

## CONTENTS

*List of Illustrations* · xiii

*Editorial Method and Apparatus* · xv

Editors' Introduction to Volume 5	3
Appendix 1	17
The <i>Monitor</i> , No. CLX 12 August 1758	18
The <i>Monitor's</i> Vindication of His Constitutional Principles 10 March 1759	25
To the <i>Monitor</i> 2 May 1761	34
The <i>North Briton</i> , No. III 19 June 1762	40
To the <i>North Briton</i> 26 June 1762	46
The <i>North Briton</i> , No. IX 31 July 1762	52
The <i>North Briton</i> , No. XVIII 2 October 1762	58
The <i>North Briton</i> , No. XXIX 18 December 1762	63
To the Printer 10 May 1763	69
To the Author of a Letter Signed A Tory 31 May 1763	73
To the Author of a Letter Signed A Tory, No. II 6 June 1763	77
To the Printer 9 November 1763	81
To the Printer 13 December 1763	84

To Messrs. Thistle, and M. B. and Co 10 September 1764	86
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> 6 July 1765	90
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> 27 August 1765	93
To the Printer 7 September 1765	97
To the Printer 11 November 1765	100
To the Printer 14 November 1765	103
To the Printer 23 January 1766	107
To the Printer 22 February 1766	111
To the Printer of the <i>Gazetteer</i> 30 September 1766	113
Editors' Introduction to the Junius Letters	115
For the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter I] 28 April 1767	117
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter III] 24 June 1767	121
To The Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter IX] 5 December 1767	124
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter X] 19 December 1767	130
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter XIV] 4 March 1768	134
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter XIX] 12 April 1768	140

To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter XXI] 23 April 1768	144
The <i>North Briton</i> , No. XLVII 10 May 1768	148
John Wilkes, Esq. 12 May 1768	154
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter XXIII] 12 May 1768	160
The <i>North Briton</i> , No. XLVIII 14 May 1768	164
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter XXIV] 19 May 1768	170
The <i>North Briton</i> , No. L 28 May 1768	172
The Extraordinary <i>North Briton</i> , No. IV 3 June 1768	179
Addressed to the Favourite 18 June 1768	184
The <i>North Briton</i> , No. LIII 18 June 1768	188
A Dialogue between a Courtier and a Patriot 25 June 1768	192
Addressed to the British Parliament 2 July 1768	195
Addressed to a Certain Great Lawyer 9 July 1768	199
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter XXVI] 19 July 1768	204
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter XXVIII] 23 July 1768	206

A Dialogue between a Courtier and a Freeholder of Middlesex 23 July 1768	209
The Extraordinary <i>North Briton</i> , No. XII 30 July 1768	218
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter XXIX] 30 July 1768	224
To the <i>North Briton</i> 6 August 1768	228
To the <i>North Briton</i> 13 August 1768	236
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter XXXIII] 19 August 1768	244
To the Right Honourable William Lord Mansfield 20 August 1768	249
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter XXXIV] 23 August 1768	255
To the <i>North Briton</i> 27 August 1768	260
To the Earl of Hillsborough [Miscellaneous Junius Letter XXXV] 29 August 1768	267
To the Earl of Hillsborough [Miscellaneous Junius Letter XXXVII] 1 September 1768	272
To the Earl of Hillsborough [Miscellaneous Junius Letter XLIII] 15 September 1768	277
The Extraordinary <i>North Briton</i> , No. XIX 17 September 1768	281
The Extraordinary <i>North Briton</i> , No. XX 24 September 1768	287
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter XLV] 6 October 1768	292

To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter XLVII] 15 October 1768	295
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter L] 27 October 1768	297
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter LI] 14 November 1768	300
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter LII] 21 November 1768	313
To the Independent Gentlemen, Clergy, and Freeholders, of the County of Middlesex 3 December 1768	315
The Petition of an Englishman 7 January 1769	323
Junius Letter I 21 January 1769	335
Junius Letter V 21 February 1769	344
The <i>North Briton</i> , No. XCV 11 March 1769	347
Junius Letter VIII 18 March 1769	352
The <i>North Briton</i> , No. XCVI 18 March 1769	356
The Extraordinary <i>North Briton</i> , No. XLVI 25 March 1769	366
The Extraordinary <i>North Briton</i> , No. XLVII 1 April 1769	373
The Elector. Letter I 1 April 1769	380
The Elector. Letter II 10 April 1769	389

To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter LIV] 12 April 1769	397
Junius Letter X 21 April 1769	398
Junius Letter XI 24 April 1769	400
To the Right Honourable the Marquis of Granby [Miscellaneous Junius Letter LV] 6 May 1769	405
The <i>North Briton</i> , No. CVIII 20 May 1769	407
Extraordinary <i>North Briton</i> , No. LIV 20 May 1769	417
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> 25 May 1769	423
Junius Letter XII 30 May 1769	428
Junius Letter XIII 12 June 1769	435
Junius Letter XVI 19 July 1769	438
Junius Letter XVIII 29 July 1769	443
Addressed to the Favourite, by a Lady 12 August 1769	448
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter LVIII] 5 September 1769	455
Junius Letter XXIII 19 September 1769	459
To His Grace the Duke of Grafton 23 September 1769	466
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> 28 September 1769	470

To Junius	
16 October 1769	477
Junius Letter XXIX	
19 October 1769	484
To the People of England	
15 November 1769	488
Junius Letter XXXII	
15 November 1769	492
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i>	
[Miscellaneous Junius Letter LXV]	
23 November 1769	494
To Junius	
[Miscellaneous Junius Letter LXVII]	
28 November 1769	498
To a Certain Great Lawyer	
2 December 1769	502
To the Printer	
4 December 1769	507
Junius Letter XXXIV	
12 December 1769	509
To the People of England	
25 January 1770	513
To the People of England	
31 January 1770	518
To the American Merchants	
1 February 1770	522
A Defence of a Late Protest	
3 March 1770	527
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i>	
[Miscellaneous Junius Letter LXIX]	
5 March 1770	536
The <i>Whisperer</i> , No. VI	
24 March 1770	540
The <i>Whisperer</i> Extraordinary, No. XII	
11 April 1770	544

To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> 19 October 1770	549
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> 19 October 1770	553
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter LXXVIII] 24 November 1770	562
The Juryman's Touchstone or A Full Refutation of Lord Mansfield's Lawless Opinions in Crown Libels Addressed to All the Jurors of England January/February 1771	564
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter LXXXVI] 11 January 1771	602
To the Printer of the <i>Public Advertiser</i> [Miscellaneous Junius Letter LXXXVII] 17 January 1771	604
Junius Letter XLII 30 January 1771	611
Junius Letter XLIII 6 February 1771	619
Junius Letter LV 26 August 1771	622
Junius Letter LIX 8 October 1771	625
Junius Letter LX 15 October 1771	633
Junius Letter LXI 17 October 1771	636
Junius Letter LXII 18 October 1771	641
Junius Letter LXVIII 21 January 1772	643
Dedication to the English Nation 1772	663

## Editors' Introduction to Volume 5

*The first public work I undertook (and the first thing I ever published in my life except a few miscellaneous pieces in the Pennsylvania Magazine in the year '75 for in England I never was the author of a syllable in print) was the pamphlet Common-Sense.<sup>1</sup>*

*My Lord,*

*I have the Honor to inclose to Your Lordship two Publications, circulated by the Rebels. One of them, the Crisis, is written by a Mr. Paine, who was brought over hither, some Years ago, by Dr. Franklin, and has been chiefly employed by him, in one Pursuit or other, ever since. He was a Grub street Writer in London, when he fell into the Doctor's Way; and, by falling into his Principles, was enabled by him to emerge from Obscurity, and to meet with considerable Attentions in this Country. He has nothing to lose, but every thing to hope, from the Establishment of the present rebellious Situation.<sup>2</sup>*

THE FIFTH AND sixth volumes of *Thomas Paine: Collected Writings* attempt to reconcile these two disparate statements. The first, Paine's statement in a letter to the Congress of the Confederation, addressing his possible employment as the official historiographer of the continent, seems to be his plain admission that, other than a few pieces in the *Pennsylvania Magazine* in 1775 (this ed., 1:263, 268, 274, 278), *Common Sense*

1. See this ed., 4:254–71.

2. *The Manuscripts of the Earl of Dartmouth*, 3 vols. (Eyre and Spottiswood, 1895), 2:439.

was his first publication. Paine's use of the word "syllable" to describe his lack of published writing in England is unusual. But it may nonetheless deliberately obfuscate a prolific period in Paine's political and writing life. The other statement, by the undersecretary for the colonies writing to the secretary of state for the colonies, hints at what this volume presents: Paine as a "Grub street" writer and (partially in that capacity) a close confederate of Benjamin Franklin, who famously wrote his letter of introduction to America. Essentially a slur against poor, so-called hackney authors, "Grub street writer"<sup>3</sup> is Serle's assessment of Paine as something of a known commodity, reputed or known by his scurrilous political writing in England and America, and obviously, for the "Rebels."

This first of these two volumes will address that apparent conflict by covering Paine's writings during the years 1758–74, a period usually presented as a great blank in his career as an author. The works presented here demonstrate the formative political, ideological, and authorial environment in which Paine, as far as new techniques of textual analysis permit us to conjecture, may have engaged with contemporary English issues of his day.<sup>4</sup> These techniques suggest that Paine developed a writing voice that was fluid in both tone and content, and cultivated radical Whig tendencies, which, suitably innovated on, formed the basis for his later more democratic republican social and political thought. Working in the literary genres that dominated political discourse in the period, ranging from journals like the *North Briton*, *Monitor*, *Whisperer*, and *Extraordinary North Briton*, to newspapers like the *Public Advertiser* (London) and the *Gazetteer and Daily Advertiser*, Paine apparently moved across genres and styles as he developed his most recognizable narrative traits and characteristic political concepts. This period may be nothing less than the possible incubator for the Thomas Paine that history and previous scholarship have contended over since the American Revolution, and the crucible of his political philosophy.

3. On the equivalent of "Grub Street" enlightenment in France, see Robert Darnton, *The Literary Underground of the Old Regime* (Harvard University Press, 1982).

4. For an account of this method of analysis, see General Introduction, this ed., 1:226. The method is explained at greater length in Gary Berton, Smiljana Petrovic, Lubomir Ivanov, and Robert Schiaffino, "Examining the Thomas Paine Corpus: Automated Computer Authorship Attribution Methodology Applied to Thomas Paine's Writings," in *New Directions in Thomas Paine Studies*, ed. Scott Cleary and Ivy Linton Stabell (Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 31–50. As texts located by this technique cannot always be verified by other methods of author identification, this volume and volume 6 of this edition have collected all the texts identified as Paine's by this method as "supplemental" volumes. The digital version of this edition will continue to update and verify these (and other) texts.

The immediate context for this period is the Seven Years' War (1756–63), English colonial policy in America and the political ramifications of the parliamentary reform movement summed up by the cry “Wilkes and Liberty.” Paine began his maturity as a political theorist and writer toward the end of the Seven Years' War, just as the new ministry of William Pitt the Elder came to power and clashes between Tory and Whig writers highlighted, and often exacerbated, the conflicts between the Crown, Parliament, and Pitt's ministry.<sup>5</sup> The second era of the Patriotic or Real Whigs began as Paine entered adulthood, and his maturing political instincts and writer's craft during this period coincided with the return of a loose coalition of politicians and writers who worked under this banner. Borrowed from the group of Whig politicians who largely opposed the foreign policy and executive power consolidation of Robert Walpole in the 1730s and 1740s, “Patriotic Whigs” was an ideal umbrella term for the political network Paine seemingly immersed himself into as the Seven Years' War ended. Taking up the previous Patriotic Whig goals of reducing factions and expanding new or retrieving lost liberties, these Patriotic Whigs evidently helped Paine coalesce his political and authorial activity around a group of like-minded progressive intellectuals. They were allied with career politicians like Pitt and Lord Shelburne, who sought to defend the liberties that existed (or had existed) in England, with the aim of fighting the entrenched privilege and corruption of the aristocratic class and royal interference in Parliament.<sup>6</sup> Their cause included the quest for honest government, the rule of law, and a defense of basic liberties. They used sympathetic newspapers and journals to advance their politics and convince the public that their politics alone were truly “patriotic,” and upheld a specifically English tradition of liberty that was threatened by executive ambition and parliamentary corruption by the wealthy and the Crown. Such contention against the established power brokers of mid-eighteenth-century England was nothing short of “radical,” a term that by the end of this period was coming to describe the parliamentary reform movement, with “radicalism” following by the 1820s.

5. William Pitt the Elder, 1st Earl of Chatham (1708–1778), sat in the House of Commons from the 1730s to the 1760s, until moving into the House of Lords after becoming Lord Chatham in 1766. Secretary of state at the crucial time of the Seven Years' War, he is credited with Britain's success. He formed the government between 1766 and 1768, but illness interrupted his leadership.

6. William Petty Fitzmaurice, 1st Marquess of Lansdowne (Lord Shelburne) (1737–1805), was a Whig who allied with Pitt early in the 1760s.

To the extent that we can verify them as Paine's, the writings in this volume demonstrate that he very soon became an active and leading advocate for the cause of these Patriotic Whigs. Emerging as a promising young writer for this group, he became deeply immersed in the political controversies of the following decade in English politics. How Paine achieved this position so early in his life, in his late twenties and thirties, and certainly well before his contributions to the American Revolution, remains something of a mystery. In 1757, after some adventures in privateering, Paine lived in London and attended science lectures, socialized at coffee shops, and met many leading intellectuals. Records are sparse, unfortunately, of exactly who he encountered and when, with some exceptions, like the science lectures given by James Ferguson, Benjamin Martin, and John Bevis, astronomer of the Royal Society.<sup>7</sup> In this milieu, however, it seems he first met many of the writers he later collaborated with, such as Benjamin Franklin, James Burgh, and William Moore.<sup>8</sup> Burgh and Franklin in particular were close, and both were members of the Club for Honest Whigs.<sup>9</sup> J.G.A. Pocock suggests that "Paine had no real place in the club of Honest Whigs to which Franklin had introduced him in

7. Ferguson (1710–1776) was a Scottish astronomer; Martin (1705–1782) was a lexicographer and inventor of scientific instruments; and Bevis (1695–1781) was also a doctor and electrical researcher.

8. A surgeon with six children (by 1780), William Moore was editor of the *Whisperer* (1770–72), which was very hostile to Lord North's ministry, and which reached a hundred numbers. His *Crisis*, No. III, was publicly burnt by the hangman, and he was prosecuted in 1775. He also edited the *Scotchman* (1772). A rabid anti-Catholic, he wrote *A Further Account of the Proceedings of the Infamous Tools of Sir William Beauchamp, Proctor* (1769); *The Infamy of Justice Kelynge, Justice, and John Broughton, Bruiser* (1769); and later *The Address for Blood and Devastation: And the Addressers Exposed* (1776) and *The Crisis . . . during the Present Bloody Civil War in America* (1776). In 1780 he was committed by John Wilkes (then alderman) for publishing *England in Blood* and the *Thunderer*, as well as for rioting and "destroying a house" (the Earl of Mansfield's, during the Gordon Riots). He served twelve months in Newgate and was fined £200. He fell out with Paine over the issue of American independence in 1776.

9. Verner W. Crane, "The Club of Honest Whigs: Friends of Science and Liberty," *William and Mary Quarterly* 23 (1966), 210–33. James Burgh (1714–1775) was a Dissenting academy master and the author of the *Political Disquisitions* (3 vols., E. and C. Dilly, 1774). Widely regarded as one of the most influential texts for the American colonists, and known in particular for its defense of free speech and writing, it may have had some assistance from Benjamin Franklin and was one of Jefferson's favorite works. On Burgh, see Carla Hay, *James Burgh: Spokesman for Reform in Hanoverian England* (University Press of America, 1979). Benjamin Franklin (1706–1790) was already famous as a scientist, statesman, and political writer. He led colonial attempts to get the Stamp Act of 1765 repealed and may have befriended Paine as early as the late 1750s.

London.”<sup>10</sup> But this edition evidences the contrary. Paine not only knew many of its members well but very likely collaborated, albeit anonymously or pseudonymously, in producing oppositional literature with them. Yet in his advocacy of democracy he would indeed move beyond the politics of most members of this group.

Pseudonyms, and in particular the practice of pseudonym stringing, were at the heart of oppositional activity in the 1750s, 1760s, and 1770s. This usually involved writing under a pseudonym, having others write under the same name, and sometimes creating a different pseudonym, in order to defend and explore differing political positions and narratives, as coalitions and groups shifted constantly. The computer textual analysis adapted for volumes 5 and 6 of this edition has identified at least eight pseudonym strings, where one individual in a network began an article or series of articles, typically in a newspaper, and over the course of a few weeks or months different members of the network wrote under that pseudonym, responding to critics or developing a line of political thought. Often, the lead writer would return to the pseudonym later in the string. Not only did the pseudonym allow for fluid, flexible, and largely untraceable authorial control; it was also a potent defensive weapon in an environment where John Wilkes and the *North Briton* no. 45 (23 April 1763), which attacked the king’s policy at the end of the Seven Years’ War, palpably demonstrated that any criticism of the king would and could be considered treason. In a 1767 article Paine likely wrote that “THERE are a Party of us who, for our Amusement, have established a kind of Political Club.”<sup>11</sup> Likewise, a member of Paine’s network, Hugh Boyd, who contributed to the Simplex pseudonym and other strings, practiced a particularly deep kind of secrecy: “Towards the end of the year 1768, he commenced a correspondence with the daily paper, entitled the *Publick Advertiser*, at that time conducted by Mr. Henry Sampson Woodfall, which he kept up with the greatest caution, and the most impenetrable secrecy, for three years and some months.”<sup>12</sup> The nature and purpose of this correspondence he never disclosed to any one of his friends, not even to Mrs. Boyd; and he died in possession of his secret.”<sup>13</sup> In such circumstances pseudonyms

10. See General Introduction, this ed., 1:33–35.

11. See “To the Printer of the Public Advertiser,” 5 December 1767, this vol., 124.

12. Henry Sampson Woodfall (1739–1805) edited the London *Public Advertiser* in this period.

13. *The Miscellaneous Works of Hugh Boyd*, 2 vols. (T. Cadell Jr. and W. Davies, 1800), 1:28. Boyd (1746–1794) was an Irish lawyer and friend of Edmund Burke, who has been sometimes identified with “Junius,” and certainly contributed frequently to the London *Public Advertiser*.

not only offered security from prosecution but also facilitated a functional framework for collaborative writing, as various individuals created and cultivated this new Patriotic Whig ideology in response to and in the aftermath of the Seven Years' War. Their use became a form of political play, allowing the announcement of political positions (symmetry) but also the internecine disagreements about politics (asymmetry) to be aired in a public forum dominated by specific literary genres. It was a dynamic, fluid, networked form of writing, perfectly suited to the political environment of mid-eighteenth-century England.

As such, who Paine possibly wrote *with* is as important as *what* he wrote in these years. An early and crucial relationship with Benjamin Franklin is reflected in an article evidently coauthored.<sup>14</sup> Franklin's ties to leading Whigs in London, and membership in the Club for Honest Whigs, smoothed the way for Paine to meet, and write with, radicals like James Burgh, William Moore, John Horne, Joseph Priestley, John Wilkes, Catharine Macaulay, Edmund Burke, and others.<sup>15</sup> Deploying pseudonyms such as Simplex, Anti-Sejanus, Vindex, and Junius in specific newspapers, this network deployed a pattern and a practice that Paine would continue for the rest of his political life. This volume demonstrates not only that Paine likely contributed to a series of pseudonym strings of articles. He was frequently also tasked with launching each string, often being the sole, or lead, writer for the first article or articles in each pseudonym string. He established the groundwork and proposed the political principles the other writers in the network built on, or sometimes contested. The Simplex pseudonym string, consisting of twenty-eight articles, is an ideal example. Paine was evidently the lead writer for the first three, developing the politics of the string, then moving to the background and contributing to eight of the twenty-eight in total. Paine must have been held in high regard by his often much more illustrious coauthors to have merited these assignments.

The most debated and historically relevant pseudonym in eighteenth-century British literature and politics is, of course, the very celebrated

14. See 26 June 1762 *North Briton* article, this vol., 46.

15. John Horne (1736–1812), later (1782) John Horne Tooke, clergyman and radical parliamentary reformer; Joseph Priestley (1733–1804), scientist, natural philosopher, theologian, and political theorist; John Wilkes (1725–1797), politician and journalist; Catharine Macaulay (1731–1791), writer and historian; Edmund Burke (1729–1797), MP and author, pro-American in his youth, during the colonists' struggle for independence, but Paine's great opponent in the 1790s after his *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790) viciously attacked the revolutionaries and their principles.

“Junius.” Great efforts have been devoted for more than two centuries in attempting to identify the author of the Junius letters (1769–72). More than forty books on the subject have appeared, with most historians attributing them to one single writer or another, the favorite being Sir Philip Francis.<sup>16</sup> Yet clues also exist as to the *collaborative* nature of the Junius letters. John Taylor wrote that “the apparent contradictions in the character of Junius, which have been utterly irreconcilable with any supposition that has hitherto been formed of the author, are of material service in the present case. That Junius appears, at various times, to be an Old Man, an Irishman, a Lawyer, a Soldier, a Courtier, a Statesman, a Divine, and again not one or all these, has been sufficient to baffle the most pertinacious inquirer.”<sup>17</sup> Another Junius theorist has it that “it was stated by Sir James Mackintosh to my informant,—a gentleman who was present at table with him—that he was convinced that Junius was the production of *a clique* though, possibly, Francis held the pen, but that he, Sir James, detected *Burkisms in the style*.”<sup>18</sup> The methods of communication among authors and publishers and printers were carefully guarded, as can be seen in the notes passed to the printer in the Junius string of articles: one person, known to the printer Woodfall, Philip Francis, wrote and passed the notes, signed only “C.” Francis in his *Memoirs* notes that “it was an early common hypothesis that the work was the labour of more than one individual, if not of a junto of party confederates.”<sup>19</sup> And Parkes (the editor of Philip Francis’s *Memoirs*) “discovered among Woodfall’s notes a letter signed Anti-Sejanus, written in a hand which not even Parkes would claim for Francis, and in which the writer spoke about himself as one of a co-operative group.”<sup>20</sup> So the theory of a “collective” Junius has plenty of backing.

16. Sir Philip Francis (1740–1818) is now usually identified as the sole author of the Junius letters, an assumption challenged here. Under the patronage of William Pitt the Elder, whom he met in 1761, he took up a post in the War Office the following year. He later led the prosecution of Warren Hastings for abuse of power in India and fought a duel with Hastings.

17. John Taylor, *A Discovery of the Author of the Letters of Junius* (Taylor and Hessey, 1813), 5–6.

18. Jelinger Cookson Symons, *William Burke: The Author of Junius* (Smith, Elder, 1859), 121.

19. Philip Francis, *Memoirs of Sir Philip Francis*, 2 vols. (Longmans, Green, 1867), 2:530.

20. Alvar Ellegard, *Who Was Junius?* (Almqvist and Wiksell, 1962), 73.

This volume suggests that Paine may well have played a leading role in the “Junius” pseudonym strings. William Burr had already suggested Paine as the main Junius writer in *Thomas Paine: Was He Junius?* (1890). Here it is evinced that there were no fewer than eleven contributors to the Junius pseudonym string. So Paine is presented here not so much as Junius, but as potentially the *main* Junius: the lead writer of the pseudonym string, starting it, writing the most single-authored articles, and contributing to greatest number of collaborative pieces as well. That Paine would see Junius as ultimately ineffective speaks to how much he had invested in the pseudonym string: “The brilliant pen of Junius was drawn forth, but in vain. It enraptured without convincing; and tho’ in the plentitude of its rage it might be said to give elegance to bitterness, yet the policy survived the blast.”<sup>21</sup> This was likely a beautifully written self-criticism, and an accurate appraisal of failure.

This volume also addresses, and rejects, the traditional narrative, which has dominated many schools of thought on the American Revolution, that Paine’s move to America was one predicated on failure, in his marriage and work. “Paine luckily was supported by Benjamin Franklin, so the story runs, but he was nonetheless a born loser,” with “a record of a dismal series of false starts, failures in his profession, in commerce, in domestic relations”; “Paine decided to abandon England altogether and wander off to America”; “as he was almost penniless and had no future in England his outlook must have seemed to him to be nearly hopeless”; “borne down by poverty, and surrounded by difficulties of every description, his condition appears to have been that of a ruined, hopeless man.”<sup>22</sup>

Also implied in this narrative is that *Common Sense* simply appeared out of nowhere, like a supernova, to become the lodestar of the independence movement. This is not convincing, despite Paine’s own statement to Congress. It is much more likely that Paine was a prolific and accomplished writer long before reaching America. And it is therefore incorrect when a recent study of Paine’s work suggests his exposure to the independence movement did not exist prior to his arrival in America in 1774—he wrote

21. *Prospects on the Rubicon*, this ed., 2:277.

22. David Freeman Hawke, *Paine* (W. W. Norton, 1974), 21; Alfred Owen Aldridge, *Man of Reason: The Life of Thomas Paine* (Cresset, 1960), 26; Jack Fruchtman Jr., *Thomas Paine: Apostle of Freedom* (Four Walls Eight Windows, 1994), 38; W. E. Woodward, *Tom Paine: America’s Godfather* (E. D. Dutton, 1945), 55; W. T. Sherwin, *Memoirs of the Life of Thomas Paine* (R. Carlile, 1819), 18.

in favor of the American struggle prior to coming to America.<sup>23</sup> The two supplementary volumes here illustrate Paine's early support for English liberty, anticipating his enthusiasm for an American Revolution as one natural outcome of Patriotic Whig thinking. And, consonant with those later texts known with certainty to be Paine's, and printed here in volume 3, they demonstrate Paine as a frequent, energetic, and persistent writer in his final years, aggressively supporting a Connecticut constitution, and immersing himself in the debates and controversies of the New York newspaper culture. His depth and breadth of knowledge of—and comfort with—the classics, the poets, the histories, the religious texts, the cultures, and the English people are demonstrated throughout these volumes. Self-taught, Paine was a quick learner, and by associating with some of the leading political talents of England, he was soon able to present a clear, plainspoken analysis of the politics and ethos of England in a formative period on the threshold of modernity. He trained himself well for the tumult of his life to follow.

The supplementary volumes here (5 and 6) have been compiled with the aid of computer author-attribution analysis of text. They are separated from volumes 1–4 insofar as this revolutionary new technology does suggest author identification, but not with the same degree of certainty as texts that have vastly more corroborative information about authorship. The works in volumes 5 and 6 were vetted through content-context-calculation analysis, and several works included in the first three volumes, chronologically presented, employed this methodology to proven Paine works to discern the presence of other authors collaborating with Paine. Without the security of additional forms of evidence to prove authorship, the attributions here necessarily remain provisional and have thus been hedged in here by such editorial caveats as “evidently,” “seemingly,” and “apparently.”

### *Method of Author Attribution*

The new system of authorship attribution used here focuses on the syntax of the document rather than on its contents, or on the similarity of philosophical or political content, which play a secondary role. Stylistic features are often used unconsciously and consistently and, if correctly identified, will correctly reveal the identity of the author(s). Three criteria, equally

23. See J.C.D. Clark, *Thomas Paine* (Oxford University Press, 2018), 420.

important, are used to make a judgment about the authorship of a particular text: content, context, and calculation. Any one of these not fitting the author selected would deny that author a claim to the text; in other words, each of these three criteria is equally important, and each can cast into doubt attribution based on the other two. Often one of these three criteria may result in an inconclusive result. Here any auxiliary historical knowledge can help to determine a prospective result. The results generated by the authorship-attribution software may indicate a strong possibility that a particular piece may or may not be attributed to a particular author, but on their own they can never be absolutely conclusive. Thus, once a trend is uncovered by the authorship-attribution software, efforts are made to consider the conformity of the work to the ideological content of the author's other writings, and to matching the text with the historical circumstances and personal idiosyncrasies of the author (content and context).

Authorship attribution is a classification task: here, to classify a document means to assign it to the class of documents written by the same author. One way to perform classification is through supervised machine learning. Special algorithms use documents of known authorship (training examples) to train the system to recognize each author's writing style. Once training has been completed, the created model can be used to attempt to identify the creator of a document. To accomplish this, author files are created for all possible authors that can be determined, based on political lines, geography, time frames, and situational availability. Once a base of authors is available to compare to the training examples, testing is applied to a particular document in question and then compared to context and content. Near certainty is possible, in some cases at least, in results based on this method. The software can reach 90 percent accuracy by itself, which is pushed higher by content and context analysis.

### *Content*

The content of an essay means the political philosophy or other ideas advocated, the approach to the question (whether it favors or opposes the object of the essay), the familiarity of the author with the topic, and the absence of phrases that would contradict a particular authorship. If, for example, an essay is being analyzed for a disqualifying phrase, and the author of the essay uses a phrase like "Jesus is our Lord," Paine's authorship of this essay would be questionable. The content of the essay does not per se identify Paine as the author, even if some strength in the other two criteria support him. And clearly, the content of an essay denouncing

American independence in 1776 would exclude Paine immediately, even if it is signed “Common Sense.”

### *Context*

Context involves circumstantial and situational availability to write the text in question. This would involve the author being alive at the time of writing, their age being old enough to have produced such an essay, their familiarity with the subject being written about, their relationship with the publisher (for example, a Tory getting printed in a radical newspaper, or vice versa), and their physical location. Here a timeline for sending the essay to a publisher is useful for judging the transmission time, as it is with Paine still writing essays sent to England from America in 1775 and 1776 under the pen name of Casca.<sup>24</sup> However, if a writer is in India, for example, and an article produced concerning a particular event just happening in London is printed there, that writer would be excluded from being the author by context.

### *Calculation*

There are two components in the author-attribution methodology. The first is the comparison of seventeen known and accepted stylistic features of writing to the document in question. The second component of the attribution methodology is the choice of machine learning methods. These algorithms consider the frequency of use of select stylistic features in each sample document in the corpus and develop a model that can then be employed to tackle the issue of unknown or disputed authorship.

Stylistic features are elements of a person’s writing style and tend to be used unconsciously and relatively consistently. The frequencies of use of stylistic features in known texts can be used to train machine learning classifiers to recognize individual writing styles. Stylistic and linguistic information is extracted from the collection of known works of each potential author and used to generate models based on various machine learning classifiers as well as classifier ensembles. Once trained, the models can be applied to the document of unknown or disputed authorship to determine which candidate author’s writing style most closely resembles the style of the text under consideration. These lexical features have been accepted by the leading text-attribution scholars and listed by the Java

24. See the introduction to *A Crisis Extraordinary*, this ed., 6:226.

Graphical Authorship Attribution Program (JGAAP) led by Patrick Juola of Duquesne University.<sup>25</sup> Each of these writing features occurs unconsciously and is almost impossible to hide, like fingerprints. They are

- MW function words: defined by Mosteller and Wallace in 1964,<sup>26</sup> including articles, preposition, pronoun use
- Word  $n$ -grams: sequences of  $n$  successive words
- Character  $n$ -grams: sequences of  $n$  characters (two or three at a time)
- Parts of speech: nouns, verbs, prepositions
- Parts of speech  $n$ -grams: sequences of  $n$  parts of speech (adjective-verb, noun-verb, etc.)
- First word in a sentence
- Prepositions: occurring with the highest frequency
- Vowel initial words: words beginning with vowels
- Suffixes: the last three letters of every word
- Coarse POS tagger: a simplification of the normal part-of-speech tagger, neutralizing minor variations
- Lexical frequencies: LOG-scaled frequencies of words from the English Lexicon Project (ELP)
- Naming reaction times: naming times from ELP database
- Sorted character  $n$ -grams: alphabetically sorted characters in each  $n$ -gram
- Word stems: stems of the words obtained from Porter's stemming algorithm

These features are analyzed by using three different learning methods: linear support vector machines (LSVM), which seek a hyperplane in the  $n$ -dimensional input space, such that the hyperplane best separates points corresponding to different candidate authors; and two further implementations: traditional LSVM, and more efficient sequential minimal optimizations. Centroid nearest-neighbor approaches represent each author by its centroid vector—a vector whose coordinates are averages of coordinates of all training instances. An unknown document is associated with the author with the nearest centroid. Distance can be measured using different metrics. Here cosine distance has been used. And the Multilayer

25. Patrick Juola, "Authorship Attribution," *Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval*, 1 (2008), 233–334. Hundreds of books and articles by leading text-analysis scientists are available on the website Science Direct, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/computer-science/authorship-attribution>.

26. Frederick Mosteller and David L. Wallace, "Inference in an Authorship Problem," *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 58:275–309.

Perceptron (MLP) is an algorithm that implements a backpropagation neural network; the program trains itself by comparing its own results through steps of learning as it approaches minimal error.

This methodology is based on combining a stylistic feature with a supervised machine learning method to create a so-called base classifier. After training each base classifier, a weighted average of classifier predictions is used to make the final authorship determination.

The methodology is straightforward: there are two software programs based on the features and classifiers explained: a package generator that groups selected authors to test, and a JGAAP tester. These programs were developed by Smiljana Petrovic at Iona University, and a series of videos are available summarizing how to read the results and use the methodology.<sup>27</sup> Basically, a series of groups of authors are selected to create author packages. The packages must contain all possible authors in groups of six to ten, and possibly two if the testing narrows it down to that. Then the testing software is used by putting in the document in question to test and an author package. The testing is repeated with as many packages of authors as you have. Then the process of reading the results begins. Patterns emerge through thousands of tests on known-authorship texts. A mark of 40 percent and above against all authors normally means that the author who consistently wins above that mark is probably the author (with content and context to be checked).

However, there is also the possibility that more than one author composed the text. Many political essays in newspapers and even pamphlets of the eighteenth century are known to have been collaborative efforts. If two authors keep receiving the top two positions in the graphs created by the testing, and if one of the authors is taken out to test using only one of them, and that author's strength on the graph rises, that is an indication of possible collaboration. At that point, the text must be broken down to paragraphs (at least two hundred words are generally needed) to determine who wrote which part. This is evident in many Paine works in this collection. Ultimately, again, who Paine possibly wrote with is as important as what he wrote. This software can help to unlock that hidden historical record.

If no clear result in testing is apparent, the author(s) may not be present in the testing. That will appear in testing results that show

27. See "Text Attribution Software" on the Iona University website of Smiljana Petrovic, <https://www.iona.edu/academics/schools-institutes/institute-thomas-paine-studies/itps-work/text-attribution-software>.

many different authors could be the author(s), or that no one will reach 40 percent on graphs. The author(s) have to show consistently winning the testing runs.

Writings that appear to be Paine's according to this method are in **bold type**, as they will be throughout the entire edition for the collaborative writings. Works entirely by Paine will not be in bold type and will be identified as such in the introductions.

© Copyright, Princeton University Press. No part of this book may be distributed, posted, or reproduced in any form by digital or mechanical means without prior written permission of the publisher.