to emulate him.

It was with this form of instantaneous mythologising that the truth concerning Swift and Harding was obscured from the beginning. Nor did that truth have any real chance of being rediscovered in the future, for throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries it was driven further underground by an avalanche of biographies and histories, almost all of which are deferential to Swift and hagiographical in tone. It is a truth, however, that can still be seen. To see it, it is necessary to make just one simple adjustment. The assumption that Swift was without fear for himself during the events of this prosecution needs to be set to one side. Once that is done, and consideration is given to the small number of people who were in a position to inform on Swift if they were of a mind to, the truth becomes apparent and the events of the period are seen for what they logically are.

On 27 October, then, a Proclamation was issued offering a reward of £300 for evidence leading to the discovery of the author. This reward, which required direct, first-hand evidence of Swift's authorship of the fourth *Letter*, was only open to a few potential claimants. These may have included one or two of his friends, such as Thomas Sheridan or John Worrall, who might have been personally privy to his work as the Drapier. Certainly Swift's valet, Robert Blakely, who acted as his amanuensis for all of the *Letters*, transcribing them to ensure that the manuscripts were sent to Harding's shop in Blakely's hand, not Swift's, was a potential claimant. So too was his printer, John Harding, with whom Swift had worked for three-and-a-half years by this time.

As for people such as Sheridan and Worrall, Swift had no concern. They were friends and confidantes whom he could trust. His valet and amanuensis, Blakely, was another he could trust. However, on the night of 27 October, following the issuing of the Proclamation and

reward earlier that day, an incident involving Blakely reveals Swift's fraught state of mind. That afternoon, Blakely absented himself from the deanery without obtaining leave and upon the evening hour, when all household members were to be in, and Blakely had not returned, an enraged Swift locked the gates on him. Throughout the evening Swift's friends did what they could to reason with him but, according to Swift's cousin and biographer, Deane Swift, the following day when Blakely showed himself:

The Doctor [Swift] fell upon him with outrageous severity, ordered him to strip off his livery and get out of the house directly: You villain, said the Doctor, I know I am in your power, and for that single reason I will the less bear with your insolence or your neglect: I suppose by this time you are rewarded, or at least in a fair way of being rewarded for your treachery. The servant, although he confessed that he had been drinking all night, protested and swore to his innocency, and begged to be confined a prisoner in the house for so long as the proclamation could entitle him to any reward for betraying his master, lest poverty or some other temptation might force him to an action which his soul abhorred.⁶¹

As Swift's friends afterwards gently intimated to him, Blakely was loyal and Swift's outburst on this occasion was not wholly rational.⁶² What this incident clearly demonstrates, however, is that Swift's fear of being informed upon and brought before the court was acute. It is to be noted, too, that the expression 'in your power,' which is attributed to Swift in this passage, testifies to the veracity of the incident as described by Deane Swift, for, as will be seen, Swift from this point would use this same expression repeatedly when referring to his concerns about people who had it 'in their power' to bring him to a legal account.

But then, what about the printer, John Harding? At the time of this incident with Blakely, Harding was in hiding and he too had Swift in his power. Was Swift anxious with regard to the possibility of Harding informing on him to claim the reward? Remarkably, this is a possibility that has never occurred to anyone. Historians of the period and biographers of Swift have all overlooked the fact that Harding was in a position to inform on Swift, should he had elected to do so. Consider for example the statement from Deane Swift, that 'there was but one person (for his intimates are not to be thought on upon such an occasion) that could have informed upon him'.⁶³ He was referring to Blakely. It never occurred to Deane Swift nor any other commentator that Swift could harbour such a concern with respect to Harding. Swift was perceived as someone who struck fear into the hearts of others, not someone susceptible to fears himself, particularly one as base as this concerning a tradesman. Yet, as evidenced by the Blakely incident and further events to be seen, this was precisely Swift's fear. It was a fear that, although unfounded, was afforded a degree of rationality by Harding's known lawlessness and reputation around Dublin as the stationer to go to for illegal printing services. If anyone was going to break the bond of loyalty, Swift would have thought in the state of mind he was in at the time, it would be Harding. And three years earlier, as already seen, his opponents in the controversy of the national bank had warned him of it. But still, no commentator has remotely suspected that such a tremulous thought, one so at odds with his print persona, could find a place in Swift's mind. No one has ever imagined that a person such as Harding could have had such a hold over him.

As mentioned, soon after Carteret formed an intention to call a meeting of the Privy Council with a view to issuing a Proclamation, someone, seemingly Lord Chancellor Midleton, alerted Swift to the fact. Swift was informed of this on the Friday, 23 October, four days ahead of the meeting, which took place on the Tuesday, 27 October. Swift did not foresee this turn of events. He never anticipated that the young Lord Lieutenant, his junior colleague in the Tory administration in London between 1711 and 1714, would exercise the full weight of his vicegeral

powers in this way. Suddenly Swift was only one step away from being brought to account. If someone with evidence of his authorship was to come forward and claim the reward, Swift would be brought either before the Court of King's Bench to answer to a charge of sedition or before the House of Lords to face a charge of treason.

His instinctive reaction was to write again. He wrote a *Letter* which was personally addressed to Middleton but which was intended for reading by all of Ireland. It was a letter of explanation and defence and one in which he was intending to put his own name to, in this way, if he was to have it published, coming forward in person to face the legal consequences. This was an honourable intention, or so it seemed on the face of it. Like the *Letters* written as the Drapier, it was written in an assured and authoritative tone. On this occasion, though, that tone camouflaged the fact that the defences he offered were weak⁶⁴ and belied the precariousness of the position he found himself in. The initial version of this *Letter to Middleton* was dated 26 October, which suggests he was contemplating having printed copies in the hands of the Privy Councillors ahead of the meeting. He decided against this, probably out of a concern that such an action could make his predicament worse, yet his prevarication with this *Letter* continued through the subsequent days as he added further to it.

In coming forward by publishing this *Letter to Middleton*, Swift's concern was whether he could do so safely. As he said in the one line of the *Letter to Middleton* which acknowledges the truth of his predicament: 'Neither is this an Affair of State, until Authority think fit to declare it so: Or if you should understand it in that Sense'.⁶⁵ He was hoping he would only have to answer to a charge of sedition in the Court of King's Bench, for although this would bring him before the unpredictable Chief Justice Whitshed, whose determination to secure outcomes favourable to the Crown was well-known, he would come before a Grand Jury of his countrymen, who would do everything they could to protect him. If, on the other hand, the matter was declared an affair of state, he would have to answer to the House of Lords, where he had no shortage of enemies and where his liberty and life would be at risk.

Three days after the issuing of the Proclamation and with the impasse between himself and Carteret ongoing, Archbishop King paid a visit to the Castle on Swift's behalf. Twentieth-century scholar Herbert Davis attempted to cover for Swift on this, saying that it was Swift's friends, not Swift himself, who arranged this visit by the Archbishop.⁶⁶ The implication from Davis is that Swift's friends were acting out of concern for his welfare and that Swift himself was impervious to fear. This, however, is the same old mistaken assumption. This errand, clearly, was made at Swift's request. The Archbishop's brief was to probe Carteret's mind and in particular to endeavour to discover whether Carteret considered it an affair of state. The day after this visit by the Archbishop, Carteret reported to Westminster:

I yesterday receiv'd a visit from the Archbishop of Dublin who after discoursing of the affairs of this Kingdom in a very extraordinary manner acquainted me that the person who wrote the Pamphlet mention'd in the order of Council and the Proclamation which I transmitted to your Grace in my letter of the 28th had some thoughts of owning and even declaring himself to be the author of it: The Archbishop added, that he believ'd in the present conjuncture the author might safely put himself upon his country, and stand his tryall, since it was generally understood that his crime was writing against the half pence. I told His Grace, if he wou'd know my opinion it was this: that no man in the Kingdom how great and considerable soever he might think himself was of weight enough to stand a matter of this nature; but if the author desir'd to have the glory of taking it upon himself, he wou'd do well to apply to the Chief Justice of the King's bench. I told him further that the Libel contain'd such seditious and in my treasonable

matter as call'd upon a Chief Governour here to exert his utmost power in bringing the author of it to justice.

The event of this is uncertain; but I must acquaint Your Grace, and beg you will lay it before the King, that if the boldness of this author shou'd be so great as the Archbishop intimates, I am fully determin'd to summon him before the Council, and tho' I should not be supported by them as I cou'd wish, yet I shall think it my duty to order his being taken into custody, and to detain him if I can by law, till His Majestyes pleasure shall be further signified to me, for if his offer of bail shou'd be immediately accepted and he forthwith set at liberty, after so daring an insult upon His Majestyes government, it is to be apprehended that riots and tumults will ensue; and that ill dispos'd persons will run after this author and represent him to be the defender of their libertyes, which the people are falsely made to believe are attack'd in this affaire of the half pence.⁶⁷

All of this was relayed back to Swift by the Archbishop. Carteret's determination to bring Swift to account, it seems, knew no bounds. In this letter to Westminster, Carteret also explained that other Irish leaders supported him in his opinions and stated what all of Ireland and England knew: 'Tis the general opinion here, that Doctor Swift is author of the pamphlet, and yet nobody thinks it can be prov'd upon him: tho' many believe he will be spirited to own it'.

On Saturday 7 November, more than a week after the Archbishop's errand, Harding was arrested. As Carteret reported to Westminster the following day, 'my Lord Chief Justice Whitshed told me that John Harding printer of the Libel against which a Proclamation has been issued, & who has absconded ever since, was taken yesterday into custody by his warrant'.⁶⁸ It follows that Harding had been in hiding for eleven days, from Tuesday 27 October to Saturday 7 November. During those eleven days he could have saved himself at any stage by informing on Swift. If he had done this, he could have claimed the reward of £300 and acquired immunity from prosecution. However, he chose not to take this course of action. Instead, given that his wife Sarah had been imprisoned in his place, which he is sure to have been aware of whilst in hiding, he probably handed himself in. This ensured his wife's release whilst putting his own liberty, and possibly his life, in jeopardy. Upon his arrest, Harding was immediately brought before Chief Justice Whitshed for a procedure known as the Preliminary Examination.⁶⁹ Indeed, Sarah Harding had also been subjected to a Preliminary Examination before Whitshed when she was arrested on 27 October. These respective Preliminary Examinations were occasions at which Sarah and John Harding could have divulged the identity of the author, but they lied on oath, insisting that, unlike every other man, woman and child in Ireland at the time, they had no knowledge of the identity of this 'M.B. Drapier'.⁷⁰

It was upon Harding's arrest on 7 November that Swift decided against coming forward as the author by publishing his *Letter to Middleton*. Again, the evidence for this decision on Swift's part is provided by Carteret. In his short letter to Westminster of 8 November where he reported the arrest of Harding, he concluded, 'The author's designs of owning himself seems to be laid aside'.⁷¹ Carteret then repeated the same message with greater clarity in a letter to Westminster six days later: 'I acquainted your grace in my letter of the 8th that the author's design of owning himself seemed to be laid aside, which I believe I may now say with certainty, since the printer is spirited up to stand the prosecution, and hitherto persists in concealing the author'.⁷²

Before discussing what for present purposes is the most relevant aspect of this decision by Swift, it is to be noted that the *Letter to Middleton* did not amount to an admission of authorship of the *Letters* of the Drapier anyway. Instead of putting his name to it, Swift signed it 'JS. Deany House'. Then, throughout the *Letter*, Swift marks a distinction between himself and the Drapier, at no stage presenting an association between the two, much less a direct acknowledgement that

he is the person who writes under that pseudonym. The only scholar who has noted that this *Letter* is not an admission of authorship of the work of the Drapier is John Middleton Murry. Avowing his authorship is ‘precisely what he does not do in the *Letter to Middleton*’, says Middleton Murry, and, ‘There was nothing in the *Letter to Middleton* which could possibly have justified legal proceedings against Swift as the author of the fourth *Letter*’.⁷³ It follows that, even if he did come forward by publishing the *Letter*, which he did not, that *Letter* was crafted in such a way as to leave him with another escape route.

Then, another unheroic aspect of Swift’s conduct in relation to this *Letter to Middleton* is seen eleven years later when the *Letter* was published for the first time in the inaugural edition of Swift’s career *Works* which was compiled and published by George Faulkner. In this 1735 edition, the *Letter to Middleton* was prefaced by an ‘Advertisement to the Reader’ which, as observed by Herbert Davis, was either written by Swift or overseen by him. This Advertisement says of the *Letter*, ‘I can tell no other Reason why it was not printed, than what I have heard; that the Writer finding how effectually the Drapier had succeeded, and at the same time how highly the People in Power seemed to be displeased, thought it more prudent to keep the Paper in his Cabinet.’⁷⁴ Swift says here he does not know why the *Letter* was not printed in November 1724, but Carteret, in his letters to Westminster written at that earlier time, stated clearly that the reason Swift withheld it from publication was because Harding had been arrested and was going to meet the prosecution himself. It follows that, in this Advertisement in 1735, Swift was feigning forgetfulness of his reason for holding the *Letter* back. The true reason is that he had only ever contemplated coming forward in person because he was fearful that Harding would betray him and wanted to avoid the ignominy of being drawn out first by his printer. Ironically, scholars have praised the nobility and courage of Swift for his intention to come forward.⁷⁵ There was nothing noble or courageous about it at all. The honourable thing to do would have been to meet the prosecution jointly and in solidarity with his printer. Instead, Swift remained behind his shield of pseudonymity and left Harding to fare for himself.⁷⁶

For now, however, the most relevant aspect of Swift’s decision not to publish his *Letter to Middleton* because Harding had been arrested is that this was reported to Westminster by Carteret in his letters of 8 and 14 November. Carteret, therefore, was aware not only that Swift had decided not to come forward but also the reason for that decision. How did Carteret come to have this knowledge? Was it simply a case of the news of Swift’s change of heart circulating around the town and reaching Carteret’s ears? Or had Carteret and Swift resumed direct communications? As already seen, Carteret had difficulty maintaining authority over Swift, always preferring to yield. Following the affront given by Swift with his fourth *Letter* as the Drapier, Carteret had taken the necessary action, issuing a Proclamation and directing that a prosecution be issued out of the Court of King’s Bench, in this way ensuring an impasse between the Lord Lieutenant and his old Tory colleague. But had he since weakened? It would not have been difficult for he and Swift to have secretly reopened a line of communication. Packages could have been delivered by messenger between the castle and the deanery with no risk of interception. Even secret meetings would have been relatively easy to arrange. It is conceivable that such communications might have started after the visit to the castle by the Archbishop on 30 October, when Carteret gave the Archbishop information which he knew was to be passed back to Swift. With this relay of information, potentially, Carteret’s resolve with respect to Swift came to an end.

Another matter suggesting that Carteret and Swift had re-established communication relates to a shortcoming in Swift’s reasoning for not coming forward. According to Carteret, Swift had withheld the *Letter to Middleton* because, with Harding now in custody, the printer was unable to volunteer his evidence of Swift’s authorship and claim the reward. However, the

'Harding threat' was not averted simply because the printer was now in Dublin's Newgate prison. Having been arrested on Saturday 7 November, Harding was now due to appear in the Court of King's Bench the following Saturday, 14 November. Here he would come before Chief Justice William Whitshed who, as he had with Edward Waters four years earlier, would disregard legal principle and procedure in order to secure an outcome favourable to the Crown.⁷⁷ This was the danger now confronting Swift. In the Court of King's Bench, the fear was not that Harding would betray him voluntarily but that an admission of knowledge of his authorship would be forced from Harding by Whitshed. Indeed, the 'Harding threat' did not even end with the King's Bench proceedings, for the reward pursuant to the Proclamation was valid for six months, through to 26 April 1725. As such, even after the court proceeding was over, Harding, if he was not in prison, would still be in a position to betray Swift, if he was of a mind to.⁷⁸ Accordingly, given these dangers that lay ahead for Swift, his decision not to come forward only makes sense if he had obtained knowledge that Harding would in fact pose no threat to him in the King's Bench proceeding or, indeed, thereafter. His decision can be seen as logical, that is, only if he had received some kind of assurance that Harding would not have *any* future opportunity to betray him.

Subsequent events leave little doubt that Carteret and Swift had indeed been communicating again. During the afternoon and evening of Friday 13 November, the eve of Harding's court appearance, a printed document was circulated around the town and brought to the attention of Ireland's leaders, including Carteret. It had no author's name, whether real or pseudonymous, but it was written by Swift, as everyone knew. Entitled *Seasonable Advice* with a long sub-title, and subsequently known as *Seasonable Advice to the Grand-Jury*,⁷⁹ it was the most lawless piece of writing Swift had yet produced in this episode of the halfpence. In this document, he was telling the twenty-three members Grand Jury what to do. The document consisted of six paragraphs and a short concluding fable. Throughout the first four paragraphs, Swift defends the fourth *Letter* in various ways, saying that in terms of its legality it was no different to the first three, all of which had been published without incident, before instructing the Grand Jury that they must not find the bill of indictment against the printer. The document was printed in a small font all on one sheet but carried no printer's imprint of any kind.

It is to be observed that, with *Seasonable Advice to the Grand-Jury*, the fear that had racked Swift from the time he had been given advance notice of Carteret's intention to issue a Proclamation was suddenly gone. The dire message relayed back to him by the Archbishop on 30 October now meant nothing. He was back to his treasonous best, and Carteret, for his part, had retreated. In his letter to Westminster of 31 October, Carteret had implied that he would leave no stone unturned in his efforts to prosecute the author, and if ever there was a reason to act on that intention, by using his powers to summon Swift for interrogation, it was upon the printing and distribution of this *Seasonable Advice to the Grand-Jury*. But he did nothing.⁸⁰ These circumstances indicate that Swift and Carteret had come to an agreement of some kind.

Then, the following morning, just hours before the commencement of the King's Bench proceeding against Harding, Carteret directed the Court to prosecute the new document, *Seasonable Advice to the Grand-Jury*, instead of the fourth *Letter* of the Drapier. The case against the fourth *Letter* of the Drapier would now be postponed until after this new case was decided. This was a nonsensical decision from Carteret insofar as the *Seasonable Advice to the Grand-Jury* document had no known author or printer and, as such, a prosecution of it could lead nowhere. Even the holder of the highest legal office in the kingdom, Lord Chancellor Midleton, could not understand the decision. Writing to his brother three days later, he said:

Just now a very sober man of good fortune, and well affected to his [Carteret's] good fortune and government, expressed a good deal of surprize, that no bill of indictment

had been drawn against Harding, the printer, and seemed to hint, if that had been done, it is possible the bill might have been found, which would have shewn how little influence the “*Seasonable Advice*” had on the minds of the jurors; and indeed it is pretty unaccountable to me, why that hath not been done all this time, if there be sufficient for finding the bill; and this would have put the offence of printing into a legal examination.⁸¹

Both Midleton and the person he spoke to were at a loss as to why Carteret had decided not to proceed against the printer. The possibility that he was manipulating the proceeding to protect Swift never occurred to them. Nor has any commentator since been able to accurately explain Carteret’s actions with *Seasonable Advice to the Grand-Jury*. Commentators have suspected that Carteret was using his office to manipulate the proceeding in some way, but have not seen through to Carteret’s true motive. Oliver Ferguson, Irvin Ehrenpreis and Sabine Baltes, for instance, all correctly suspect that Carteret was protecting Swift but assume that the protection took the form only of keeping Swift’s *publication* out of court.⁸² With the exception of Ferguson, Harding does not enter into their thinking. As for Ferguson, he says Carteret’s decision was to Harding’s *benefit* in that it ensured he would not be convicted. Again, all of these commentators overlook Swift’s fear. Carteret’s decision to redirect the Court’s attention to *Seasonable Advice to the Grand-Jury* was not first and foremost about keeping Swift’s publication out of court and was not remotely about Harding’s welfare. As seen by joining the dots from all of the preceding circumstances, the motive for Carteret’s decision was to keep Harding from coming into Court, where he would have faced interrogation from Chief Justice Whitshed.

The indications are that Carteret and Swift were acting in concert and had contrived a detailed plan with regard to the composition, printing and distribution of the *Seasonable Advice to the Grand-Jury* document. Assuming that their communications recommenced soon after the visit to the Castle by the Archbishop on 30 October, they had ample time to devise this plan. It involved the creation of a flagrantly unlawful document which carried no printer’s imprint or authorial statement of any kind. Important, too, was the timing. It was circulated around the town throughout the afternoon before the scheduled hearing, in this way ‘forcing’ Carteret into a ‘rushed’ decision to switch the court’s attention to this document, with no opportunity for the decision to be scrutinised by other leaders in the time available. It was a plan that hoodwinked everyone, including Midleton and Whitshed. The creation of such a plan, too, drew directly on Carteret’s strength. Earlier in his career, as an Ambassador and Secretary of State, he had orchestrated intricate settlements between rival European monarchs, employing deft tactics with occasional sleight of hand.⁸³ He has also been described as being adept at the ‘double game’ and having ‘brilliancy of conception’.⁸⁴

Internal evidence from the text of *Seasonable Advice to the Grand-Jury* also indicates that the document had been contrived by Carteret and Swift. This internal evidence is associated with Whitshed, the man, incidentally, whom Swift would afterwards blame for Harding’s death.⁸⁵ At the time of these King’s Bench proceedings, Whitshed’s determination to be of service to the Crown was never greater. He wanted the author as first prize, the printer as second prize, or ideally both. Any decision from Carteret to divert the Court’s attention away from the fourth *Letter* of the Drapier, therefore, was going to be difficult to justify to the Chief Justice. Consider, therefore, the fifth paragraph of *Seasonable Advice to the Grand-Jury*. The preceding paragraphs had been defensive as they sought to clarify that the fourth *Letter* was innocent and that no harm had been intended by it. In this fifth paragraph, however, Swift went on the offensive:

The fifth thing to be considered, is, that the Members of the Grand *Jury* being Merchants, and Principal Shop-Keepers, can have no *Suitable Temptation* offer’d them, as a Recompence for the Mischief they will suffer by letting in this Coyn, nor can be at any

Loss or Danger by rejecting the *Bill*: They do not expect any *Employments* in the *State*, to make up in their own private Advantage, the Destruction of their Country. Whereas those who go about to *Advise, Entice, or Threaten* them to find that *Bill*, have great Employments, which they have a mind to keep, or get *greater*, which was likewise the Case of all those who *Sign'd* to have the Author Prosecuted.

Whitshed is libelled as someone seeking to use the case for his own personal advancement. So too, incidentally, is Lord Chancellor Midleton, who said as much in a letter to his brother soon afterwards.⁸⁶ It was with Whitshed in mind, however, that this anomalous fifth paragraph was crafted. Whitshed of course had no option but to obey the direction from his Lord Lieutenant anyway but this fifth paragraph has the appearance of having been designed by Carteret and Swift to placate to him in that decision. This is further evidenced by the fact that the charge brought against *Seasonable Advice to the Grand-Jury* was not ‘embracery of the jury’, which clearly it should have been,⁸⁷ but seditious libel with reference to the offence aimed at Whitshed in that one specific paragraph.

Even the conclusion of *Seasonable Advice to the Grand-Jury* is suggestive of collusion between Carteret and Swift in the preparation of the document. ‘I will conclude all with a Fable, ascrib’d to Demosthenes’, Swift wrote. The fable was one that Demosthenes, the Greek patriot, had told the people of Athens upon his apprehending that he was to be turned over to his enemies. The wolves desired a league with the shepherds, Demosthenes had said, only for the wolves to then make havoc of the sheep. Swift relayed this seemingly as a warning to the people of Ireland not to betray their champion orator. The issue pertaining to communications between Swift and Carteret, however, is that Swift is never known to have referred to Demosthenes before this time, whilst for Carteret, the two scholarly studies of his life were Homer and, in particular, Demosthenes.⁸⁸ Indeed, Carteret remained a devotee of the works of Demosthenes through to his last days. It seems too much of a coincidence, then, that Swift should reference Demosthenes in this particular document at this particular time. His doing so suggests that in the course of their communications, Carteret, with his customary obsequiousness, had compared Swift to Demosthenes and had mentioned this fable, with Swift then giving Carteret a nod by referencing the fable in the document itself.

On Saturday 14 November, then, no case came before the court. Due to the decision to switch to *Seasonable Advice to the Grand-Jury* being made so late, leaving no time for preparation by the court or the government’s prosecutors, the hearing was deferred until the following Saturday, 21 November, which was only one week before the end of Michaelmas Term on 28 November. It followed that there was minimal chance that the case against Harding would come before the Court that Law Term, as indeed eventuated. A further consequence was that, pursuant to a rule that prisoners who had had no indictment brought against them in legal form were to be released at the end of the Law Term,⁸⁹ Harding would now be released on Saturday 28 November, three weeks after his arrest. This, too, eventuated.

During the course of this three-week imprisonment, Swift engaged in two acts of purported kindness towards his printer. First, there is evidence that Swift supported Harding by sending him money to help him pay the jailors for food and water. This can be inferred from a comment Swift made in the course of his fifth *Letter* as the Drapier, *A Letter to the Right Honourable the Lord Viscount Molesworth*, which would be published on 31 December. In this *Letter*, Swift extols Molesworth as a man whose political principles and skills as a writer were superior even to his own, with the consequence that, ‘if ever I shall be discovered, I think you will be bound in Honour to pay my Fine, and support me in Prison; or else I may chance to *Inform* against you by Way of *Reprisal*’.⁹⁰ Swift here analogises an imagined scenario involving himself

with the actual events that befell his printer. The analogy reveals, however, that he only gave money to Harding in order to lessen the possibility of him having an animus to inform on him.⁹¹ Swift's comment is also a further proof, if any was needed, of his fear that Harding would betray him. The second supposed act of kindness by Swift was his sending a note to Harding to tell him he would soon be going home. The fact that Swift did this is given to us by Harding's widow in the course of this stanza from her poem of 1726:

To hearten him, the DRAPIER sent to him in Jail,
 To tell him, he'd quickly get home to his Wife;
 But, scarce cou'd he find one, to stand for his Bail,
 Which struck to his Heart, and depriv'd him of Life.⁹²

When Harding would come home on 28 November, however, he would not be the same man.

As is also revealed by Sarah Harding in this stanza, Harding had been hoping if not expecting to be bailed. This expectation was indeed a reasonable one on Harding's part given the risks he had shouldered on behalf of the Drapier and the country, and the person who should have bailed him, of course, was Swift, just as he had bailed Waters four years earlier.⁹³ On this occasion, though, Harding was left to languish in prison, which seems to have been a part of the plan devised by Carteret and Swift.

What was that plan exactly? As mentioned, it was one that appears to have been made in the course of detailed written communications between the castle and the deanery, with all papers, once carefully read, burnt. They might also have discreetly met in person. Their first objective was to keep Harding from appearing in Whitshed's court in order to eliminate the risk of his being compelled to divulge Swift's identity. This was done with *Seasonable Advice to the Grand-Jury*. It was also necessary to keep Harding in prison, where he could not voluntarily offer evidence and claim the reward, for as long as possible. This was done with *Seasonable Advice to the Grand-Jury* and by not bailing him. But a problem lay ahead. As his case had not come before the Court, Harding would necessarily be released on Saturday 28 November. By keeping him in prison and out of Whitshed's courtroom, then, Carteret and Swift had bought some time. Carteret might even have been hoping for an intervening event that would save the situation, such as the withdrawal of the patent by the Crown and the annulment of the prosecution and the Proclamation.⁹⁴ But in the absence of such an event, what was planned for the protection of Swift upon Harding's release on Saturday 28 November? The answer is self-evident. Carteret was prepared to give a direction to the jailors for Harding to be incapacitated. This aspect of the plan would never have been expressly communicated between Swift and Carteret. Swift would only have made his concerns clear and Carteret would have said no more than that he had the matter in hand. The intention, though, is clear. For the second time, someone was saving Swift's bacon, this time in a far more dire manner.

On Saturday 21 November, the hearing concerning *Seasonable Advice to the Grand-Jury* proceeded. However, when the Grand Jury returned from its deliberations and told Whitshed that they would not find the bill of indictment, Whitshed discharged them from their duty. In the trial of Waters in 1720 he had ordered the petty jury to reconsider its 'not guilty' verdict on nine occasions before ordering a retrial. On this occasion, in November 1724, he took the more direct route of dismissing them on the spot upon their refusal to find the bill. Whether this action by the Chief Justice was lawful is not certain. There was a precedent for a judge dismissing a Grand Jury whilst the matter before the court was still under consideration. This was in 1680 in London when Justice Scroggs had dismissed the Grand Jury in the case of Carr II for not receiving a presentment against the Duke of York.⁹⁵ As this was a controversial move by Scroggs, it was met

with a resolution in the English House of Lords declaring the practice of dismissing a Grand Jury whilst the matter before it was still under deliberation to be unlawful. It is to be noted that this was an *English* resolution and whether it was binding in Ireland, where judges held office at the pleasure of the Crown, was not clear. This, however, did not stop Swift. Within a few days of Whitshed's dismissal of the Grand Jury, his lawyer friends had discovered this 1680 resolution of the English House of Lords and had arranged for it to be printed and circulated around the town.⁹⁶ It was another display of contempt for the Court of King's Bench and another action which the Lord Lieutenant saw fit to let pass.

Then, the following Saturday, 28 November, a hearing to find the bill against *Seasonable Advice to the Grand-Jury* took place before a new Grand Jury. In advance of the hearing, Swift prepared a 'Presentment of the Grand Jury of the County of the City of Dublin'. It was a statement of three paragraphs which purported to make a formal 'Presentment' of any person who had attempted to introduce the halfpence and it declared those persons to be enemies of the kingdom. In an act of high treason, the Foreman of the Grand Jury presented this document to Whitshed in court, presumably reading it aloud.⁹⁷ Carteret did no more than report that he believed the paper to have been prepared by 'a hand that has been employed before now with too much success in disturbing the peace of this kingdom'.⁹⁸

This same day, Saturday 28 November, Harding was released. He returned home in a deteriorated physical condition and would die life less than five months later. What had befallen him? In 1726, Sarah Harding said in her *Poem to the Whole People of Ireland* that he died of a broken heart for not having been bailed, but this is no more than a poetic euphemism. One possible cause of death is that Harding contracted jail fever, as has been assumed for almost three hundred years now. Counting against this possibility, though, is that Harding was young and prison-hardened, having endured a few imprisonments already including one of seven months from July 1723 to February 1724. The other possibility is that he had been beaten by the jailors, on orders from the castle, in such a way as to render him incapable of speaking or writing. Such a beating would have ensured that he would not be able to claim the reward pursuant to the Proclamation, which remained valid until 26 April 1725. This beating could have consisted of a brain injury or the physical mutilation of his tongue and hands. It is a horrific scenario that is consistent with Thomas Sheridan's 1728 description of Harding's imprisonment as 'iniquitous'⁹⁹ and also potentially Sarah Harding's description of the prosecution as one from which she suffered 'much shame, and Disgrace'.¹⁰⁰ If this is indeed what occurred, as the weight of evidence suggests, the brutal deed was probably carried out on the eve of Harding's release.

Another unusual thing happened on Saturday 28 November. Throughout 1724 Swift had not left Dublin, as he normally did each year on at least one occasion. Nor was there any need for him to leave Dublin in late November 1724. On the contrary, as he knew, the spirit of opposition against the patent was furthered by the knowledge of his presence in the town. But in the afternoon of Saturday 28 November, he left Dublin for the country estate of his friends, the Grattans, at Belcamp.¹⁰¹ Why did he do this? Could this have been another instance of Swift running from a situation in which he anticipated public hostility? It is certainly a coincidence that the day he left town was the very day of Harding's release. If it is *not* a coincidence, we are presented with the real possibility that Swift had advance knowledge of what was going to happen to Harding and made plans accordingly.

Swift spent three weeks at Belcamp, not returning to Dublin until about 18 December,¹⁰² and whilst at Belcamp he wrote his fifth *Letter* as the Drapier, his *Letter to Molesworth*. This would be published on 31 December, nearly two weeks after his return to Dublin. In preparing this *Letter*, one dilemma Swift faced was that another publication from him was the last thing the people of Ireland wanted or expected at this time. The sentiment throughout Dublin was that

Swift's work to that point, though of tremendous service, had already been more than enough.¹⁰³ However, Swift had a need to write again and, as would be revealed when the fifth *Letter* was published, devised a novel way to circumvent this issue of public resistance to him again appearing in print as the Drapier. He included with the fifth *Letter* a short preface entitled 'Directions to the Printer'. This purported to be a letter sent to the printer as an accompaniment to the manuscript of the principal *Letter to Molesworth*. It told Harding, amongst other things, that the enclosed *Letter* was a private one for Lord Molesworth but that Swift wanted it printed to make it easier for Molesworth to read, then Harding was to send it to Molesworth at his Brackdenstown address. As for whether this *Letter* was to be published for the people of Ireland, Swift, in this letter of 'Directions', leaves that up to Harding. However, this 'Directions to the Printer' was simply another of Swift's pantomimes, one which the people of Ireland were presumably expected to ascribe to the eccentricities of genius. As David Woolley has acknowledged, the intention all along was for 'Directions to the Printer' and the *Letter to Molesworth* to be published, and published together, as eventuated.¹⁰⁴ Indeed, it was essential for Swift that 'Directions to the Printer' be printed, and I will return to the subject of how this was done in a moment.

But 'Directions to the Printer' is significant for another reason. Allowing that Harding had suffered a horrific beating, as the evidence suggests, Swift would have feared that, once word of Harding's condition spread through the town, the people would suspect that what had been done to Harding had been done for Swift's own sake. Swift's concern, that is, would have been an assumption made by the people that Harding had been beaten in order to prevent him being able to inform on Swift. Such an assumption, which would have been a perfectly reasonable one to draw in the circumstances, would implicate Swift in the crime. An important matter, too, is that, upon the town's realisation of what had happened to Harding, no one was going to challenge Swift on it. Swift was the de facto monarch of the kingdom and, as such, what had happened to Harding, from the moment it became known, was taboo. Swift, however, in order to prevent any suspicions against him, was anxious to distance himself from what had happened to Harding and for that reason needed to find a way to let the people know that Harding had never had him *in his power*. He needed to demonstrate, that is, that Harding had never been in a position to identify him as the author. For, if Harding had never had Swift in his power, there can have been no motive for Harding to have been beaten for the sake of protecting Swift, from which it must follow that what had happened to Harding had had nothing to do with protecting Swift and cannot therefore have been done with his involvement. Accordingly, as Swift was at Belcamp preparing the *Letter to Molesworth* with its prefatory 'Directions to the Printer', he was wanting to illustrate that he and Harding had never worked together in person, had never so much as set eyes on each other, and that Harding had never had knowledge that the packages he was receiving were coming from the deanery of St. Patrick's. Here is the complete text of 'Directions to the Printer'.

Mr *Harding*,

When I sent you my former Papers, I cannot say I intended you either *Good* or *Hurt*, and yet you have happened through my Means to receive *Both*. I pray God deliver you from any more of the *Latter*, and increase the *Former*. Your Trade, particularly in this Kingdom, is of all others the most unfortunately Circumstantiated; For as you deal in the most worthless kind of Trash, the Penny Productions of Pennyless Scriblers, so you often venture your Liberty and sometimes your Lives, for the Purchase of Half a Crown, and by your own Ignorance are punished for other Mens Actions.

I am afraid, You in particular think you have Reason to complain of Me for your own and your Wife's Confinement in PRISON, to your great Expence, as well as Hardship, and for a Prosecution still impending. But I will tell you, Mr. *Harding*, how that Matter

stands. Since the Press hath layn under so strict an Inspection, those who have a Mind to inform the World are become so Cautious, as to keep themselves if possible out of the Way of Danger. My Custom is to Dictate to a 'Prentice who can write in a Feigned Hand, and what is written we send to your House by a Black-guard Boy. But at the same time I do assure you upon my Reputation, that I never did send you any thing, for which I thought you could possibly be called to an Account. And you will be my Witness that I always desired you by a Letter to take some good Advice before you ventured to Print, because I knew the *Dexterity of Dealers in the Law* at finding out something to Fasten on where no Evil is meant; I am told indeed, that you did accordingly consult several very able Persons; and even Some who afterwards *appeared against you*: To which I can only answer, that you must either change your Advisers, or determine to print nothing that comes from a *Drapier*.

I desire you will send the inclosed Letter, directed to my *Lord Viscount Molesworth* at his House at Brackdenstown *near Swords*; but I would have it sent *Printed* for the Convenience of His Lordship's Reading, because this Counterfeit Hand of my 'Prentice is not very legible. And if you think fit to Publish it, I would have you first get it Read over carefully by some *Notable Lawyer*: I am assured you will find enough of them who are Friends to the *Drapier*, and will do it without a Fee, which I am afraid you can ill afford after all your Expences. For although I have taken so much Care, that I think it impossible to find a Topick out of the following Papers for sending you again to Prison; Yet I will not venture to be your Guarantee.

This ensuing Letter contains only a short Account of my self, and an Humble Apology for my former Pamphlets, especially the Last, with little Mention of Mr. *Wood* or his *Half-pence*, because I have already said enough upon that Subject, until Occasion shall be given for *New Fears*; and in that Case you may perhaps hear from me again.

I am, Your Friend and Servant,

M.B.

From my shop in St. *Francis-street Dec. 14. 1724.*

P.S. For want of intercourse between You and Me, which I never will suffer, your People are apt to make very gross Errors in the Press, which I desire you will provide against.¹⁰⁵

To begin with, Swift's use of the word '*Hurr*' in the opening line is direct evidence that Harding had been physically injured whilst in prison, rather than struck by an illness, but despite this Swift has nothing but bombast for his printer. 'I will tell you, Mr. *Harding*, how that Matter stands...', and 'you will be my Witness...'. The fact is, fortunately for Swift, Harding was *incapable* of testifying as a witness at this time. But this 'Directions to the Printer' is a most uncomfortable piece of writing by Swift, and for a reason: he was trying to distance himself from a crime. It is an attempt, as if looking the other way, to say '*this was nothing to do with me*'. The details of the precautions that were taken in the delivery of the manuscripts to Harding's shop, which have nothing at all to do with 'Directions', were written for the people to believe that he and Harding had never had direct dealings. When he refers to 'my Reputation' he is doing so by way of defence. Even Swift's claim that he always told Harding to obtain his own legal advice is an act of deflecting blame. And the awful post-script, of course, is designed to say that the two of them had never met in person. All as part of the flow of supposed 'Directions', Swift inserted messages intended to ward off the possibility of an accusation against him. This was the purpose of 'Directions to the Printer': to convey an impression that Harding had never had him in his power. With Harding never having had Swift in his power, the crime cannot have been committed on Swift's behalf, or for his sake, or with his involvement, for there can have been no motive. Swift needed to send this message out to Ireland. This is why he went to such lengths to write again as the *Drapier* and to have this prefatory letter to Harding included at the front of the publication.

Should there be any doubt that Swift's intention with 'Directions to the Printer' was to persuade the people that Harding had never had him in his power, there is independent proof of it given by Swift himself. In George Faulkner's inaugural collected edition of Swift's *Works* published 1735, the *Letters* written as the Drapier were introduced with an 'Advertisement' which, like all other editorial commentary in these volumes, was purportedly written by Faulkner but, as is evident from these comments, can only have been written by Swift or overseen by him. This Advertisement includes the following description of the Proclamation issued against the fourth *Letter*:

Upon the publication of his fourth Letter, a Proclamation was issued out by the Lord-Lieutenant and Council, promising 300l. as a Reward to any Person who should discover the Author of that Letter: But he was then become too popular to be betrayed, and besides we are informed, that it never lay in the Power of the printer to discover him; for the Copies were always sent to the Press by some obscure Messenger who never knew the Deliverer, but gave them in at a Window, as the Author himself observes in a Letter to Harding the Printer. His Amanuensis was the only Person he trusted; to whom about two Years after he bestowed an Employment of 40l. a Year, as a Reward for his Fidelity.¹⁰⁶

Swift here explains that the purpose of the precautions taken when sending the manuscripts to Harding was to ensure that the printer would not have him in his power. Accordingly, Swift's comment that such precautions were also detailed 'in a Letter to Harding the Printer', which is a reference to 'Directions to the Printer',¹⁰⁷ is an acknowledgment that this 'Directions to the Printer' had been intended to demonstrate the same thing. A separate point of interest from this passage in 'Advertisement' is that it offers yet further confirmation that the one person Swift did not trust with respect to the Proclamation was John Harding. It illustrates too, of course, that a decade or so after Harding's death, Swift *still* felt it necessary to try to ward off the perception that Harding had had him in his power, even adding extra details such as the window.

As for how and by whom the *Letter to Molesworth* and its prefatory 'Directions to the Printer' were printed, it is to be noted that Swift returned from Belcamp with the manuscript on 18 or 19 December and the publication did not appear until 31 December. This was quite a long preparation time. It seems that during that time the two pieces were prepared in separate shops and brought together for the publication in one pamphlet. The main component of the pamphlet, the *Letter to Molesworth*, carried the standard Harding imprint: 'Printed by John Harding in Molesworth's-Court in Fishamble-Street'. With Harding incapacitated, this printing work would have been performed by his wife, Sarah.¹⁰⁸ Despite what had happened to her husband, the twenty-four-year-old Sarah Harding could not have passed up this opportunity to print this fifth *Letter* of the Drapier, given the windfall it would bring her. 'Directions to the Printer', on the other hand, has a font that had never before been associated with the Harding press and the quality of the presswork far exceeded the Hardings' usual standard. It was clearly not printed in the Harding shop. It seems, therefore, that Swift arranged for this to be printed elsewhere to keep it from the Hardings' eyes, given that it contained what they are likely to have considered to be bald-faced lies about Swift's working relationship with them. It follows that the text of 'Directions to the Printer' may not have been seen by anyone in the Harding family until it appeared in printed form appended inside the title page of the *Letter to Molesworth* which they had set to type, with the work of inserting that preface into the main document undertaken at the second printing location.

A question to be addressed is whether Swift was in fact justified in his claim that Harding never had him in his power. Is it true that Harding was never in a position to identify him as the author? The answer is no. In fact, firstly, even entertaining the hypothetical scenario that Harding was *not* in a position to legally identify Swift, in the circumstances of this prosecution it would not have mattered anyway, for Whitshed was not going to let anything stand in the way of his determination to bring this author to account. He had shown scant regard for law or procedure in either the case of Waters four years earlier or this one involving Harding in 1724. Any mention from Harding of the words 'Jonathan Swift' or 'Dean of St. Patrick's' was going to be enough for this Chief Justice, which Swift knew. That is very reason he decided against coming forward with his *Letter to Middleton*. With Harding imprisoned, he was safe for a time. This is also why he and Carteret went to such lengths to keep Harding out of court. They knew that Harding *could* bring Swift out from behind his shield of pseudonymity.

But for the sake of the exercise, did Swift and Harding ever meet as author and printer? Whilst there is no conclusive proof of any given meeting at any given time and place, the likelihood is high that they met on several occasions, if not often, and that they had a close professional rapport. To demonstrate this, let me review some principal matters and other specifics of the Harding-Swift working relationship between 1721 and 1724. To begin with, in April 1721, soon after Harding took over the role from Waters, Harding moved from his shop in Dirty Lane to premises in Molesworth's Court. This new shop was much closer to the deanery and appears to have been owned by Swift's friend, Viscount Molesworth. Then, throughout the four years of their author-printer association, which was exclusive, it is clear that copies of Harding's newspapers were being delivered to the deanery several times a week,¹⁰⁹ and, in turn, that Swift was at liberty to send Harding copy to be inserted into his newspapers, which he did on several occasions.¹¹⁰ All of the matters mentioned to this point suggest that Swift and Harding would have met in person on occasion. Indeed, there have been scholars who themselves have speculated upon the likelihood of direct meetings between Harding and Swift at different times. Oliver Ferguson and Paul Baines are of the view that Swift probably visited Harding in his shop in April 1722 shortly prior to writing *The Last Speech and Dying Words of Ebenezer Elliston*, which was printed by Harding a few days later.¹¹¹ And James Woolley has speculated with regard to Swift's poem, *Harding's Resurrection. From Hell Upon Earth*. Swift wrote this poem to celebrate Harding's release from his long imprisonment in February 1724 and gave Harding permission to publish it in his *Weekly Impartial News-Letter* for 18 February 1724. James Woolley has said that the poem exhibits knowledge of the inner workings of Harding's shop.¹¹² It clearly does and in my view it can be considered almost certain that Swift visited Harding upon his release, to offer encouragement and to steel him for what lay ahead, with the poem written and sent to Harding after that visit. Then there are the events of 1724. During the course of that year, errands back and forth between the deanery and Molesworth's Court, with manuscripts, trial editions, editorial instructions and newspapers, must have numbered in excess of a hundred. Four *Letters* of the Drapier were printed in the Harding shop before the prosecution. As for the first, note that when it began to sell in large quantities, Swift inserted a notice into Harding's *Dublin Journal* which disclosed that he had undertaken to send Harding money to help him with his costs.¹¹³ Money, therefore, was changing hands between Harding and Swift. The second *Letter* written as the Drapier, though intended for all of Ireland, was personally addressed to Harding, which was an open display of the camaraderie between them. With the third *Letter*, the type in one section towards the end is in a smaller font, which led Herbert Davis to suggest that Swift sent Harding additional text to insert as the *Letter* was being set to type.¹¹⁴ It follows from this that Swift might have stood at the press working with Harding, as he is known to have done with his London printer, John Barber. A separate point of interest is that, at some point during the year, probably upon receiving the manuscript of the fourth *Letter*, Harding gave Swift a gift of a pair of scissors.¹¹⁵ It was a gift which was probably given in the course of a meeting and which,

incidentally, was a clever gesture on Harding's part, suggesting that the Drapier needed to do some trimming of his cloth. Then, the fourth *Letter* was meticulously co-ordinated by Swift and Harding to appear hours before the docking of Carteret's ship, which is indicative of close and frequent communications between them. Then, following the onset of the prosecution and the imprisonment of Harding, Swift, as noted earlier, sent him a personal message. And in *Seasonable Advice to the Grand-Jury*, Swift said of Harding, speaking of the fourth *Letter*, that 'He knew the Author's design was honest', and, arguing that there was no harm in the *Letter*, said that Harding 'cou'd see none himself'. These comments infer that Swift had spoken directly with Harding.

I could continue with further circumstances that illustrate the likelihood that they met, probably on several occasions. However, one of the strongest pieces of evidence indicating that Harding did indeed have Swift in his power is a statement Swift made about Harding's predecessor as his printer, Edward Waters. In the course of the *Letter to Molesworth*, Swift presents a scenario in which the Drapier, his writing persona, is receiving advice from 'a certain *Dean*,' meaning himself, and as part of this advice, the 'dean' looks back on the prosecution of *A Proposal For the Universal Use Of Irish Manufacture* in 1720. The Drapier says:

He [the Dean] produced an Instance of a writer as Innocent, as disinterested, and as well meaning as my self, where the *Printer*, who had the *Author* in his Power, was prosecuted with the utmost Zeal, the *Jury sent back Nine Times*, and the Man given up to the Mercy of the Court.¹¹⁶

This is an open statement that Waters had had Swift in his power. There were no material differences between the working relationship of Swift and Waters and that of Swift and Harding. If Waters had had Swift in his power in 1720, so too had Harding in 1724. The making of this comment by Swift in this *Letter to Molesworth* was therefore a slip on his part and one which he later corrected. When this *Letter* was republished by Faulkner and Swift in 1735, this sentence was amended, with the comment about Waters having had Swift in his power edited out.¹¹⁷

3. Some final matters (up to August 1725)

This paper is concerned only with the period up to the conclusion of the controversy of the halfpence in August 1725. There is much more to be seen from the life of Sarah Harding between August 1725 and early 1730 that is relevant to the issue of Harding's death. For now, though, I will conclude with these last few matters.

Soon after the *Letter to Molesworth* was published, Carteret discontinued the two cases that were still on foot, against *Seasonable Advice to the Grand-Jury* and the fourth *Letter* of the Drapier respectively. The discontinuance of the latter ensured that Harding did not have to appear publicly, if he was able to appear at all, but Carteret discontinued the cases with no known explanation. Up until this time he had been providing regular detailed reports to Westminster but when it came to the quashing of the cases and the reasons, there is no known official record. He can only have reported these matters, but, for reasons unknown, those letters have not survived. Further, at around the same time that he discontinued the cases, Carteret instigated an investigation into alleged fraud in the Treasury, in this way creating a diversion.¹¹⁸ This seems to have been intended to divert public attention from his annulment of the prosecutions and the circumstances relating to John Harding.

An illustration of how the truth concerning Harding came to be lost to history is seen in a tract from early 1725 entitled *Seasonable Advice to M.B. Drapier. Occasioned by his Letter to the Right Honourable the Lord Viscount Molesworth*.¹¹⁹ In this tract, which was mentioned briefly earlier, the pseudonymous, 'M.M.', queries the comments Swift had made in the *Letter to Molesworth*, where

Swift had said, 'if ever I shall be discovered [as the author], I think you [Molesworth] will be bound in Honour to pay my Fine, and support me in Prison; or else I may chance to *Inform* against you by Way of *Reprisal*'.¹²⁰ The author of this pamphlet gently reproaches Swift for making these comments because they suggest by analogy that Swift had paid someone's fines and supported someone in prison in order to keep that someone from informing on him. That someone can only have been Harding. No one else associated with these events was imprisoned. But the author of the pamphlet assumes that the person Swift was alluding to was Swift's valet and amanuensis, Robert Blakely, making no mention of Harding. It represents a bewildering blindness, either genuine or wilful. In my view it is the latter, with the author conveying the impression, intended to comfort Swift, that no one was conscious of his Harding issue. Whether genuine or wilful, however, this blindness was one factor that contributed to the erasure of Harding from the Irish conscience.

Throughout the months that Harding lay dying, Swift was looking to leave Ireland altogether. He even expressed this publicly in the *Letter to Molesworth*. At the end of this *Letter*, he asks its nominal addressee, his friend Viscount Molesworth, to give him a lease of a part of his estate in Yorkshire so that he can bid Ireland a final farewell.¹²¹ He is not in jest. Swift always preferred England over Ireland, of course, but having just made a national hero of himself by uniting Ireland under the 'love of country' banner, this comment betrays Ireland and openly portrays him as a hypocrite. In my view, it reveals a mind mired in guilt and resigned to the fact that the people of Dublin can only have known that he was implicated in what had happened. Then, on 11 March 1725, as Harding was ebbing away, he wrote to a trusted friend in London saying that he was thinking of travelling to London at the end of the month. Swift asked this friend, given English hostility towards the writings of the Drapier at the time, whether it would be safe for him to do so, and requested a quick reply.¹²² That reply is not recovered but presumably it advised him against the idea, for Swift made an alternative plan. Harding died on 19 April 1725 and was buried the following day.¹²³ On that day of his burial, Swift left Dublin for his friend Thomas Sheridan's house at Quilca in company with his friends, Stella Johnson and Rebecca Dingley. Here, yet again, we have Swift leaving town at the precise time of an event involving Harding from which he anticipated ramifications, even though, as it turned out, those ramifications never materialised. A comment by the historian Stephen Gwynn in 1933 is on point. Although Gwynn is referring only to Swift not having *bailed* Harding, rather than anything more, and although Gwynn is mistaken in saying that Harding died in prison when he had in fact been released, he correctly sensed the mood of the town: 'though the printer died in prison, Swift walked the streets, no man daring to lay hand on him'.¹²⁴

Lastly, in the summer of 1725, Swift prepared another pamphlet as the Drapier. Entitled *An Humble Address to Both Houses of Parliament*, Swift wrote this with the intention of having it published in advance of the Irish Parliamentary session in September that year. It was a pamphlet filled with advice for the Parliament on a range of economic matters whilst calling for an investigation into what Swift considered to be the fraud committed by Wood. As it turned out, Swift withheld this *Humble Address* from publication at the last minute and it was not published until 1735.¹²⁵ Nonetheless, when writing it, he had the perfect opportunity to say something meaningful about Harding, which he had not yet done. Clearly it was incumbent on him to give a tribute and explain what had happened. All he offered, however, in the midst of a passage celebrating his own achievements, was: 'And therefore I was no further affected with *their Proclamation*, and subsequent Proceedings, than a good Clergyman is with the *Sins* of the People. And as to the poor *Printer*, he is now gone to appear before a higher, and before a RIGHTEOUS Tribunal'.¹²⁶ This muted comment demonstrates that there was something in Harding's death that was not to be mentioned and that Swift's conscience was not free.

How can the truth of what happened to Harding never have been noticed? How is it that no one has seen the real reason, for instance, why Harding never had his day in court? Then, even after Harding's release from prison, when he emerged in a 'Hurt' condition, how was it that no one put two and two together, realising that Swift and Carteret were old friends? The answer is that people *did* realise, but the issue was lost amidst the kingdom's love for Swift, together with its fear of him, due to what he had wrought as the Drapier. The overriding sentiment at the time was a belief in Swift's virtue. As the people of Dublin wrote songs with lyrics immortalising his bravery¹²⁷ and erected signs of the Drapier around the country, they believed and *wanted* to believe in him. As for those who realised what had happened, either they did not have the nerve to make any statement or they turned a blind eye. In this way, John Harding and the circumstances of his death slipped into an historical abyss, with no one since thinking to look back on him, this lowly-ranked tradesman, or, as Carteret's first biographer described him, 'this insignificant man'.¹²⁸

¹ *A Letter to the Right Honourable the Lord Viscount Molesworth*. By M.B. Drapier, author of the letter to the shop-keepers, &c. (Dublin: John Harding, 1724).

² M.B. Drapier, *Letter to Molesworth*, p. vii.

³ Several commentators have said simply that he 'died in prison'. Harding did not in fact die in prison. He was released at the end of Michaelmas Term in November 1724 and died later. Nonetheless, these commentators include: J. T. Gilbert, *A History of the City of Dublin*, 3 vols. (Ireland: 1854–9), p. 59–60; R. R. Madden, *The History of Irish Periodical Literature*, 2 vols. (London: T. C. Newby, 1867), i, p. 267; Stephen Gwynn, *The Life and Friendships of Dean Swift* (London: Thornton Butterworth, 1933), p. 234; Harold Williams (ed), *The Poems of Jonathan Swift*, 3 vols., second edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958, 1966), ii, p. 417; Harold Williams (ed), *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift*, 5 vols. (Oxford: 1963–1965), iii, p. 93 n. 2; Carole Fabricant, *Swift's Landscape* (Baltimore: 1982), p. 43 (Fabricant mistakes Harding for his predecessor as Swift's printer, Edward Waters); Irvin Ehrenpreis, *Swift: The Man, His Works and the Age*, 3 vols. (London: 1983), iii, p. 108; Pat Rogers (ed), *Jonathan Swift: The Complete Poems* (London: Penguin, 1983), p. 771; David Nokes, *Jonathan Swift, A Hypocrite Reversed: A Critical Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), p. 294, 296; Ian Higgins, *Swift's politics: A study in disaffection* (Cambridge: 1994), p. 159; Éamonn Ó Ciardha, *Ireland and the Jacobite Cause, 1685–1766: a fatal attraction* (Dublin: 2002), p. 231 n. 191; and Paul J. DeGateno and R. Jay Stubblefield (eds), *Critical Companion to Jonathan Swift: A Literary Reference to His Life and Works* (New York: 2006), p. 426–427. Other commentators have said that his 'health was ruined': Robert Munter, *The History of the Irish Newspaper 1685–1760* (Cambridge: 196), p. 150; Patrick Walsh, 'Harding, John,' in Clark, Fanning, Happon, Johnson-Liik, McGuire, Murphy, Quin (eds), *Dictionary of Irish Biography, under the Auspices of the Royal Irish Academy*, 9 vols. (London: 2009), iv, p. 453–454. Elsewhere, Robert Munter says his 'health was broken': *A Dictionary of the Print Trade in Ireland 1550–1775* (New York: 1988), p. 127.

⁴ Madden, *The History of Irish Periodical Literature*, i, p. 301.

⁵ Richard Starratt, 'The Streets of Dublin', *Irish Quarterly Review* v (1852), p. 23.

⁶ Further evidence from the period late 1725 to early 1730 is the subject of a second paper which is forthcoming.

⁷ This is seen in Swift's correspondence: Swift to Archdeacon Walls, 11 June 1714, in David Woolley (ed), *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, D.D.*, 5 vols. (Frankfurt: 2002–2014), Letter 278, i, p. 611; Swift to Charles Ford, 12 June 1714, in David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*, Letter 279, i, p. 614; Swift to Charles Ford, 29 August 1714, in David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*, Letter 354, ii, p. 76.

⁸ Patrick Delany, *Observations Upon Lord Orrery's Remarks on the Life and writings of Dr. Jonathan Swift* (London: 1754), p. 218.

⁹ *A Proposal For the Universal Use Of Irish Manufacture, in Cloaths and Furniture of Houses, &c. Utterly Rejecting and Renouncing Every Thing wearable that comes from England* (Dublin: Edward Waters, 1720).

¹⁰ Only a few works with which he was involved as an editor or author ever carried the name 'Jonathan Swift'. These were the volumes of the correspondence and miscellanea of Sir William Temple, for which he was the editor and compiler: *Letters Written by Sir W. Temple, Bar^t and other Ministers of State, Both at Home and Abroad, Containing, An Account of the most Important Transactions that pass'd in Christendom from 1665 to 1672. In Two Volumes. Review'd by Sir W. Temple sometime before his Death and Published by Jonathan Swift Domestick Chaplain to his Excellency the Earl of Berkeley, one of the Lords Justices of Ireland* (London: J. Tonson, A. & J. Churchill, R. Simpson, 1700); and Jonathan Swift, *A Proposal for Correcting, Improving and Ascertaining the English Tongue; in a Letter to the Most Honourable Robert Earl of Oxford and Mortimer, Lord High Treasurer of Great Britain* (London: Benjamin Tooke, 1712).

¹¹ It led to his falling-out with the writer Richard Steele, to cite one incident that stemmed from it. For an example of Steele attacking Swift for his anonymity, see: Richard Steele, *Two Letters Concerning the Author of The Examiner* (London: 1713). Then, in early 1714, when Steele published his *The Crisis*, which was a Whig response to a Tory treatise written anonymously by Swift, Steele put his name to it: Richard Steele, *The Crisis* (London: Sam. Buckley and Ferd. Burleigh, 1713). For secondary sources on this issue and the falling-out of Swift and Steele: Ian Gadd, "At four shillings per year, paying one quarter in hand": reprinting Swift's *Examiner* in Dublin 1710–11', in Kirsten Juhas, Hermann Josef Real, and Sandra Simon (eds), *Reading Swift: papers from the Sixth Munster Symposium on Jonathan Swift* (Munich: 2013), p. 78 n. 19; Bertrand A. Goldgar and Ian Gadd (eds), *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jonathan Swift, Volume 8: English Political Writings 1711–1714* (Cambridge: 2008), p. 31, 32, 34, 35.

¹² Ehrenpreis, *Swift: The Man, His Works and the Age*, iii, p. 316.

¹³ *The Publick Spirit of the Whigs: Set forth in their Generous Encouragement of the Author Of the Crisis: with Some Observations on the Seasonableness, Candor, Erudition, and Style of that Treatise* (London: John Morphew, 1714).

¹⁴ James Joel Cartwright (ed), *The Wentworth Papers 1705–1739* (London: Wyman, 1883), p. 359.

¹⁵ M. B. Drapier, *A Letter to the Shop-keepers, Tradesmen, Farmers, and Common-People of Ireland, Concerning the Brass Half-Pence Coined by Mr. Woods. With a Design to have them Pass in this Kingdom* (Dublin: John Harding, 1724), p. 3.

¹⁶ *Letter to Molesworth*, p. 14.

¹⁷ M. B. Drapier, *Letter to the Right Honourable the Lord Viscount Molesworth*, in *The Works of J.S, D.D, D.S.P.D. In Four Volumes* (Dublin: George Faulkner, 1735), iv, p. 175. (This edition of Swift's *Works* is hereafter referred to as *Faulkner 1735*).

¹⁸ M. B. Drapier, *An Humble Address to Both Houses of Parliament*, in *Faulkner 1735*, iv, pp. 236–7.

¹⁹ Swift to Knightley Chetwode, February 1723, in David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*, Letter 576, ii, p. 448.

²⁰ Evidence of these corporal punishments is seen in a few matters. In a letter to Viscount Bolingbroke in London in 1721, Swift described what Waters was being forced to endure. That letter is lost but Bolingbroke in his reply says Waters 'need have iron ribs to endure all the drubbings you will procure him': Viscount Bolingbroke to Swift, 28 July 1721, in David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*, Letter 544, ii, p. 387. Next, in September 1725, Swift wrote to Alexander Pope explaining that his manuscript of the work that would become known as *Gulliver's Travels* was nearing completion, and that these *Travels* are 'intended for the press when the world shall deserve them, or rather when a Printer shall be found brave enough to venture his Eares': Swift to Pope, 29 September 1725, in David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*, Letter 673, ii, p. 606. The possibility that this 'ventures his ears' comment alludes to the punishments administered to

Waters is supported by a comment made by Lord Bathurst to Swift in a letter of 1730: 'But I won't forget y^r Political tracts y^u may say that y^u have ventur'd y^r Ears at one time & y^r Neck at another for the Good of the Country': Lord Bathurst to Swift, 9 September 1730, in David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*, Letter 887, iii, p. 323. This indicates that Bathurst was replying to a letter from Swift where Swift had referred to his political tracts in Ireland, *A Proposal For the Universal Use Of Irish Manufacture* of 1720 and the *Drapier's Letters* of 1724, where, speaking vicariously through the experiences of his printers, Swift had, with the first, ventured his ears, and with the second, ventured his neck (his life). For a longer discussion of the evidence indicating that Waters was subjected to these punishments: Craig Pett, *I am no inconsiderable Shop-Keeper in this Town, Swift and his Dublin Printers of the 1720's: Edward Waters, John Harding and Sarah Harding* (Melbourne: Monash University thesis, 2015), pp. 130–138.

²¹ M. B. Drapier, *Letter to Molesworth*, p. 3.

²² He was baptised in the Protestant Parish of St. Bride's, Dublin, on 6 August 1697: Trinity College MSS 1478, in *St. Bride's Register. Births from 1633–1800*. See also Alita Dusek, 'Baptisms in St. Bride's, Dublin, 1633-1713', *Irish Genealogist* 7:2 (1987), p. 220. He was the second son to parents James and Elizabeth. Their eldest son, James, had been baptised on 1 December 1692: Trinity College MSS 1478, in *St. Bride's Register. Births from 1633–1800*.

²³ Harding announced this move in his newspaper: *Dublin Impartial News-Letter* (2 April 1720).

²⁴ She was baptised in the parish of St. Paul's on 24 October 1700: Representative Church Body Library P 273.01.1, *St. Paul's, Dublin, Parish Registry Book, Baptisms*, online: www.irishgenealogy.ie, record identifier: DU-CI-BA-167920. On her parents and family ancestry: Mary Pollard, *Dictionary of Members of the Dublin Book Trade: 1550–1800, based on the records of the Guild of St. Luke the Evangelist, Dublin*, (London: 2000), p. 506-7; Pett, *I am no inconsiderable Shop-Keeper in this Town*, p. 153-4.

²⁵ Sarah Harding revealed this in the course of her poem written in 1726, looking back on the events of 1724 and 1725, saying of her husband, 'He left with his Widow, two Children behind': *A POEM to the Whole People of IRELAND, Relating to M. B. DRAPIER* (Dublin: Elizabeth Sadlier, 1726). For the first child, I have not found a baptismal record. The second was baptised on 18 June 1725: RCBL P 328/1/2-3, *St John the Evangelist, 1720-1823*; online: www.irishgenealogy.ie, record identifier: DU-CI-BA-93018. This baptismal record includes a note, 'baptysed 18 days old'. This child was therefore born on 1 June 1725, which was six weeks after Harding's death.

²⁶ *Some Arguments Against Enlarging the Power of Bishops* (Dublin: J. Hyde, 1723).

²⁷ *An Epilogue to be Spoke at the Theatre-Royal This present Saturday being April the 1st. In the Behalf of the Distressed Weavers* (Dublin: Printed by John Harding).

²⁸ Swift, *Subscribers to the Bank Plac'd according to Their Order and Quality with Notes and Queries* (Dublin: printed by John Harding).

²⁹ 'John o' Stiles' was a general pseudonym for a lawless figure: *The Oxford English Dictionary Online*, Oxford University Press, 2022.

³⁰ *The Bank of Ireland's Answer to the Author of the Notes and Queries about Subscribers to the same. By way of Queries upon Queries* (Dublin: printed by C. Carter, 1721).

³¹ *The Last Speech and Dying Words of Ebenezer Elliston, who is to be Executed this second day of May, 1722. Publish'd at his desire for the common good* (Dublin: Printed by John Harding in Molesworth's Court in Fish-shamble Street).

³² When he reprinted this tract in 1735, George Faulkner, in a comment likely to have been overseen by Swift, said that this trick by Swift was to good effect, with 'very few Robberies of that kind' committed in the fifteen years since: *Faulkner 1735*, iv, p. 375. Refer also: John Boyle, Earl of Orrery, *Remarks on the Life and Writings of Dr. Jonathan Swift* (Dublin: George Faulkner, 1752), p. 201-2; Walter Scott (ed), *The Works Of Jonathan Swift, D.D., Dean of St. Patrick's, Dublin*, 19 vols. (London: 1814), i, p. 283; and McCue, 'A Newly Discovered Broadsheet of Swift's *Last Speech and Dying Words of Ebenezer Elliston*', *Harvard Library Bulletin*, XIII, (1959), 362–368, at p.

362. But Mayhew doubts the veracity of Faulkner's claim: 'Jonathan Swift's Hoax of 1722 upon Ebenezer Elliston', in A. Norman Jeffares, ed., *Fair Liberty Was All His Cry: A Tercentenary Tribute to Jonathan Swift*, London, 1967, pp. 290–310, 303–304; and Mayhew is supported in that view by Paul Baines, 'Swift's *Last Speech and Dying Words of Ebenezer Elliston*: Reading the Ephemeral Text', *Swift Studies* 28 (2013), pp. 78–95, at pp. 89, 90.

³³ *Ireland's Consternation in the loosing of Two Hundred Thousand Pound of their Gold and Silver for Brass Money* (Dublin: 1723); *The Patentee's Computation of Ireland* (Dublin: John Whalley, 1723); *Ireland's Case Humbly Presented to the Honourable the Knights, Citizens and Burgesses in Parliament assembled* (Dublin: 1723); *A Creed for an Irish Commoner* (Dublin: 1724).

³⁴ Grafton's indecision as to how to respond to the first publication that appeared, *Ireland's Consternation*, is on display in his letter to Walpole: Grafton to Walpole, 22 August 1723, State Papers, No. 63, vols. 380–385. The relevant portion of the letter is quoted in Davis (ed), *The Drapier's Letters to the people of Ireland against receiving Wood's halfpence*, by Jonathan Swift (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1935), pp. xvii–xviii.

³⁵ For primary sources related to this incident: *The Dublin Courant* (4 February 1720); *Weekly Impartial News-Letter* (14 May 1723); *The Dublin Courant* (25 May 1723); 'Account of secret service money, 11 June 1723', in Marsh's Library MS 3.1.1 (41).

³⁶ I have not located the particular Number of his *Weekly Impartial News-Letter* in which he printed the false assize but the fact that he did so is reported: *The Dublin Courant* (1 July 1723) and *The Dublin Courant* (10 July 1723).

³⁷ Swift to Robert Cope, 11 May 1723, in David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*, Letter 582, ii, pp. 454–6; Swift to Robert Cope, 1 June 1723, in David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*, Letter 588, ii, pp. 458–9. For secondary commentary on Swift's running to escape scandal on this occasion: David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*, ii, p. 455, n. 2; Denis Johnston, *In Search of Swift* (Dublin: Hodges Figgis, 1959), pp. 171, 174.

³⁸ *An Hue and Cry After Dr. S—T; Occasion'd by a True and Exact Copy of Part of his own Diary, found in his Pocket-Book* (London: J. Roberts, 1714), p. 7, 8, 13. For discussion of other instances of Swift running away: Pett, *I am no inconsiderable Shop-Keeper in this Town*, p. 107–109.

³⁹ *Weekly Impartial News-Letter* (21 April 1724); *Dublin Journal* (11 May 1724).

⁴⁰ John Boyle, Earl of Orrery, *Remarks on the Life and Writings of Dr. Jonathan Swift* (Dublin: George Faulkner, 1752), p. 73.

⁴¹ I Sam. Xiv. 45. Refer also: Tickell to Delafaye, 1 November 1724, Public Records Office of Northern Ireland, 580/1, 230–232.

⁴² On the life and career of Carteret: Archibald Ballantyne, *Lord Carteret: a political biography, 1690–1763* (London: R. Bentley, 1887); William Baring Pemberton, *Carteret: the Brilliant Failure of the Eighteenth Century* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1936).

⁴³ Swift to Carteret, 28 April 1724, in David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*, Letter 608, ii, pp. 496–497. The other publication enclosed with the letter was: Anon, *The True State of the Case Between The Kingdom of Ireland on the One Part, and Mr. William Wood Of the Other Part. By a Protestant of Ireland* (Dublin: John Harding, 1724), thought to have been written by the Irish Peer, Lord Abercorn.

⁴⁴ Swift to Carteret, 9 June 1724, in David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*, Letter 610, ii, pp. 498–499.

⁴⁵ Carteret to Swift, 20 June 1724, in David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*: Letter 612, ii, pp. 502–3.

⁴⁶ Swift to Carteret, 9 July 1724, in David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*, Letter 613, ii, p. 503.

⁴⁷ Carteret to Swift, 4 August 1724, in David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*, Letter 620, ii, p. 512.

⁴⁸ Details of the ceremonies upon his arrival were given in each of: *Dublin Impartial News Letter* (24 October 1724); *Dublin Courant* (26 October 1724); *Dublin Gazette* (26 October 1724).

⁴⁹ Carteret to Newcastle, 28 October 1724, Public Records Office of Northern Ireland (PRONI): T580/1/221–224.

⁵⁰ Carteret too, of course, was maintaining the charade. This observation was made by Carteret's secretary, the poet Thomas Tickell. He said that if all of the most comical scenes involving great ministers of state from Roman times to the present could be collected in one volume, he had a new chapter to add: Tickell to Delafaye, 1 November, 1724: PRONI 580/1, 230–232.

⁵¹ The Proclamation was also published in the *Dublin Gazette* (2 November 1724).

⁵² This fact is given to us by Thomas Tickell: 'the printer is run away': Tickell to Delafaye, 1 November 1724, PRONI 580/1, 230–232.

⁵³ The evidence that Sarah Harding was arrested at this time is clear. Firstly, it has always been known that Sarah and John Harding were *both* imprisoned during this period. This fact is given by Swift in the course of the 'Directions to the Printer' when he refers to 'your own and your Wife's Confinement in PRISON': M.B. Drapier, *Letter to Molesworth*, p. iv. It has been assumed that they were arrested and imprisoned at the same time together; that is, at the time of John Harding's arrest: Davis (ed), *The Drapier's Letters to the people of Ireland against receiving Wood's halfpence*, p. xlvi; Williams (ed), *The Poems of Jonathan Swift*, ii, p. 417; Oliver W. Ferguson, *Jonathan Swift and Ireland* (USA: 1962), p. 125; Ehrenpreis, *Swift: The Man, His Works and the Age*, iii, p. 276–7; James Woolley (ed), *Jonathan Swift and Thomas Sheridan: The Intelligencer* (Oxford: 1992), p. 35; Joseph McMin, *Jonathan Swift: A Literary Life* (Basingstoke: 1991), p. 110; David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*, ii, p. 536, n. 2; Walsh, 'Harding, John', in *Dictionary of Irish Biography, under the Auspices of the Royal Irish Academy*, iv, pp. 453–454. Cf: David Woolley, who at one point suggests that Sarah Harding might have been imprisoned *after* her husband: David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*, ii, 532, n. 8. But in her *Poem to the Whole People of Ireland* of 1726, looking back at the time of her husband's imprisonment, Sarah Harding says, 'To hearten him, the DRAPIER sent to him in Jail,/To tell him, he'd quickly get home to his Wife'. This suggests that Sarah Harding was arrested on 27 October and was released when Harding was eventually taken up.

⁵⁴ It had happened in London, with the arrest of Nathaniel Mist's wife in 1722 (reported in the *Dublin Intelligencer* for 21 August 1722), but not in Dublin. As such, I think Harding would have left his shop and living quarters on 27 October without suspecting that his wife would be taken in his place. As for instances of the wife of a Dublin stationer being imprisoned *after* this time, there is only the joint imprisonment of Cornelius Carter and his wife for printing false news in 1729: Pollard, *Dictionary*, p. 93.

⁵⁵ *The Intelligencer, Numb XVIII*, (DUBLIN: Printed by S. HARDING, next Door to the *Crown in Copper-Alley*), 1728, p. 8.

⁵⁶ *A POEM to the Whole People of IRELAND, Relating to M. B. DRAPIER* (Dublin: Elizabeth Sadlier, 1726).

⁵⁷ Although this particular reward for the discovery of the author did not include an express clause giving an assurance of pardon to anyone making the discovery, such a term was implicit, for without it there can have been no inducement to give the evidence. Indeed, evidence that the reward was understood at the time to include this promise of pardon is seen in a tract written in early 1725, *Seasonable Advice to M.B. Drapier. Occasioned by his Letter to the Right Honourable the Lord Viscount Molesworth* (No imprint). Imagining a scenario in which a claimant of the reward came forward against Swift, the anonymous writer of this tract assumes that any such successful claimant would be 'dismissed by Law'. The implicit nature of such a condition is also seen in the case of Defoe's pamphlet, *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters*, published in London in 1704, when Defoe turned himself in to secure the release of his printer and publisher: Williams, *Old-Time Punishments*, London, 1971 [1890], p. 99. For an example of a reward which included a promise of pardon as an express clause, refer: Rivington, Charles A., *'Tyrant:' The Story of John Barber, Jacobite Lord Mayor of London, and Printer and Friend to Dr. Swift* (York: 1989), p. 46 and note 20. Another example is in the Proclamation issued against the 1725 poem thought by some commentators to have been written by Swift, *On Wisdom's Defeat in a Learned Debate*. On the issue generally, refer

also: McCue, 'A Newly Discovered Broadsheet of Swift's *Last Speech and Dying Words of Ebenezer Elliston*', *Harvard Library Bulletin*, XIII, (1959), pp. 362–368, 363, note 7.

⁵⁸ *An Humble Address to Both Houses of Parliament*, in *Faulkner 1735*, iv, pp. 216, 221.

⁵⁹ See the five 'New Songs Sung at Mr. Taplin's The Sign of the Drapier's Head in Truck-Street', which Faulkner printed in *Fraud Detected: Or, The Hibernian Patriot. Containing all the Drapier's Letters to the People of Ireland, on Wood's Coinage* (Dublin: George Faulkner, 1725), pp. 217–224.

⁶⁰ *Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift, D.S.P.D.*, in Williams (ed), *The Poems of Jonathan Swift*, ii, p. 566.

⁶¹ Deane Swift, *An Essay Upon the Life, Writings and Character of Dr. Jonathan Swift* (London: Charles Bathurst, 1755), pp. 190–191. The 'outrageous' in the opening line of the quote was a contemporary spelling. For later retellings of this incident and commentary: John Hawkesworth (ed), *The Works of Jonathan Swift, D.D. Dean of St. Patrick's, Dublin*, 12 vols. (London: 1755), i, pp. 43–44; Thomas Sheridan, *The Life of the Rev. Dr. Jonathan Swift* (London: 1784), p. 244; Walter Scott (ed), *The Works Of Jonathan Swift*, i, p. 297; William Monck Mason, *The History and Antiquities of the Collegiate and Cathedral Church of St. Patrick, near Dublin, from Its Foundation in 1190, to the Year 1819* (Dublin: 1820), p. 344 note n; Starratt, 'The Streets of Dublin', p. 22 note; Richard Ashe King, *Swift in Ireland* (London: 1895), p. 131; Davis (ed), *The Drapier's Letters to the people of Ireland against receiving Wood's halfpence*, p. 289; Victoria Glendinning, *Jonathan Swift* (London: 1999), p. 169.

⁶² Sheridan, *The Life of the Rev. Dr. Jonathan Swift*, pp. 244–5.

⁶³ Deane Swift, *An Essay Upon the Life, Writings and Character of Dr. Jonathan Swift*, p. 190.

⁶⁴ As for instance when he answers the allegation that he had brought the King's name into disrepute. Swift says that, having reviewed all of his writings on the matter throughout the year, he cannot see that he mentioned the King's name even once, by which he meant that he had not used the word 'George': *Faulkner 1735*, iv, p. 190.

⁶⁵ *Faulkner 1735*, iv, p. 188.

⁶⁶ Davis (ed), *The Drapier's Letters to the people of Ireland against receiving Wood's halfpence*, p. xlvi.

⁶⁷ Carteret to Newcastle, 31 October 1724, PRONI SP 63/382; MIC 223/162, 177–180; also reproduced at length in Davis (ed), *The Drapier's Letters to the people of Ireland against receiving Wood's halfpence*, p. xlvi–xlvi.

⁶⁸ Carteret to Newcastle, 8 November 1724, PRONI SP 63/382; MIC 223/162, 177–80.

⁶⁹ On the history of the procedure known as the Preliminary Examination: Theodore F. T. Plucknett, *A Concise History of the Common Law*, fifth edition (London: 1956), pp. 43, 431–433, 437. Also on these procedural matters: Neal Garnham, *The Courts, Crime and the Criminal Law in Ireland, 1692–1760* (Dublin: 1966), p. 50.

⁷⁰ The evidence that they denied knowledge of the identity of the author was given by Swift himself later in this same month: 'He [Harding] and his Wife have offered to take their Oaths that they know not the Author': *Seasonable Advice to the Grand-Jury* (Dublin: no imprint, 1724); reproduced in Herbert Davis (ed), *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift* 14 volumes (Oxford: Shakespeare Head Press, 1959), x, p. 71. Although Swift said that they had 'offered to take their Oaths that they know not the Author' (my emphasis), contemporary reports indicate that John and Sarah Harding were questioned on oath at these Examinations: Carteret to Newcastle, 8 November 1724, PRONI SP 63/382, MIC 223/162, 177–80; Lord Middleton to Thomas Brodrick, 23 November 1724, quoted in Davis (ed), *The Drapier's Letters to the people of Ireland against receiving Wood's halfpence*, p. 269.

⁷¹ Carteret to Newcastle, 8 November 1724, PRONI SP 63/382; MIC 223/162, 177–180. Despite this clear statement from Carteret, some commentators have speculated on other reasons for Swift withholding the *Letter to Middleton*: Ferguson, *Jonathan Swift and Ireland*, p.124; Davis (ed), *The Drapier's Letters to the people of Ireland against receiving Wood's halfpence*, p. xlvi; Ehrenpreis, *Swift: The Man, His Works and the Age*, iii, pp. 276–277.

⁷² Carteret to Newcastle, 14 November 1724, PRONI T/580/1, 236–241. Carteret's comment that Harding 'persists' in concealing the author gives rise to the possibility that Harding was

questioned on another occasion, separate to the Preliminary Examination, but there is no independent evidence of any such separate questioning. It is conceivable that, in the course of a visit to Harding in prison by a messenger for Swift, Harding reiterated that he was never going to betray Swift, with that information sent back to Swift and thereafter forwarded to Carteret, and that this accounts for the perception that Harding was *persisting* in concealing the author. A messenger was certainly visiting Harding on Swift's behalf. Separate evidence will be presented showing that Swift at one point sent Harding a message whilst he was in prison and also that he was sending Harding money to support him during that time.

⁷³ *Jonathan Swift: A Critical Biography*, op. cit., pp. 373, 375.

⁷⁴ *Faulkner 1735*, iv, p. 183.

⁷⁵ For example: James Anthony Froude, *The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, 3 vols. (London: 1906), i, p. 539; Ehrenpreis, *Swift: The Man, His Works and the Age*, iii, pp. 276–7; David Oakleaf, *A Political Biography of Jonathan Swift* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2008), p. 172–3.

⁷⁶ There is one further matter that is illustrative of Swift's fearful conduct with his *Letter to Middleton*. In that 'Advertisement to the Reader' of 1735, Swift says, 'I could discover his Name subscribed at the End of the Original, although blotted out by some other Hand'. Presumably to safeguard against the possibility of the manuscript being stolen and delivered to the authorities, then, Swift's name, 'JS. Deanry House', was blotted out. This is one thing. Then, Swift tell us that the blotting-out was done by someone else, as if to suggest that he himself could not be responsible for such a fretful action. This is clearly a ruse. A blotting-out is a blotting-out. How anyone could determine that it was done by someone else is unknown. Consistent with his other conduct with regard to the *Letter to Middleton*, it was Swift who blotted his own name out, afterwards lying about it to disassociate himself from the act.

⁷⁷ For evidence of Whitshed's ongoing ambition and intensity at this time, see Carteret's comments about him: Carteret to Newcastle, 31 October 1724, PRONI SP 63/382; MIC 223/162, 177–180; reproduced at length in Davis (ed), *The Drapier's Letters to the people of Ireland against receiving Wood's halfpence*, pp. xlvi–xlvii.

⁷⁸ A month after the reward expired, Swift commented in a letter, 'The 6 months are over, so the Discoverer of the Draper, will not get the 300^l as I am told': Swift to Knightley Chetwode, 27 May 1725, in David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*, Letter 279, i, p. 614. The one inaccuracy here concerns the words 'as I am told'. Swift would have had an eye on the date of 26 April 1725 all along.

⁷⁹ The full title including the sub-title (or sub-description), is: *SEASONABLE ADVICE. Since a Bill is preparing for the Grand Jury, to find against the Printer of the Drapier's last Letter, there are several things maturely to be considered by those Gentlemen, before whom this Bill is to come, before they determine upon it*. The document carried no printer's imprint or date, though it is known to have produced in Dublin in November 1724. It is hereafter referred to by its commonly used title, *Seasonable Advice to the Grand-Jury*.

⁸⁰ Carteret to Newcastle, 31 October 1724, PRONI SP 63/382, MIC 223/162, 177–180. Other letters in which Carteret expressed his determination to bring the author to justice are: Carteret to Newcastle, 28 October 1724, PRONI T580/1/221-4; Carteret to Newcastle, 8 November 1724, PRONI SP 63/382, MIC 223/162, 177-80; and Carteret to Newcastle, 14 November 1724, PRONI T/580/1, 236-241.

⁸¹ Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 17 November 1724; quoted in: Coxe, *Memoirs of the Life and Administration of Sir Robert Walpole, Earl of Oxford*, ii, pp. 405–6; also Davis (ed), *The Drapier's Letters to the people of Ireland against receiving Wood's halfpence*, p. 269. A point of interest in this passage is that the person who had been speaking to Middleton says that no bill of indictment had been drawn. Maybe this is intended to refer to the general fact that the case had not come before the court, but, if understood literally, from which it follows that no bill of indictment had even been prepared in the days preceding the hearing, it suggests that the decision not to proceed with

the prosecution of the fourth *Letter* had been made some days in advance of the morning of Saturday 14 November.

⁸² Ferguson, *Jonathan Swift and Ireland*, pp. 126-7; Ehrenpreis, *Swift: The Man, His Works and the Age*, iii, p. 279; Sabine Baltes, "The Grandson of that Ass Quin?: Swift and Chief Justice Whitshed", *Swift Studies* 23 (2008), pp. 126-146, at 133 n. 37. A more recent biographer of Swift, Leo Damrosch, says in passing that Carteret was 'working behind the scenes to make peace': *Jonathan Swift: his life and his world*, New Haven, 2013), p. 353. Certainly he was working to make peace for Swift.

⁸³ Pemberton, *Carteret: the Brilliant Failure of the Eighteenth Century*, Chapters II and III.

⁸⁴ Pemberton, *Carteret: the Brilliant Failure of the Eighteenth Century*, pp. 225, 242.

⁸⁵ Swift went to considerable lengths in his efforts to blame Whitshed for Harding's death. Irish-born Whitshed was only thirty-five when he was appointed to the office of Chief Justice of the King's Bench in 1714. A man who never married, he applied himself to his work with a singular ardour and was highly regarded for his judicial skills but his administration of 'justice' was compromised in cases involving a government interest, when he would make an open display of his desire to secure an outcome favourable to the Crown. As already noted, given that he had no tenure, holding office at the pleasure of King George, whether or to what extent he should be criticised for this is debatable. For Swift, however, there was no skerrick of doubt. Whitshed was a villain and an enemy of the kingdom and, despite the fact that Harding never so much as set foot in his court, it was the conduct of Whitshed that somehow brought about Harding's death. Swift wrote damningly of Whitshed, in doing so inciting a hatred of the judge so intense that it broke Whitshed's spirit, precipitating his death at age fifty-one in 1727. Even then, Swift did not let up. There must be no sympathy for wrongdoers like Whitshed, he wrote. On the contrary, 'although their Memories will Rot, there may be some Benefit for their Survivors to smell it while it is rotting': *An Answer to a Paper, Called a Memorial of the poor Inhabitants, Tradesmen, and Labourers of the Kingdom of Ireland* (Dublin: Printed by S. Harding, next Door to the Crown in Copper-Alley, 1729), p. 16.

⁸⁶ Middleton to Thomas Brodrick, 23 November 1724; quoted in Davis (ed), *The Drapier's Letters to the people of Ireland against receiving Wood's halfpence*, pp. 269-70.

⁸⁷ This was Lord Chancellor Middleton's opinion: Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 17 November 1724; quoted in William Coxe, *Memoirs of the Life and Administration of Sir Robert Walpole, Earl of Oxford*, 3 vols. (London: 1798), ii, p. 405-6; and Davis (ed), *The Drapier's Letters to the people of Ireland against receiving Wood's halfpence*, p. 269.

⁸⁸ Ballantyne, *Lord Carteret: a political biography, 1690-1763*, pp. 385, 394, 398, 402-5; Pemberton, *Carteret: the Brilliant Failure of the Eighteenth Century*, pp. 123, 277, 336.

⁸⁹ This appears to have been a rule at common law at the time. It was passed into legislation at Westminster in 1782: 21, 22 G.3.c.11: *The Statutes at Large passed in the Parliament of the Kingdom of Ireland*, 20 vols., (Dublin, 1799). Refer also: David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*, ii, p. 536.

⁹⁰ *Letter to Molesworth*, p. 10.

⁹¹ Indeed, this is how these comments were interpreted at the time by another writer in a separate publication. This pseudonymous writer described those comments as an indirect acknowledgement by Swift that he had made payments in order reduce the threat of being informed upon: M.M. *Seasonable Advice to M.B. Drapier. Occasioned by his Letter to the Right Honourable the Lord Viscount Molesworth* (No imprint).

⁹² *A POEM to the Whole People of IRELAND, Relating to M. B. DRAPIER* (Dublin: Elizabeth Sadlier, 1726).

⁹³ For the evidence that it was Swift who bailed Waters in 1720, see Pett, *I am no inconsiderable Shop-Keeper in this Town*, pp. 128-30.

⁹⁴ A hope on Carteret's part that the patent would be annulled at that time was not unreasonable. Indeed, his biographer, Pemberton, suspects that Walpole only delayed the withdrawal of the

patent in order to compound Carteret's difficulties: Pemberton, *Carteret: the Brilliant Failure of the Eighteenth Century*, p. 101.

⁹⁵ On this case and on Scroggs generally: *Common Sense, or The Englishman's Journal*, April 29, 1738; *Letters and Memorials of State*, London, 1746, p. 163; Madden, *The History of Irish Periodical Literature*, i, pp. 36–37, 51–58; Stephen, *History of the Criminal Law of England*, 3 vols. (London, 1883), i, pp. 311–313. Refer also: 22 November 1724, Carteret to Newcastle: PRONI: T/580/1, 241–243.

⁹⁶ The circulated document carried the title, *An Extract out of a Book, Entituled An exact Collection of the Debates of the House of Commons, held at Westminster, Oct. 21st. 1680*. It bore no imprint or date. For commentary related to Whitshed's action on 21 November: *Common Sense, or The Englishman's Journal* (29 April 1738); Arthur Collins (ed), *Letters and Memorials of State* (London: T. Osborne, 1746), p. 163; Madden, *The History of Irish Periodical Literature*, i, p. 36–7, 51–8; James Fitzjames Stephen, *A History of the Criminal Law of England*, i, p. 311–3. Refer also: Carteret to Newcastle, 22 November 1724, PRONI: T/580/1, 241–243.

⁹⁷ This 'Presentment' was afterwards printed in the *Dublin Gazette* complete with the names of twenty-three Grand Jury members: *Dublin Gazette* (1 December 1724). A separately published version also appeared by 1 December: *The Presentment of the Grand-Jury of the County of the City of Dublin* (Dublin: Pressick Rider and Thomas Harbin, 1724).

⁹⁸ Carteret to Newcastle, 1 December 1724, PRONI T/580/1, 247–8; also quoted in Davis (ed), *The Drapier's Letters to the people of Ireland against receiving Wood's halfpence*, p. lv.

⁹⁹ *The Intelligencer, Numb XVIII*, (DUBLIN: Printed by S. HARDING, next Door to the Crown in Copper-Alley), 1728, p. 8.

¹⁰⁰ *A POEM to the Whole People of IRELAND, Relating to M. B. DRAPIER* (Dublin: Elizabeth Sadlier, 1726).

¹⁰¹ Swift to Charles Ford, 27 November 1724, in David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*, Letter 630, ii, pp. 531–2. Davis says he left Dublin in the afternoon of the 28th: Davis (ed), *The Drapier's Letters to the people of Ireland against receiving Wood's halfpence*, p. liv.

¹⁰² On the date of his return: Swift to Charles Ford, 27 November 1724, in David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*, Letter 630, ii, pp. 531–3 and n. 9; Joseph McMinn, *Jonathan's Travels: Swift and Ireland* (Belfast: 1994), p. 96.

¹⁰³ This is apparent from an anonymously written tract that had recently appeared, entitled *The Fifth and Last Letter to the People of Ireland In Reference to Wood and his Brass* (Dublin: 1724). Without naming Swift or the Drapier, this tract thanked all of the writers who had exerted themselves on the issue of the halfpence whilst offering praise to God, in this way announcing with solemnity that the matter was at a conclusion. Swift was also aware of the ongoing opposition to his writing from certain quarters in particular, as seen in this fifth *Letter* where he mentions that some people have been 'cursing [him] to Hell... so that I am determined never to *work for Persons of Quality* again': *Letter to Molesworth*, page 4.

¹⁰⁴ David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*, Letter 632 bis, ii, p. 536.

¹⁰⁵ M. B. Drapier, *Letter to Molesworth*, pp. iii–vii.

¹⁰⁶ *Faulkner 1735*, iv, pp. iii–iv.

¹⁰⁷ He is not referring to the second *Letter* of the Drapier, *A Letter to Mr. Harding the Printer*, which was written and published before the prosecution commenced. That second *Letter* of the Drapier is not at all concerned with Swift trying to show that he was never in Harding's power. Indeed, it is one that only illustrates how *closely* Swift and Harding were working together at that time.

¹⁰⁸ Indeed, in 1728, when Sarah Harding was printing the periodical, *The Intelligencer*, Thomas Sheridan would describe her as the person 'who did likewise *Print* the DRAPIER's Letters': *The Intelligencer, Numb XVIII* (Dublin: Sarah Harding, 1728), p. 8. This is a reasonably clear statement that the printing work for not only the fifth *Letter* of the Drapier, but the preceding ones as well, was undertaken by Sarah Harding.

¹⁰⁹ This is evidenced, for instance, by two instances of Swift having read and responded to Harding's newspapers, respectively: *Weekly Impartial News-Letter* (5 March 1723) and *Dublin Impartial News-Letter* (1 August 1724). The first instance is discussed in Pett, *I am no inconsiderable Shop-Keeper in this Town*, p. 190-1. The second newspaper report provided the cue for the second Letter of the Drapier, *A Letter to Mr. Harding the Printer*.

¹¹⁰ Known instances: *Weekly Impartial News-Letter* (18 February 1724); *Weekly Impartial News-Letter* (21 April 1724); *Dublin Journal* (11 May 1724). There are also these two short pieces from 1724 that are generally believed to have been written by Swift: 'Advertisement of the Church Wardens' which appeared in Harding's *Dublin Impartial News-Letter* (5 September 1724); and 'The Declaration of the Beggars' in Harding's *Dublin Impartial News-Letter* (12 September 1724).

¹¹¹ Ferguson, *Jonathan Swift and Ireland*, p. 76 and n. 68; Paul Baines, 'Swift's *Last Speech and Dying Words of Ebenezer Elliston*: Reading the Ephemeral Text', *Swift Studies* 28 (2013), pp. 78–95, at pp. 78, 84, 85.

¹¹² James Woolley, 'Poor John Harding and Mad Tom: 'Harding's Resurrection' (1724)', in *That Woman! Studies in Irish Bibliography: A Festschrift for Mary 'Paul' Pollard* (Dublin, 2005), pp. 109-110.

¹¹³ *Dublin Journal* (11 May 1724).

¹¹⁴ Davis (ed), *The Drapier's Letters to the people of Ireland against receiving Wood's halfpence*, pp. lxxxiv–lxxxv. Refer also Ehrenpreis, *Swift: The Man, His Works and the Age*, iii, p. 238. n.1.

¹¹⁵ This is revealed by Swift himself: *An Humble Address to Both Houses of Parliament*, in *Faulkner 1735*, iv, 207.

¹¹⁶ *Letter to Molesworth*, p. 14.

¹¹⁷ See *Faulkner 1735*, iv, p. 175. The omission is observed by Herbert Davis (ed), *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, x, pp. 89, 213. All changes to the *Letters* in *Faulkner 1735* were adopted by Davis as his copy text for *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*.

¹¹⁸ Refer: Robert Edward Burns, *Irish Parliamentary Politics in the Eighteenth Century: Volume I, 1714–1730* (Washington, 1989), pp. 188–9.

¹¹⁹ M. M., *Seasonable Advice to M.B. Drapier. Occasioned by his Letter to the Right Honourable the Lord Viscount Molesworth* (Dublin: 1725).

¹²⁰ *Letter to Molesworth*, p. 10.

¹²¹ *Letter to Molesworth*, p. 21-2.

¹²² Swift to Charles Ford, 11 March 1724-5, in David Woolley (ed), *Correspondence*, Letter 641, ii, pp. 547-8.

¹²³ The date of his death is stated in the title of *Elegy on The Much-Lamented Death of John Harding Printer, who departed this Transitory Life, this present Monday being the 19th of this Instant April 1725* [no imprint]. For the date of his burial: RCBL P 273.01.2, *St. Paul's, Dublin, Parish Registry Book, Burials*. This record is the last on page 10 of the Book and is repeated as the first on page 11: 'April 20: Bur: *John Harding*'. It is accessible online at: www.irishgenealogy.ie The Record Identity Numbers for these two entries are: DU-CI-BU-226622 and DU-CI-BU-226623.

¹²⁴ Gwynn, *The Life and Friendships of Dean Swift*, p. 234.

¹²⁵ M. B. Drapier, *An Humble Address to Both Houses of Parliament*, in *Faulkner 1735*, iv, p. 210–242.

¹²⁶ M. B. Drapier, *An Humble Address to Both Houses of Parliament*, in *Faulkner 1735* iv, p. 216.

¹²⁷ 'New Songs Sung at Mr. Taplin's The Sign of the Drapier's Head in Truck-Street', in *Fraud Detected*, p. 217–224.

¹²⁸ Ballantyne, *Lord Carteret: a political biography, 1690-1763*, p. 123.