Author/s:
Mierowsky, M

Title:
Daniel Defoe on Naturalization

Date:
2022-10-08

Citation:
Mierowsky, M. (2022). Daniel Defoe on Naturalization. The Review of English Studies: the leading journal of English literature and language, 74 (313), https://doi.org/10.1093/res/hgac059.

Persistent Link:
https://hdl.handle.net/11343/317548

The Review of English Studies, 2022, Vol. **00**, No. 00, 1–18
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/res/hgac059
Article

Daniel Defoe on Naturalization

Marc Mierowsky

This essay explores the connection in Daniel Defoe's writing between naturalization as a civic concept and naturalization as an epistemological or literary-critical process. For Defoe, the incorporation of new subjects was a moral project that entailed the literary interpellation of a more productive, tolerant and empowered populace. A history of his efforts to encourage immigration by broadening access to legal citizenship provides, then, not just crucial insight into his view of the national political community but points to the role his satire, journalism and novels might play in bringing subjects together in its formation. In pursuit of this history, I trace Defoe's approach to naturalization to *The True-born Englishman* (1700), the poem that established his reputation as an advocate for immigration reform. I then track Defoe's activism in favour of The Foreign Protestants Naturalization Act (7 Anne c. 5) before its passage in March 1709 and after its repeal in 1711 (10 Anne c. 9), as debate turned to the fate of successive alien populations: Huguenot and Palatine refugees and England's Jews. These debates provide an important new context for Defoe's final novel, *The Fortunate Mistress [Roxana]* (1724). Attention to the ways Defoe deployed poetry and prose fiction during them reveals how questions of admission and assimilation underpinned his polemical strategy as a popular author and signalled the importance of his work to the history of modern citizenship.

For most of his writing life Daniel Defoe promoted his association with *The True-born Englishman* (1700). The poem was the most popular of his works and became one of the most widely read poems of the entire eighteenth century.[1] In 1703, when the appearance of pirated editions of his writings prompted Defoe to try and stabilize an authorial persona, he turned to the poem, overseeing the production and publication of *A True Collection of the Writings of the Author of the True Born Englishman*. Two years later, he released a second volume of works under the same title.[2] These volumes were reprinted and subsequent editions issued regularly enough that Defoe—one of the period's most prolific writers—remained for much of his career best known for a poem published towards the start of it. Although ad hoc, this was not without design. Defoe's efforts to identify himself as a verse satirist depended on how this one poem made its way in the world. Evidence that his strategy worked and that Defoe's early eighteenth-century public saw him as both poet and satirist has spurred a critical recuperation of these otherwise neglected

This essay was supported by a McKenzie Fellowship, University of Melbourne. Open Access was provided by funds from the Council of Australian University Librarians.

1 For sales figures, see Ashley Marshall, *The Practice of Satire in England, 1658–1770* (Baltimore, MD, 2013), 25.

2 *A True Collection of the Writings of the Author of the True Born Englishman, Corrected by himself* (London, 1703), *A Second Volume of the Writings of the Author of the True-Born Englishman* (London, 1705).

aspects of his canon. Ashley Marshall and Joseph Hone have shown that the writer built his contemporary reputation on a mode of satire more wide-reaching, more artful, more cognizant of tradition and more politically consistent than generations of critics have allowed.[3] That Defoe went so far as to sign *Jure Divino* (1706)—the fullest statement of his constitutional thought—'by The Author of *The True-born Englishman*' gives some measure not just of the importance he attached to this reputation but of how it served him as a basic standpoint in political argument.

With each new poem or prose pamphlet signed by 'the author of *The True-born Englishman*' the image that sharpened into public focus was that of a defender of Whig principles. Above all, 'the author' was committed to the gains of the Williamite Revolution, believed in the aggregative national benefit of moral reform, and defended the Toleration Act (1689). And yet for all the metonymic force the poem so accrued, it was published anonymously. One of the earliest writers to publicly address Defoe's authorship was William Pittis, whose poem *The True-Born-Hugonot* (1703) traced the emergence of these principles to Defoe's support for naturalizing Huguenot refugees.[4] The question of why Pittis thought Defoe's attempts to remove the civil disabilities on immigrants the key to understanding his politics is worth asking. The possibility that Pittis raises and that I pursue here is that renewed attention to Defoe's campaign for a general naturalization act—waged throughout his writing life—might bring to light the principles guiding his approach to readers as collective political subjects and uncover some latent continuities between his polemical prose, verse satires and novels.

For Pittis, unmasking the so-called 'true born Englishman' meant revealing the danger he posed to the state: a threat he thought fundamentally akin to that posed by the French refugees. The Huguenots had rebelled against French royal authority in the 1620s, and so it was only logical that when they came to England this insurrectionist spirit would cross the channel.

> Hence Traytors to our Church and State arose,
> And hence our *De Larue's* and our *De Foe's*,
> Who to bring in the Devil assume the Saint,
> And the whole Leaven which they mix with Taint.
> Hence our Decrease of Money and of Trade,
> And our discourag'd Natives cry for Bread,
> Our Mourning Husbands and our Weeping Wives,
> That without Labour, drag laborious Lives,
> That unemploy'd, sit Pensive at their Doors,
> And see their Lands Possess'd by *Foreign Boors*. (6–7)

Defoe was English. But the much-mocked addition of the French nobiliary particle 'De' to his name gives Pittis grist to position him as an inheritor to the tradition of Huguenot rebellion. What follows is a commonplace attack on refugees as a sponge on the English economy and an existential threat to those at the bottom rung of English society.

Pittis spent a good amount of energy answering Defoe in print. The Tory publicist was adept at identifying Defoe's authorship where others floundered. Hackwork though it may be, his response to *The True-born Englishman* merits a second look for the systematic account it provides of Defoe's early satire and non-fiction. Emulating Defoe, who calls upon 'Satyr' in *The True-born Englishman* to expose the collective vices of the English people, Pittis invokes the same figure,

[3] Marshall, 'Daniel Defoe as Satirist', *HLQ*, 70 (2007), 553–76; Joseph Hone, 'Daniel Defoe and the Whig Tradition in Satire', *ELH*, 84 (2017), 865–90. Marshall identifies thematic unities across Defoe's satiric output: an anti-Catholicism, liberty of conscience for Protestant non-conformists, and concern with English manners. By contextualizing Defoe's satiric practice within the Whig tradition, Hone pushes for a connection Marshall was unwilling to make, between these ideological concerns and the idea of Whig satire as a meaningful literary category.

[4] William Pittis, *The True-Born Hugonot: or, Daniel de Foe* (London, 1703).

asking the genre to expose 'the Windings' of Defoe's 'Verse and Prose' so that readers may see in this 'Paper Labyrinth' the workings of his 'Crooked Mind' (10). The works that Pittis invokes as he navigates this labyrinth are telling. In prime position is *Lex Talionis* (1698), the first in a series of pamphlets in which Defoe made the case for increasing immigration on the basis of equity and economic rationalism. There are also references to 'the *Kentish History*' (10), 'More Reformation' (15) and 'The Shortest Way' (4).[5] All published in the years after the first appearance of *The True-born Englishman*, the first mounts a defence of the right to petition based on the original sovereignty of the people. The second defends satire as a means of moral reformation. The third essays a form of satire designed to expose the bigotry of an anti-tolerationist High Church (with disastrous results for its author). In sum they expose Defoe as a writer who intends to reshape the nature of the political community; a prospect Pittis fears. This anxiety stems from the reach of Defoe's *True-born Englishman*. As the poem works its way on individual readers, in much the way Defoe intended it would, it reduces Britain's collective standing:

> *Britain*, 'tis true, thou'rt Scandalously low,
> That could'st stretch out thy *Arms* to a *De Foe*. (12)

The outstretched arms draw into their grasp and so connect the popular reception of Defoe's poem and the acceptance of Huguenot refugees. Pittis seems convinced that in naturalizing both poem and people England will change its nature.

Taking this fear seriously provides a useful starting point for exploring the connection in Defoe's writing between naturalization as a civic concept and naturalization as an epistemological or literary-critical process; the connection, that is, between extending the bounds of the political community and the kinds of arguments and forms of writing that were thought to move readers towards such expansion. Studies of Defoe and immigration, such as those by Daniel Statt, have tended to overlook potential connections between these two definitions by approaching naturalization through Defoe's writing on demography and economics.[6] As I show here, the concept is deeply implicated in Defoe's writings on Dissent and social organisation as well. But even once we establish that Defoe's idea of civic naturalization was fundamental to his political thought and confessional politics, the question remains: how does his advocacy in favour of selectively extending citizenship rights relate to his writing at large—to works such as his novels that are at one remove from the polemical fray?

To answer this question, I begin with a close analysis of *The True-born Englishman* that draws out the precedents Defoe relied on in defining the bounds and constitutional force of the English people. Mapping these precedents to developments in citizenship law, I show how Defoe's attempts to control the poem's reception were shaped from the start by his conviction that the moral corrective satire performed created the necessary conditions for integrating new Englishmen. In the second part, I focus on Defoe's campaign in favour of the Foreign Protestants Naturalization Act, before the Act's passage in 1709 and after its repeal in 1711, when public attention turned from the Huguenots to migrants from the Rhenish Palatinate. During this campaign Defoe returned to the moral community invoked in the poem, binding its membership by the limits of religious toleration and economic productivity. For Defoe, naturalization worked, like satire, by conversion, instilling the ethos of the community in new members in order to incorporate them and their economic output. When he measured the success of *The True-born Englishman* by its capacity to change popular attitudes, he detailed a vision of literary naturalization that expanded the possibilities of language and the circulation of information. In

[5] Defoe, *The History of the Kentish Petition* (London, 1701), *More Reformation: A Satyr upon himself. By the author of The True born English-man* (London, 1703), *The Shortest-Way with the Dissenters* (London, 1702).

[6] Daniel Statt, 'Daniel Defoe and Immigration', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 24 (1991), 293–313.

the final part, I look at how Defoe was forced to confront the radical endpoints of such possibilities by John Toland, whose proposal to grant citizenship rights to England's Jews revealed that naturalization could be used to efface confessional affiliation in favour of civic identity. While Defoe failed in this instance to defend his reputation as 'the author of *The True-born Englishman*', he remained concerned with the questions Toland raised about modes of legal and extra-legal affiliation and the kinds of social morality they entailed: so much so, that this became a central preoccupation of his fiction. A brief analysis of how Defoe dramatized the social and sentimental constraints on naturalization in *The Fortunate Mistress* (1724), his final novel and the first full-dress novel in English with a refugee protagonist, reveals how he adapted the form to explore and enforce the affective demands of modern citizenship.

I. 'A MAN *A-KIN* TO ALL THE UNIVERSE'

In *An Appeal to Honour and Justice* (1715), Defoe recounts how he was prompted to write *The True-born Englishman* by the appearance of John Tutchin's *The Foreigners* (1700). A 'vile abhor'd Pamphlet in very ill Verse', in Defoe's estimation, *The Foreigners* attacked King William III for his preference for Dutch courtiers. Tutchin and other Country Whigs interpreted this supposed failure to rule in England's interest as an abuse of his prerogative.[7] Pregnant with 'Rage', Defoe 'gave birth to a Trifle which I never could hope should have met with so general an Acceptation as it did'.[8] The modesty rings false. Defoe traded on the poem's widespread 'Acceptation'. Its reach was the reason he looked beyond the question of William's Dutch courtiers to the unease that animated Tutchin's attack on them: an underlying concern that aliens might claim the rights of English political subjects wholesale.

Caroline Robbins notes that anxieties about usurping foreigners were felt most acutely during the reigns of foreign-born monarchs.[9] This is not simply a matter of prejudice but of a legal question that arose after James VI of Scotland became James I of England in 1603. A 1608 case brought by the trustees of Robert Colville affirmed the claimant's right to inherit English lands on the grounds that as a Scot born in 1606 he was an English subject. The ruling established that Scots born after the regnal union (*postnati*) were to be considered English subjects on the basis that allegiance was to the person of the monarch, and thus not bound by kingdom or civil law. Colville was loyal to the monarch at the time of his birth. That monarch's power crossed the geographic bounds of England and Scotland; *ipso facto* Colville was an English subject.

Calvin's Case, as it came to be known, laid the fundamental common law precedent for English nationality and citizenship. Its implications extended beyond the rights of citizens to the legal union of nations, the concept of allegiance and the ties that bound subjects to each other and to their sovereign: all of which preoccupied Defoe in *The True-born Englishman*. According to Keechang Kim, the case took on an outsized significance because Sir Francis Bacon and Henry Hobart, who argued for the *postnati*, attempted to bypass a Parliament that resisted 'the project of legal union' between Scotland and England by establishing through Colville's claim a framework for union in the common law.[10] Sir Edward Coke, one of the justices who saw the case when it was adjourned to the Court of the Exchequer-Chamber, published a set of reflections that shaped its later application. In them, he drew on Bacon's arguments to articulate a notion of natural allegiance that began at birth, was indelible and could not be changed by

[7] D. N. DeLuna, 'Topical Satire Read back into Pocock's Neo-Harringtonian Moment', in DeLuna (ed.), *The Political Imagination in History* (Baltimore, MD, 2006), 129–75 (132).
[8] Defoe, *An Appeal to Honour and Justice*, in P. N. Furbank and W. R. Owens, *A Political Biography of Daniel Defoe* (Abingdon, 2016), 199–235 (202).
[9] Caroline Robbins, 'A Note on General Naturalization under the Later Stuarts', *Journal of Modern History*, 34 (1962), 168–77 (169).
[10] Keechang Kim, '*Calvin's Case* (1608) and the Law of Alien status', *Journal of Legal History*, 17 (1996), 155–71 (155–6).

the monarch. At the same time, Coke outlined that the only means to enter this allegiance was through naturalization by way of an act of Parliament.[11]

Calvin's Case fed directly into popular prejudices against the regnal union by raising the prospect that Scots claiming English subjecthood would follow James VI in an influx that could amount to a 'colonisation'.[12] They never did. Yet after the accession of William III, who retained the office of Stadtholder of his Dutch territories, the same fear returned. England awaited a horde of Dutch migrants claiming English nationality. They never arrived either. But the possibility that they might—magnified by the prospect of future foreign monarchs—spurred in the final years of William's reign new legal restrictions on nationality designed to limit the extent to which allegiance would afford subject rights. The widest reaching of these restrictions was a clause added to the Act of Settlement (1701) which passed both houses in May and gained royal assent in June. This 'disabling' clause barred from office or from receiving grants of land anyone 'born out of the Kingdoms of England, Scotland, or Ireland, or the dominions thereunto belonging (although he be naturalised or made a Denizen, except such as are born of English parents)'.[13] Appended to the Act that conferred the English throne on the descendants of the Electress of Hanover, the clause sought to qualify who could enter the shared allegiance of English subjecthood and directed attention to the mechanisms then available to grant them entrance: naturalization and endenization.

Defoe wrote *The True-born Englishman* in the immediate lead up to William's fifth Parliament, publishing it just before Parliament took up the Settlement Bill. At this historical juncture the question of foreigners seeking office and land could not help but draw public notice to the wider social effects citizenship law had on the political unions of peoples. Defoe's awareness of this broader context is apparent from the poem's outset. The title page to the first edition does not carry a quotation from a poetic model or philosophical authority. In its place is a clause from William the Conqueror's *Charter of Public Peace* that promises to maintain comity between the nations that comprised England post Norman invasion: '*Angloes & Normanoes, Francoes & Britones, Walliae & Cornubiae, Pictos & Scotos…*'.[14] The unusual choice of epigraph signals Defoe's interest in building historical and legal precedents for extending the bounds of citizenship in the present—a goal that unfolds as the poem uncovers England's mixed heritage and exposes the lie that one can be 'true born'.

Defoe's appeal to England's mixed heritage has rightly been interpreted by Maximillian Novak as a vindication of the King's Eurocentrism.[15] Andreas Mueller argues that the writer's defence of William III should be read against the broader context of the standing army controversy. Mueller's approach develops from J. G. A. Pocock, who was the first to document the ways the poem promoted Defoe's position that a standing army is a requirement of modern warfare. As Pocock notes, this appeal to necessity did not fully address the Country objection that maintaining a standing army would corrupt parliament and shift the balance of power by diminishing their capacity to refuse supply.[16] What critics have missed is that contained in Defoe's support for the King's European and military vision is a targeted critique of England's naturalization provisions.

One of the ways Parliament attempted to reduce William's army to the status of a militia was to restrict his troops to natural born subjects. Questions of sovereign balance and the political influence of the military in effect circled back to issues of allegiance and naturalization. At the time of the poem's publication there were only two ways available to remove this restriction and the

[11] W. Cobbett, T. B. Howell, T. J Howell and D. Jardine (eds), *Complete Collection of State Trials*, 34 vols (London, 1816–1828), 2, cols. 621, 623; Edward Coke, *The First Part of the Institutes of the Law of England* (London, 1738), 129.
[12] Christopher Brookes, *Law, Politics and Society in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2009), 133.
[13] 12&13 Will.3, c.3, s.3.
[14] *Satire, Fantasy and Writing on the Supernatural by Daniel Defoe*, ed. W. R. Owens, vol.1 (London, 2003), 77.
[15] Maximillian Novak, *Daniel Defoe: Master of Fictions* (Oxford, 2003), 149.
[16] Andreas Mueller, *A Critical Study of Defoe's Verse* (Lewiston, NY, 2010), 171–211; J. G. A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton, NJ, 2003), 433–4.

other civil disabilities imposed on foreigners, who could not own real property, hold a lease, have an heir or inherit. The first was denization, a grant from the crown that conferred most but not all citizenship rights. The second was naturalization, which could only be achieved by a private act of parliament. Both were prohibitively expensive and rarely used. Prior to the explicit codification of citizenship by the British Nationality Act of 1948, these provisions and the naturalization acts that underwrote them defined how the concept operated and was experienced.[17]

In chronicling a series of monarchs from 1066 onwards whose accessions brought new English subjects, the poem builds legal precedents for a general naturalization act that would remove barriers to naturalization and thereby encourage immigration. The form this takes is a longue durée argument on the net benefit of immigration. In each case, the negative sentiment towards the new arrivals gives way in the face of their eventual contribution to English society. When William I assumed the English throne, he 'canton'd out the Country to his Men, | And Every Soldier was a Denizen' (ll. 207–8). Defoe's word choice in this first example conveys the negative perception that contemporaries had of the incursion of Norman soldiers. At the same time, in calling the soldiers denizens, he echoes Coke's claim in his commentary on Calvin's Case that the right of endenization could be traced to William I.[18] With each such example, the argument proceeds, as in common law, by precedent and analogy. Defoe canvasses historical occasions where foreigners were eventually welcomed and finds in their operation legal justification as well as a successful exemplar for extending the bounds of the English people. When, for instance, Defoe lists those who arrived during 'good Queen Bess's Charitable Reign'—the '*Dutch, Walloons Flemings, Irishmen,* and *Scots,* | *Vaudois* and *Valtolins,* and *Hugonots*' (ll. 259–60)—he recalls in form the diverse populations united in William I's charter of peace. The precedent is strengthened by its application. The outcome this progressive history reaches towards is a widescale naturalization of foreign protestants.

In bringing this highly partial history to the present, Defoe is forced to confront the fact that the first concerted push for a general naturalization act occurred during the reign of a monarch he deplored. The restoration of Charles II inaugurated what Robbins characterizes as a 'vigorous' campaign to increase 'the wealth of the nation by attracting immigrants to it'—a cause the King largely supported.[19] The belief behind this campaign is neatly encapsulated by William Petty in his *Treatise of Taxes* (1662). 'Fewness of people', Petty argues, 'is real poverty'.[20] Josiah Child, the most influential exponent of what came to be called populationism, notes that 'the people are the riches and strength of a country'; 'that most nations in the civilized parts of the world are more or less rich or poor, proportionable to plenty or paucity of their people'.[21] In the month after *The True-born Englishman* was published, the economic writer William Paterson, with whom Defoe exchanged ideas on trade and colonization, advanced a populationist case for empire building. Paterson's plan to rebuild the failed Scottish colony at Darien under English command expands upon Child's central premise that 'People, and their industry, are the true riches of a prince or nation, and in respect to them, all other things are but imaginary'.[22] Like Nicholas Barbon before him, Paterson saw a Spanish empire in torpor because of 'depopulation'.[23] The steady flow of Spaniards to the new world and the failure of Spain, in turn, to naturalize citizens of its colonies precipitated what the populationists saw as the empire's ineluctable decline.

[17] In the period covered by this essay, the development of naturalization begins to mark out a concept of citizenship rights that, by the time citizenship is codified, are distinct from the rights of subjecthood. Citizenship is in a sense a legal anachronism, used here to chronicle the development in practice of these rights.
[18] W. Cobbett et al. (eds), *Complete State Trials*, 2, cols. 559, 639.
[19] Robbins, 'A Note on General Naturalization', 168.
[20] William Petty, *A Treatise of Taxes and Contributions* (London, 1662), 16.
[21] Josiah Child, *A New Discourse of Trade* (London, 1693), 12, xi.
[22] William Paterson, 'Proposal for settling on the Isthmus of Darien', London, British Library, Add. MS 12437, f.17.
[23] Nicholas Barbon, *A Discourse on Trade* (London, 1690), 61.

Defoe was an avowed populationist. In a 1709 issue of his *Review*, the periodical he founded in 1704, he turns from current affairs into a recurring section 'Of TRADE *in General*'. In common with Child, Barbon, Petty and Paterson, the basis for his economic thought is a belief that 'the Numbers of the labouring and industrious People' constitutes 'the Wealth and Strength of a Nation'. Defoe is discriminating in who constitutes 'the people'. This group does not include 'the Passive Good-for-nothings […] but the People, who labour, or employ those that labour, trade, or assist those that trade, enjoy, or protect those that enjoy this Life'. Thus, in his mercantilist equation: 'the more People, the more Trade; the more Trade, the more Money; the more Money, the more Strength; and the more Strength, the greater a Nation.'[24]

Populationist economic thinking drove legislative action in later Stuart England. The first bill for general naturalization was presented to Parliament shortly after Charles II was restored, in 1664. It was followed by attempts in 1667, 1672–1673, 1673, 1680 1685, 1693–1694, 1696–1697. Although these bills did not pass, a 1677 'Act for the Naturalizing of Children of his Majestyes English Subjects borne in Forreigne Countryes during the late Troubles' offered the first categorical naturalization of a class of people born outside of England's territorial domain.[25] A similar act was passed in 1698 naturalizing the children of men in service to William III abroad.[26] According to Clive Parry, both acts created a precedent for general naturalization.[27] In *The True-born Englishman* the legislative advances of the Restoration allow Defoe to return to the problem of the subjects who arrive with a 'foreign' king (in this case the formerly exiled Charles II) with new emphasis on the people 'as the Essential of Commerce':[28]

> The *Royal Refugee* our Breed restores,
> With *Foreign Courtiers,* and with *Foreign Whores*:
> And carefully repeopled us again
> Throughout his Lazy, Long, Lascivious Reign. (ll. 289–91)

The familiar troping of Charles II as a sexually profligate *pater patriae*—literally father to the entire nation—while far from panegyrical, offers grudging praise for his efforts to ensure that England had the necessary population for economic development. In the tradition of the poems on affairs of state, Charles' sexual largesse both accounts for and detracts from his generosity towards new subjects. Precisely who these new subjects are is signalled by the paradox of the '*Royal Refugee*'. Like the Huguenots, Charles II had been forced to seek refuge after fleeing his homeland. In 1681 he issued an order that Huguenot refugees receive a 'kind reception'. In promising 'to recommend it to his Parliament at their next meeting to passe an Act for ye Generall Naturalisation of all such Protestants as Shall come over' he yoked the campaign for new nationality and citizenship laws to the Huguenot cause.[29]

The poem's relation to the legal-historical coordinates of this campaign would have eluded readers less familiar with Defoe than Pittis. Defoe was, however, unwilling to let their acumen undermine the reach of *The True-born Englishman*'s argument. The so-called ninth edition, which appeared within a year of the poem's first printing, carried 'An Explanatory Preface' (79) that explicitly linked his excavation of England's heritage to his support for loosening civil disabilities on resident aliens and encouraging more immigration: two factors that could only be achieved by a general naturalization act.

[24] *Defoe's Review*, ed. John McVeagh, 9 vols (London, 2003–2011), vol. 6, no. 34, 21 June 1709. All references are to this edition.
[25] John Raithby (ed.), *Statutes of the Realm*, vol. 5: *1628–80* (s.l, 1819), 847.
[26] Raithby (ed.), *Statutes of the Realm*, vol. 7: *1695–1701* (s.l, 1820), 380–81.
[27] Clive Parry, *Nationality and Citizenship Laws of the Commonwealth and Ireland*, 2 vols (London, 1957–1960), 1. 48.
[28] *Review*, vol. 6, no. 34, 21 June 1709).
[29] Quoted in William Shaw (ed.), *Letters of Denization and Acts of Naturalization for Aliens in England and Ireland, 1603–1700* (Lymington, 1911), 124–5.

In the preface Defoe defends himself against charges that his poem maligned the character of the English people by exposing their 'mix'd' heritage (79). He merely wanted to point out the '*Vanity*' of those who claim to be 'True born' in a nation where, if we speak of 'Englishmen ab Origine, *we are really all Foreigners our selves*' and are better for it (79–80). The reason England is better off with increased immigration is populationist:

> *I could go on to prove 'tis also Impolitick in us to discourage Foreigners; since 'tis easy to make it appear that the Multitudes of Foreign Nations who have took Sanctuary here, have been the greatest Additions to the Wealth and Strength of the Nation; the great Essential whereof is the Number of its Inhabitants* (80)

As in the poem's historical excursus, immigration is figured as an accretive process, with each wave of people building on what has come before.

Opponents of populationism found an all too easy counterargument by drawing focus away from the economic benefits of immigration to what they argued were its cultural deficits. A 1694 speech by Sir John Knight the Younger captures this approach in brief. In the speech Knight laments the extinguishing of 'the English Breed' by immigrants of foreign 'races'.[30] Defoe attempts to drain such appeals to racial purity of their emotional force by recasting England's mixed heritage as a source of national pride. Rather than fearing other races, England should '*boast among our Neighbours, that we are a part of themselves, of the same Original as they, but better'd by our Climate, and like our Language and Manufactures, deriv'd from them, and improv'd by us to a Perfection greater than they can pretend to*' (80). The naturalness of this integration recalls Bacon's argument on Colville's behalf that 'by the law of nature all men in the world are naturalised one towards another'.[31]

Precisely how the poem might turn England towards this better aspect of its nature, drawing from and improving those it assimilates, is signalled in the final appeal to his countrymen to '*take the Hint, and grow better-natur'd from my* ill-natur'd Poem, *as some call it; I would say this of it, that tho' tis far from the best Satyr that ever was Wrote, 'twould do the most Good that ever Satyr did*' (81). Defoe's insistence on measuring satire by its impact echoes the preface to the first edition of *The True-born Englishman*, in which he maintains that 'The *End of Satyr is Reformation: And the Author, tho he doubts the Work of Conversion is at a general Stop, has put his Hand to the Plow*' (83). The agricultural metaphor suggests that, as in the *Review*, productivity determines one's assimilation. The fact that satire's work is 'Conversion' reveals the confessional limits to whom it can incorporate. Defoe first proposed this view of satire in the preface to *A New Discovery of an Old Intreague* (1691). Hone points out that the reference is to Luke 9:62, where Christ explains to his disciples: 'No one who puts his hand to the plough and looks back is fit for the kingdom of God'. In Hone's reading, the allusion bears out the 'moral authority' of a satirist whose work consists in providing models for the correction of vice and the praise of virtue.[32] There is also in the allusion a sense of how these epideictic models might work. Ploughing is elementary, the first step towards growth. Satire by this analogy primes. Its moral efficacy is seen not in the moment but in the process it initiates.

Satire provokes, causing readers to reflect and reform. As more read, this reformation sweeps from the personal to the local to the national in a chain of action. *The True-born Englishman* is structured to serve as catalyst and guide for this task. At its core, the poem is a bipartite study of the English people, who remain in focus until Defoe beckons 'Satyr' stop and calls in 'Britannia'.

[30] William Cobbett, *Parliamentary History*, vol. 6 (London, 1810), 780, cited in Robbins, 'A Note on General Naturalization', 171.
[31] James Spedding, R. L Ellis and D. D. Heath (eds), *The Works of Francis Bacon*, vol. 7 (Cambridge, 1858), 664, quoted in Polly J Price, 'Natural Law and Birthright Citizenship in *Calvin's Case*', *Yale Journal of Law and the Humanities*, 9 (1997), 73–145 (110).
[32] Hone, 'Defoe and the Whig Tradition in Satire', 867–9.

Figured as the 'Representative or Mouth of the Nation, as a Body' (81), Britannia is only able to speak for the people—she is assembled—by virtue of the moral reformation carried out in the previous two parts. The lampoon of Sir Charles Duncombe MP tacked to the end works in contrast to Britannia, exposing him and all other MPs who were ungrateful to William as lacking representative authority.

The first part of *The True-born Englishman* approaches the people from a sociological vantage-point. Defoe surveys the tutelary vices of each nation, showing how centuries of invasion and immigration have brought these vices together and made them manifest in '*Ingratitude*' (l. 159), the chief vice of the English. The English cannot claim racial purity or an inherent moral superiority by dint of their genetic origins. They have emerged from the melting pot of Europe: 'From this Amphibious Ill-born Mob began | That *vain ill-natur'd thing, an* Englishman' (ll. 187–8). The explanatory preface forecloses the interpretation of this couplet by raising heterogeneity as a positive and showing its true target to be those who falsely celebrate England's monoculture. The historical precedents for accepting new subjects supplied in this part of the poem work to raise naturalization as way to change one's 'ill nature' for good, with Defoe offering what is in effect a poetic naturalization test:

> For *Englishmen* to boast of Generation,
> Cancels their Knowledge and lampoons the Nation.
> A *True-Born Englishman's* a Contradiction,
> In Speech an Irony, in Fact a Fiction.
> A Banter made to be a Test of Fools,
> Which those that use it justly ridicules.
> A Metaphor invented to express
> A man *a-kin* to all the Universe. (ll. 368–77)

If arguments are conducted by an appeal to common meaning, then what this stanza does is change the common meaning of the phrase 'True-born Englishman'. In the process, it seeks to change the make-up of those who define themselves as such. The new meaning relies on literary interpretation. The metaphor shows the English related to all those who have come into contact with them. But to realize this, readers and hearers have to be able to discern irony, and to disambiguate fact from fiction. The stanza tests their foolishness, as the broader poem tests their pride and pushes for what is at once a more cognizant and 'natural' ideal of how they relate to one another.

The second part of the poem approaches the people from the standpoint of England's *de facto* constitution. Just as part one showed readers their genetic make-up or constitution, part two turns them from 'mob' to people by revealing their proper legal make-up. The path to moral reformation offered in the poetic test of part one takes on broader implications in part two as properly understanding one's self and engaging in the necessary reform becomes the means to constitute the sovereign people. Defoe's immediate concern is that English ingratitude manifests in a failure to acknowledge that King William III restored their liberty. Echoing the formulation '*The End of Satyr is Reformation*', he writes that 'The Good of Subjects is the End of Kings' (l. 774). In this pithy line 'the Good of Subjects' is both the purpose and terminus of kingship. Defoe short-circuits constitutional mechanics to justify simultaneously the Revolution of 1688—on the condition that James II no longer represented the good of his subjects—and the limits on monarchic power accepted with the Act of Settlement. In both cases, it is arbitrary power that imposes the limit: 'Arbitrary Power's so strange a thing, | It makes the *Tyrant* and unmakes the *King*' (ll. 777–8). When it enters, the bond between subjects and sovereign unravels and the country returns to the state of nature.

The re-formation of the people ex nihilo is on the face of it evidence of Defoe's contractarianism.[33] What bears noting is the role Defoe affords satire in this formation. Throughout his career Defoe insisted on the obsolescent spelling of 'Satyr'. In the context of *The True-born Englishman* this has less to do with Pan's playfulness than his mixedness. Defoe's 'Satyr' mixes praise and blame, the sociological and constitutional, seeking out a structure, however unwieldy, that is able to make individual subjects aware of the implications for everyday social life that attend their status as incorporate members of the commonwealth. Reminding readers towards the end of the poem that foreigners 'have faithfully obey'd' William (l. 1035), he makes a final attempt to reform the 'ill-nature' of the English. This end, pursued through the poem's insistent normative claims on the make-up and power of the people, bears the same goal as early immigration law: to define the terms under which natural allegiance can shift as new people are incorporated into the national whole.

II. TWO REFUGEE CRISES

The Huguenots are only mentioned in passing in *The True-born Englishman*. Yet Defoe's support for their naturalization is, as Pittis rightly identified, key to understanding the poem's politics—and the poet's. One of the drivers behind the Whig campaign for a general naturalization act was the need to provide statutory relief for the mounting hostility against Huguenot refugees. As with *Lex Talionis, The True-born Englishman* lent support to this campaign. When the debate turned to the social effects of naturalizing foreign Protestants more widely, Defoe returned to the example of the Huguenots, as he did to the assumed influence of his famous poem. Examining how he did so reveals the underlying function naturalization occupied in his socio-political thought and writing.

Defoe first expands upon the history of the Huguenots under Queen Elizabeth sketched in *The True-born Englishman* in *Giving Alms no Charity* (1704). Fundamental to the pamphlet's scheme for better employing England's poor is the idea that England's success as a manufacturing power can be traced to the fact that the 'wise Queen' appreciated that the strength of nation lay in its people.[34] Contra Pittis, she 'was far from that Opinion, we have shown too much of in complaining that Foreigners came to take the Bread out of our Mouths'.[35] Defoe invoked the Huguenots as an example of successful naturalization in part to provoke the High Tories who believed that naturalization ought to be contingent on religious conformity. In a 1704 letter to his friend John Fransham, Defoe groups *Giving Alms* with his writings on occasional conformity, suggesting that his social projects, support of immigration and confessional politics all worked to expand participation in the national economy.[36] Defoe decried the practice whereby Dissenters took Anglican communion occasionally in order to bypass civil restrictions. At the same time, he deplored the exclusion of Dissenters from civic life. The Huguenots provided a useful instance to argue against the latter. They were unified where Dissenters 'have not a Unity in Affection, enough to produce a Unity of Interest'.[37] And although Defoe used this disunity to prevent all Dissenters from being tarred with the same brush, he maintained a belief that unity would allow them to wield power. A power best illustrated by a hypothetical refusal: if Dissenters abstracted their wealth from the main, if they 'Card, Spin, Knit, Weave and Work' amongst themselves only, Defoe dares their persecutors to 'see how you'll maintain your own Poor without us'.[38]

The connection between naturalization, economic development and the toleration of Dissent is more apparent when Defoe argues against the imposition of sacramental tests on foreign

[33] See Paula Backscheider, 'The Verse Essay, John Locke, and Defoe's Jure Divino', *ELH*, 44 (1988), 99–124.
[34] He repeated this argument in *Review*, vol. 1, no. 10, 8 April 1704; no. 13, 18 April 1704.
[35] Daniel Defoe, *Giving Alms no Charity* (London, 1704).
[36] *The Letters of Daniel Defoe*, ed. G. H. Healey (Oxford, 1955), 72.
[37] *Political and Economic Writings of Daniel Defoe*, ed. W. R. Owens, vol. 3 (London, 2003), 222; *The Letters of Daniel Defoe*, 54.
[38] *Political and Economic Writings*, 3. 87.

Protestants. For him, naturalization is sufficient in and of itself. His reason for latitude is that a nation that can naturally accommodate foreign Protestants civically and confessionally would both draw immigrants to its shores and prevent the emigration of Dissenters.[39] Freedom of worship would allow England to attract and retain the necessary population for imperial dominance. Like Paterson, Defoe offers a reason of state where naturalization, free trade and religious toleration are mutually supportive.[40] Defoe's vision of naturalization is limited. In defending the Huguenots, he found a community of Protestants whose creed fit with his programme of extending freedom of worship to Trinitarians. With enough latitude and a society willing to embrace their utility, this unified group could shift their allegiance to the English state more completely.

For Defoe, the process of absorbing wealth and people had an ameliorative effect on the nature of English government. The Huguenots provided a useful instance in this regard too. In Defoe's mind they embodied the reserve power the sovereign people possessed as a limit to monarchic overreach, as outlined in *The True-born Englishman*. As he put in one of the earliest issues of the *Review*, so staunch were the Huguenots against the imposition of the arbitrary power of the French monarchy that they had to be 'rooted … out of the Kingdom' for that power to prevail.[41] The story Defoe tells across the *Review*'s volumes of successive waves of immigrants extends that of the poem by rendering more explicit the idea that the assimilation of immigrants is what allowed for the gradual acquisition of customary liberty by England's people. With the incorporation of new citizens England moves from being a 'Nation of Slaves and meer Soldiers, to a rich, oppulent, free, and a mighty People, as it is this Day'. The history begins with Henry VII, who, according to Defoe, established his Kingdom by embracing French migrants, and in the process opening '1.Trade for the Commons' and '2. Reducing his Nobility'. Elizabeth I is similarly lauded, and James I castigated for narrowing the body of Englishmen by driving the Puritans into exile.[42] The natural endpoint of this potted history is Parliamentary supremacy. As the people gain liberties from naturalizing new arrivals, the rights of those who represent them increase to the point where only Parliament 'can reverse the highest Humane Judgment, take off Attainders, and restore Blood; they can Legitimate Bastards, Naturalize Foreigners'. In short, Defoe's history bears out Stephanie DeGooyer's argument that the emergence of statutory naturalization was a key element in the shift of sovereign power towards Parliament.[43]

In Defoe's thought, naturalization is a means for deriving representative authority as well as for increasing the basis of economic power. The affective dimension that shaped how far newcomers were accepted by English society thus had an immense power. More than most, Defoe believed that the emotional ties between subjects could be influenced by what people read and heard. In an issue of the *Review* from 1705 Defoe attacks the 'false Reports, Malicious Suggestions' that have contributed more than anything else 'to the Disturbing the Peace of this Nation, and Dividing us farther'. His specific target is the Tory manuscript newsletter produced by John Dyer, which reported that an East India Company ship lost at sea had carried with it silver melted from English coinage. It was a crime to melt English coin, and Dyer's accusations played on the fear that free access to foreign trade might remove English wealth. In countering Dyer, Defoe describes the process by which precious metals become English currency as one of naturalization; gold and silver are 'Legitimated, or Naturaliz'd into *English*'.[44] The legal definition is never far from the surface when Defoe uses naturalization to mean something other than the conferral

[39] *Review*, vol. 5, no. 151, 15 March 1709.
[40] Paterson, 'Proposal for settling on the Isthmus of Darien', ff. 17–19.
[41] *Review*, vol. 1, no. 10, 8 April 1704.
[42] *Review*, vol. 5, no. 144, 26 February 1709.
[43] *Review*, vol. 2, no. 97, 16 October 1705; Stephanie DeGooyer, *Before Borders: A Legal and Literary History of Naturalization* (Baltimore, MD, 2022). I want to thank Stephanie for sharing material from this book prior to publication. *Before Borders* will no doubt form the basis for all future work on naturalization in this period.
[44] *Review*, vol. 2, no. 74, 23 August 1705. Defoe uses the same metaphor in *Review*, vol. 3, no. 4, 8 January 1706.

of citizenship rights. We get a sense from these cognate meanings what the extra-legal dimensions of naturalization entailed. In other issues the term becomes a way to allow '*Improvement of our Mother-Tongue by naturalising more significant Words in other Languages*'; only those words that expand the expressive possibility of English.[45] The prospects the two analogies raise are that allegiance can shift; that naturalization can create a system of exchange, allowing Englishness to be cast from the foundry of global trade; and that the circulation of 'correct' information can aid this process. As the exchange of information creates the conditions for incorporating more subjects, the expansion of language gives writing the range and grasp to draw them in—a view that we will see underwrites Defoe's innovations in the form of the novel.

To Dyer and his ilk, expanding the bounds of Englishness posed a direct threat to the nation's character. It is not surprising that *The True-born Englishman* was quickly embroiled in debates on national character. What is often overlooked, though, is the extent to which such debates shaped the poem's afterlife and, by extension, Defoe's reputation and relation to readers. With the Whig bill for the naturalization of foreign Protestants before Parliament in February 1709, Defoe reverts to a strategy pursued in the poem by asking readers of the *Review* how long must we pursue 'private Aims, and separate Interest, and neglect the Body in the gross?' The question sets in motion a further series of inquiries that prompt the reader to agree that wealth depends on population and that colonial expansion depopulates the main. As they do, the interest of the national political community comes into view. This interest is economic until Defoe begs leave to ask a final question: 'But, O *Ye True-Born Englishmen*, shall I ask you another Question?—Who are you all, and whence came you all? And how long have you been Possessors here?'[46] The question is designed to discomfit readers in the same way that the poem does, forcing to mind an inglorious history intended to unsettle how they locate themselves in the world. The allusion relies on the 'General Acceptation' of the poem: the wide readership that he takes as evidence that he has imbued the meaning of 'true-born' with a satiric aspect that undermines the appeal to English originality.

Defoe came to see the 1709 campaign for legal naturalization and social acceptance as an extension of his poem's original project, a kind of redemption for the reputation England 'lost when the *Dutch* that came hither to bring over your deliverer, and indeed your deliverance … *Were paid, and curs'd, and hurry'd home again*'.[47] The problem Defoe faced was that soon after the General Naturalization Act passed in March 1709, attention turned from the Huguenots to another set of arrivals: the so-called 'Poor Palatines', the roughly 14,000 Germans from the Rhenish Palatinate who began to reach England that same year. Statt points out that news of the Act's passage would not have reached Germany in time to spur their exodus. And, even if it had, the Palatines were too poor to take advantage of its provisions.[48] This did not stop a successful Tory campaign that presented the German refugees as a direct result of widening access to naturalization. England's failure to accommodate the vast number of arrivals reflected and fuelled a xenophobia that Robbins shows led to the Act's repeal three years later and ensured thereafter that the example of the Palatines was raised each time an eighteenth-century parliament reconsidered general naturalization.[49]

Defoe's first instinct was to propose a set of projects to the Lord Treasurer Sidney Godolphin and to communicate them widely through *The Review*. He thought the solution was to resettle the Palatines on unused land, in 'Forrests and Wastes'.[50] This would have the benefit of keeping

[45] *Review*, vol. 5, no. 93, 30 October 1708.
[46] *Review*, vol. 5, no. 141, 24 February 1709. Defoe alludes to his poem *Ye True-born Englishman Proceed* (1701), in which he satirized another set of 'disloyal MPs'.
[47] *Review*, vol. 6, no. 56, 11 August 1709.
[48] Daniel Statt, *Foreigners and Englishmen: The Controversy over Immigration and Population, 1660–1760* (Newark, DE, 1995), 127.
[49] Robbins, 'A Note on General Naturalization', 171.
[50] *Review*, vol. 6, no. 39, 2 July 1709.

them in England, though many had come in the hope of travelling on to England's North American colonies. It would also remove them from directly competing with England's agricultural labourers, and stimulate the economy from the land up. His belief in the scheme did not waver. He continued to promote it in *The Review* and discussed his meeting with Godolphin in the first volume of *A Tour Thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain* (1724).[51] But he did grudgingly realize 'The *True-Born English* Reasons, why this easie, profitable, and hospitable Experiment will not take'.[52] The trouble was the 'vast Distance between Reason and Humour',[53] or as he put it elsewhere, 'the Difficulty is in your Tempers, not in your Reasons'.[54] He could convince readers of the necessity of the settlement scheme but failed to change their inherent bias against foreigners. In a less dogged writer this might have proved that satire could not change one's nature. Defoe leaves readers with a mix of plea and threat that suggests he did not abandon his ideal that satire could be constitutionally reforming. The only way to 'stop the Mouth of Railery and Satyr upon the Nation', he writes, is for England to open its 'Hands and Hearts' to the Palatines'.[55]

III. *THE FORTUNATE MISTRESS* AND THE LIMITS OF NATURALIZATION

Defoe built his polemical strategy on the belief that in England 'Writers of Pamphlets … have so many Turns to impose upon their People'.[56] He often approached the same issue from multiple anonymous viewpoints in order to draw sections of the populace into coherence around the same basic proposition.[57] The turns he took to define the 'author of *The True-born Englishman*' on immigration were comparatively univocal. He claimed them as his own and he always made them with particular groups of Protestants in mind. The significance of this figure—the popular writer—to the history of citizenship is perhaps most evident in his dispute with John Toland, the putative author of *The State Anatomy of Great Britain* (1717).[58] The two fought over the intercultural reach of naturalization and its consequent impact on England's Protestant identity. Their dispute raised a vital question for Defoe—touched on but never fully articulated in his earlier work—about how to discern some natural law limits that might halt the progression of naturalization.

The year before *The State Anatomy* appeared, Defoe published a new edition of *The True-born Englishman* with minor revisions and a new preface. His rationale was that the experience of German refugees had been mobilized against the new German king, George I. Despite the fact that the Act of Settlement's disabling clause was in place to dissuade immigrants from Hanover, the anxiety remained pervasive enough that Parliament was compelled to pass an Act ensuring that the clause was included in every private naturalization bill.[59]

The backlash against both the new king and the Palatine refugees left Defoe acutely aware that *The True-born Englishman* had not yet altered the 'humour' of some readers. It had not removed their '*Surliness to Strangers*' or '*exclusive Opinion of themselves*', as he put it in the poem's new preface. He was nonetheless confident that in the time since the poem's first appearance '*the Word* True-Born *was so effectually lash'd by it, that we never hear it made Use of*' (119). Defoe takes this shift in the frame of reference as evidence that the naturalizing process had started. Changing how people defined themselves was, for him, the first step to changing their '*Temper*'.

[51] *Writings on Travel, Discovery and History by Daniel Defoe*, ed. John McVeagh, vol. 1 (London, 2001), 232. A similar scheme is outlined in *A Brief History of the Poor Palatine Refugees Lately Arrived in England* (1709), although this pamphlet has been convincingly de-attributed in P. N. Furbank and W. R. Owens, *Defoe De-Attributions* (London, 1994), 35.
[52] *Review*, vol. 6, no. 39, 2 July 1709.
[53] *Review*, vol. 6, no. 40, 5 July 1709.
[54] *Review*, vol. 6, no. 41, 7 July 1709.
[55] Review, vol. 6, no. 56, 11 August 1709.
[56] *Satire, Fantasy and Writing on the Supernatural by Daniel Defoe*, ed. P. N. Furbank, vol. 4 (London, 2003), 64.
[57] Novak, *Master of Fictions*, 125. It is worth noting that Novak's view is based on a more expansive Defoe canon than that defined in the work of Furbank and Owens.
[58] I follow Justin Champion who convincingly attributes the pamphlet to Toland in *Republican Learning: John Toland and the Crisis of Christian Culture, 1696–1722* (Manchester, 2003). It is also clear that Defoe believed Toland was the author.
[59] 1 Geo.1 st.2.c.4.

His recourse to satire as a mode capable of being '*universally acceptable*' even to those '*most lash'd by it*' (119) signals a theory of genre in which the demographic reach of satire's lash guaranteed its eventual moral efficacy. His republication and redeployment of his most popular satire in new context has to be seen as another attempt to bridge 'reason' and 'humour', to bolster rational arguments in favour of immigration with a kind of writing capable of altering a reader's character or constitution.

If satire aimed for universal acceptance, then presumably it could naturalize all who were sufficiently changed by it. The logic of this position calls for a far more encompassing mandate for naturalization than Defoe's tolerationism would allow. Precisely who could be changed and thus incorporated into the national political community was the crux of his dispute with Toland. The author of *The State Anatomy* argued for abolishing the sacramental test and refiguring foreign policy according to a global Protestant interest. Holding '*Scriptures* alone' as rule of 'a universal Protestant faith' and admitting into the fold all who hold 'no principles, that can render them justly suspected to their Sovereigns',[60] Toland showed that church membership need not act as the binding force of the national political community. He raised other points of affiliation that might substitute, citing the integration of the '*French* Refugees'. They live in '*English* houses … eat *English* beef … pay *English* taxes'; they serve with distinction in the English army and have not disturbed the Church (56). They have become good English subjects on the whole because of this integration. Toland's argument is premised on populationism. His belief that in the 'multitude of inhabitants consists the riches, and consequently power of a nation' forms the basis for his attack on the Tory campaign against a General Naturalization Act. For Toland, the disabling clause is a shameful vestige of the campaign, and should be abolished, especially in the cases of the Baron de Bernsforff and Count de Bothmer, the Hanoverian nobles whose exclusion from the English peerage despite their service to the country is akin to the treatment of William's Dutch courtiers (56–7).

Defoe responded with *An Argument Proving that the Design of Employing and Ennobling Foreigners, Is a Treasonable Conspiracy against the Constitution* (1717). Here the writer argues that admitting 'Foreign Families into the Rank of the Nobility' will 'give Occasion for more Satyrs to be written and jested with over the World, upon the Mixtures, and unknown Originals of our Peers'.[61] Such hypocrisy was immediately seized upon by Toland, who, in *The Second Part of the State Anatomy* (1717), took noticeable glee in pointing out that the author 'who wrote the *True-born Englishman,* a Satyr against the whole *English nation for their contempt of Foreigners*' now 'rails against all Foreigners indiscriminately'.[62]

This apparent reversal has puzzled Defoe's critics and bibliographers.[63] When read against the exigencies of the general naturalization debate, Defoe's rationale becomes somewhat clearer. It seems that he was willing to risk accusations of hypocrisy in order to shore up the confessional limits to naturalization and to expose Toland's own reversals on this issue. It is a strategic gamble taken by a writer confident that he will have other 'Turns' to work upon the public. Behind it lurks Defoe's fear that Toland was using the Hanoverian nobles as a front for reviving his 1714 proposal to naturalize England's Jews.[64] To Defoe the central aim of Toland's *Reasons for Naturalizing the Jews* (1714) was the destruction of the Church. As Justin Champion points

[60] John Toland, *The State Anatomy of Great Britain* (London, 1717), 54.
[61] Defoe, *An Argument Proving that the Design of Employing and Enobling Foreigners: Is a Treasonable Conspiracy* (London, 1717), 16.
[62] Toland, *The Second Part of the State Anatomy* (London, 1717), 27, 30.
[63] Furbank and Owens deattributed the pamphlet because of this inconsistency but reversed their position on the weight of external evidence. Furbank and Owens, *The Canonisation of Daniel Defoe* (New Haven, CT, 1998), 157–60; P. N Furbank and W. R. Owens, *A Critical Bibliography of Daniel Defoe* (London, 1998), 168–71, xxiv. Andreas Mueller makes the case that *An Argument* exhibits moments of irony, however poorly signalled, designed to expose Toland's own reversals. Mueller, '"One of the greatest puzzles in Defoe bibliography": John Toland, Daniel Defoe and Ennobling Forreigners', in Katherine Ellison, Kit Kincade and Holly Faith Nelson (eds), *Topographies of the Imagination* (New York, NY, 2014), 271–97.
[64] Toland, *Reasons for Naturalizing the Jews in Great Britain and Ireland* (London, 1714).

out, Toland's efforts were far subtler than Defoe would allow. The philosopher was not out to destroy the church per se, but to divorce religious confession from civic identity and civil rights. By acknowledging that Jews partook of a common humanity, and that like any other group, they could be 'sordid wretches, sharpers, extortioners' or 'men of probity and worth',[65] he found natural law grounds on which to expand the notion of English citizenship to the point where it would 'break the confessional foundation of politics'.[66]

Defoe had good reason to suspect Toland's moderate approach to naturalization in the *State Anatomy*. In *Reasons* Toland had pushed the provocative case that the Jews were 'preferable' to other naturalized populations. Having no nation of their own, no place to which 'they are ty'd by inclination or interest', there was no risk of split loyalty. On Toland's account, Jews will never 'enter into any political engagements, which might be prejudicial to ours, as we have known (for Example) certain *French* Refugees to have done'.[67] Calling attention to *Reasons* had the effect of showing that behind the supposedly narrow intent of naturalizing two Hanoverian nobles in the *State Anatomy* lies a radical attempt to wield naturalization as a means to extend civil rights to England's Jews. It also exposed Toland's hypocrisy in pushing for the naturalization of two men with clear foreign interests. For Defoe, whose idea of toleration amounted to extending rights of religious worship—and not necessarily civil rights—for trinitarians only, this prospect was intolerable.

Evidence certainly suggests that Defoe had *Reasons* in his sight when he published *An Argument*. From the outset, he attacks Toland and his associates for having followed the 'Method of the *Jewish Rabbins*' in arguing both sides of a point, haranguing 'the People with their Zeal for the Law of Moses' in order to stoke sedition against the Romans and accusing sects they disagreed with of inciting the Romans in order to lessen sectarian power.[68] The terms of attack, namely Toland's facility with Jewish sources, rabbinic commentators and clear admiration for Moses, though absent from the *State Anatomy*, were widely commented upon aspects of *Reasons*.

The charge did not land. After half-heartedly disavowing the authorship of *An Argument*, Defoe published *A Farther Argument Against Ennobling Foreigners* (1717) in which he attempts to stave off the progress of naturalization, while keeping true to the spirit of *The True-born Englishman*. Observing that 'this *Toland* makes himself merry with *De Foe's* Verses' he has 'only this to say':

> that if that Satyr was Just upon our Country and Nobility, it certainly infers, that as we are now arriv'd to an Excellence which we believe is not *out-done* by other Nations, either in Science or Religion, and moral Virtue, *we should keep were we are,* and mix no farther *if we can help it,* unless we are sure to improve.

Defoe argues that his attempt to arrest the progression of naturalization is less about 'mixing of Blood' than 'mixing our Politicks'.[69] However flawed, this is Defoe's attempt to confront his growing unease that naturalization, in emphasizing a sense of natural allegiance, contained the germ to dismantle the institutional structures that gave form to the national political community. This distinction was poorly made and Defoe certainly failed to defend his reputation against Toland's onslaught. Yet he did not abandon his search for 'natural' limits, a capacity for feeling or aspect of identity that made some people better prospects for naturalization than others.

[65] Toland, *Reasons*, 20.
[66] Champion, *Republican Learning*, 143, 'Toleration and Citizenship in Enlightenment England: John Toland and the Naturalization of the Jews, 1714–1753', in Ole Peter Grell and Roy Porter (eds), *Toleration in Enlightenment Europe* (Cambridge, 1999), 133–56.
[67] Toland, *Reasons*, 12–13.
[68] Defoe, *An Argument*, 7.
[69] Defoe, *A Farther Argument*, 35.

Although Robinson Crusoe is the son of a German immigrant, it is *The Fortunate Mistress* (1724) that most explicitly confronts this question. In theme, and as process, naturalization acts as an interface for the novel's exploration of national identity and the moral limits it places on individuals. When focalized through a protagonist-narrator, prose fiction possessed the necessary scope for Defoe to respond to the individual tests that, following the inclusion of disabling clause in private naturalization bills, once again determined naturalization. The form was also broad enough in its evocation of social reality for him to explore what he believed were the natural, social and confessional determinants of citizenship. The reflexive acknowledgement between the immigrant seeking naturalization and the novelized subject navigating the interactions with people and institutions that shape her sense of social morality and felt allegiance comes into focus as Defoe responds to Toland's challenge, addressing the twinned propositions behind the philosopher's radical extension of naturalization rights: (1) That Jews might prove better subjects than Huguenots and, (2) that amongst the Jews there were men of 'probity' as well as 'sharpers'—there being no difference in humankind between Jews and Protestants.

The novel's narrator and heroine is a Huguenot refugee, having arrived in England with her parents in 1683. Her family are 'People of better Fashion, than ordinarily the People call'd Refugees'.[70] They are nonetheless 'truly Refugees' as her father makes clear, having fled France for '*Conscience*' and not for profit. The young heroine is culturally naturalized from a young age, speaking 'Natural *English*' and assuming 'all the Customs of the *English* Young Women' (24). Given the prominence of her parents, she might have been legally naturalized as well.

After an imprudent marriage, the heroine is left destitute, and embarks upon a series of sexual adventures in the pursuit of financial gain. The extent to which she genuinely examines her actions once that gain is achieved has become the site of a critical dispute over the novel's realism. According to Jonathan Lamb, *The Fortunate Mistress* never reaches beyond the realm of romance. It is confined there by the heroine's failure to engage 'in the sort of self-examination which forges a person out of a self, and makes an abridged history out of the chaos of one's memories'. In Lamb's reading, Roxana prefers to engage uncritically with the image of herself she sees mirrored in others.[71] P. N. Furbank makes the opposing and far more convincing case that Roxana is an 'indefatigable self-castigator', whose distaste with her own hypocrisy and lament for her failure to repent produces precisely the kind of personhood Lamb feels is absent.[72] At the heart of their disagreement is the depth of the heroine's character, and how it refracted through her interactions with others. For Defoe, this was a question of naturalization. And it is naturalization that structures his response, entering the novel at moments when heroine's self-examination takes into its ambit the moral constraints of national identity.

One such moment occurs when Roxana encounters a Jewish trader in Amsterdam, brought in by a Dutch Merchant to help convert her assets into bills of exchange she can transport across Europe. Laura Rosenthal identifies this as the central point in the heroine's progression from privately kept 'woman of pleasure' to courtesan. James Thompson notes that this problem of converting ill-gotten wealth provides a crux for several of Defoe's novels. In the case of *The Fortunate Mistress*, by converting the jewels she received from her murdered lover the Jeweller, the heroine can efface aspects of her life and deeds.[73] Defoe called this process of conversion naturalization in the *Review*, drawing a parallel between the conferral of citizenship and the way wealth can slough off its origin and seek value in a new country. In the novel the presence of the Jew at the point of exchange temporarily thwarts the conversion, as he recognizes the jewels and believes the heroine a murderer. From that point on, the Jew is pitted against the heroine. For Rosenthal,

[70] *The Novels of Daniel Defoe*, ed. Furbank, vol. 9 (London, 2009), ix, 23.
[71] Jonathan Lamb, *The Things Things Say* (Princeton, NJ, 2011), 162.
[72] *The Novels of Daniel Defoe*, ed. Furbank, vol. 9, 2.
[73] James Thompson, *Models of Value: Eighteenth-Century Political Economy and the Novel* (Durham, NC, 1996), 88–9.

this juxtaposition works to create a sympathetic identification between the Jew and the prostitute, with each pursuing accumulation in ways that threatened the period's commercial culture. The Jew becomes, in her incisive reading, 'a distorted mirror and limit point' for the heroine's 'looming trade-offs'.[74]

To establish this comparison Rosenthal looks forward to the controversy surrounding the 'Jew Bill' of 1753, in which both exponents and opponents of Jewish naturalization linked the social position of Jews and Huguenots.[75] Toland's *Reasons* anticipates this comparison, and is the more likely target in *The Fortunate Mistress* when Defoe takes the opportunities afforded by prose fiction to examine something he gestured to in *The Trueborn Englishman* and across the *Review*: the notion that naturalization had a moral dimension; that under certain conditions it could 'improve' those it assimilated to England's 'Climate'.

Immediately prior to meeting the Jew for the first time, the heroine once again emphasizes her naturalized status: 'I esteem'd myself an *English-Woman,* tho' I was born in France' (103). Looking back on how she escaped his clutches, she remarks that she would have repented 'had I had any Religion' (110). The 'Affair of the *Jew*' (111) becomes enmeshed in the developing moral sense of the heroine, shadowing its moments of arrest and suppression. The Jew functions as foil. On one plane his suffering is explained by the common belief that the abject condition of the Jews was witness to the wrath of God's judgement. In a more concentrated way, his condition allows Defoe to test the limits of who can be naturalized.

Fleeing the Jew, the heroine travels from Calais to Dover, a journey that recalls her first trip 'from *Rochelle*' as a refugee (112). Midway she is visited by another sign of God's judgement, when a storm batters the ship. Again, she is forced to reflect on her life. This time England's shores become a point of both physical and spiritual deliverance. Reaching them, she declares 'it would not be possible that I should be the same Creature again' (114). Redemption and naturalization are thus bound together. Despite the heroine's constant backsliding, and the ambiguity of her eventual 'repentance', the mere fact that repentance is an object of her thought makes her a candidate for naturalization. The novel's abrupt ending leaves in doubt whether the heroine changed her nature but not the fact that she has experienced and taken in the stimuli that would set this change in motion. The Jew is indeed a 'limit point' to Roxana's morality but also to her intersubjectivity and cosmopolitanism. His religion and lack of homeland, *contra* Toland, render him unable to change: he is cut off from any degree of national allegiance or fellow feeling, and has nothing thereby to convert. No doubt provoked by Toland's challenge, the heroine's interaction with the Jew stages Defoe's more limited approach to naturalization—one where Protestantism is the *sine qua non* and the embrace of a community of moral actors required. That the Jew's exclusion from such a community promotes the kind of reflection that would allow the heroine's entrance into it reveals a structural affinity between naturalization and the novel. Each in its own way seeks to incorporate the individual into a social world.

After successfully evading the Jew's continued pursuit, the heroine marries the Dutch merchant, an event that marks the end of her 'Life of Crime' (202). Once more, the fate of the Jew acts as point of reflection. When they find out that the Jew is a fugitive in a robbery and no longer a threat, the Merchant and the heroine can return to the continent. At this point the Merchant realizes the heroine is 'so naturaliz'd' that to remove her from England would be to carry her out of her 'native Country' (194). This sets him on his own path to naturalization. He opts for a private bill, 'joining in' with other foreigners to 'save the Expence'. Having purchased his '*Act of Naturalization*' (201) he acquires a Baronetage. Both processes are expensive and their transactional nature raises questions about the value of obtaining nationality and rank by wealth

[74] Laura Rosenthal, *Infamous Commerce: Prostitution in Eighteenth-Century British Literature and Culture* (Ithaca, NY, 2006), 72.
[75] Rosenthal, *Infamous Commerce*, 80. For the impact the Jewish Naturalization Bill had on later novels, see Bonnie Latimer, 'Samuel Richardson and the "Jew Bill" of 1753: A New Political Context for *Sir Charles Grandison*', *RES*, 66 (2015), 520–39.

alone. Here Defoe speaks from the Merchant's point of view: 'Titles sometimes assist to elevate the Soul, and to infuse generous Principles into the mind, and especially where there was a good Foundation laid in the Persons' (200). In telling the life of a refugee, *The Fortunate Mistress* holds up extended biographical narrative as a mode to explore how these foundations are built, shaped and changed by circumstances of place and interaction with others: for testing how one is valued and re-values themselves as part of the national whole.

When Defoe talks about naturalization in the novel, he does so in order to call attention to the moral reckoning that occurs when the rational self-interest of the entrepreneurial heroine (who later ages would dub *homo economicus*) is brought into contact with notions of national 'character' and the kinds of political solidarity and fellow-feeling it ideally induces. Viewing the novel's interest in this process as a continuation of the campaign for a general naturalization act waged by the 'author of *The True-born Englishman*', as this essay has done, discloses the political stakes and literary implications of naturalization. In Defoe's work the concept ties both his satire and the history of the novel to his contributions to demography, economics and moral philosophy. Naturalization is the moment when each one of these fields implicates the others so as to define the modern citizen as someone who possesses the right sentiments, is productive and convertible or tractable in a certain way. It is no coincidence that the novelistic subject takes on these same properties given that one of its early architects sought a form of writing with the requisite reach and popularity to instil and enforce the demands of a citizenship he helped categorize as both legal status and aspect of identity.

University of Melbourne, Australia