

“A provincial enlightener”: Andrew Hooke of Bristol, Whig writer and newspaper proprietor in the reign of George II

Despite the astonishing breadth of his historical interests and writings, Jeremy Black has continued to publish groundbreaking studies on the intersection between politics, foreign policy and the press in Hanoverian England, especially during the reign of George II, and the understandings of religion, trade, history and geography which underpinned the cultural politics of this period. It therefore seems appropriate to offer here an essay on an understudied Whig writer, Andrew Hooke (c.1688-1753), who published on history, geography and political economy, as well as running, from 1742 to 1749, a newspaper whose avowed aim was to educate his fellow Bristolians in a proper understanding of politics and foreign policy to reinforce their loyalty to the Hanoverian regime against the threat of Jacobitism. In 1987 Black characterised Hooke, with typical acuity, as a ‘provincial enlightener’<sup>1</sup> but this is the first attempt to see Hooke’s life and writings in the round. It establishes the basic details of his life before considering his aims and achievements as a newspaper proprietor and author.

Hooke’s native Bristol was one of England’s major provincial cities, with an extensive electorate (freemen and freeholders) leading to hotly disputed contests between Whigs and Tories throughout the first half of the century, culminating in the by-election of 1739 where Edward Southwell triumphed for the Tories, giving them both seats until 1754. By contrast the self-perpetuating city Corporation had become increasingly Whig, with Presbyterians sitting alongside moderate Anglicans, and during the 1730s they supported a range of measures designed both to improve Bristol’s amenities and display an enlightened Whig politeness, such as the equestrian statue of William III in Queen Square or the opening of the Infirmary, followed, as we shall see, by the new Exchange and other street improvements. However, the late 1730s also saw Bristol at the forefront of the new evangelical movement, led by George Whitefield (from nearby Gloucester) and the Wesley brothers. This dismayed many in the Anglican elite, including Bristol’s bishop, Joseph Butler, and his chaplain, the

---

<sup>1</sup> Jeremy Black, *The English Press in the Eighteenth century* (London, 1987), p. 33.

Bristol clergyman Josiah Tucker, who feared Methodism's appeal to popular zeal and associated it (unfairly) with popery and Jacobitism (which they also feared as a lurking sentiment among Bristol's Tories).<sup>2</sup> It was therefore of great concern to the Whig corporation, including its Recorder (the future Sir) Michael Foster (1689-1763)<sup>3</sup> not only that their opponents were proving successful electorally, but that they also controlled Bristol's only weekly newspaper, produced by brothers Samuel and Felix Farley. Samuel, a Quaker, increasingly left the Bristol press to Felix, an early convert to Wesleyan Methodism, who was one of John Wesley's major publishers throughout the 1740s. He was opposed by the *Gloucester Journal*, for which Tucker was a regular contributor, but until 1742 Bristol itself lacked a rival paper to support the Whig establishment both nationally and locally against Farley's blend of country, Tory and evangelical views.<sup>4</sup> Like Foster and Tucker, Hooke was to step forward to defend Whig values.

## Life

Andrew Hooke was the son of Joseph Hooke (1656-99), a Bristol brewer, and his wife Mary, daughter of the sugarmaker Godfrey van Ittern, who had married at St James, Bristol, on 16 October 1684.<sup>5</sup>

Joseph was the third son of the wealthy Bristol brewer Andrew Hooke (1616-88) and was freed on 1

---

<sup>2</sup> Jonathan Barry, 'Provincial town culture 1640-1780: urbane or civic?' in Joan H. Pittock and Andrew Wear (ed.), *Interpretation and Cultural History* (Basingstoke, 1991), pp. 198-234; id., 'Cultural patronage and the Anglican crisis: Bristol c.1689-1775', in J.D. Walsh et al., ed., *The Church of England c.1689-c.1833* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 191-208; id., 'Bristol as a "Reformation city" c.1640-1780', in N. Tyacke, ed., *England's Long Reformation* (London, 1997), pp. 261-84. Steve Poole and Nicholas Rogers, *Bristol from Below: Law, Authority and Protest in a Georgian City* (Woodbridge, 2017) brings together the work of two outstanding scholars of Bristol's Hanoverian political culture. For Tucker see G. Shelton, *Dean Tucker and Eighteenth-Century Economic and Political Thought* (London and Basingstoke, 1981), pp. 21-36.

<sup>3</sup> J. Latimer, *Annals of Bristol in the Eighteenth Century* (n.p., 1893), pp. 192, 197, 224, 341; Bristol Archives (hereafter BA) 14754/1; N.G. Jones, 'Sir Michael Foster' at <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/9964>. Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, pp. 37-41 notes that Tucker's anti-Jacobite publications were sponsored initially by Foster.

<sup>4</sup> Jonathan Barry, 'The press and the politics of culture in Bristol, 1660-1775' in Jeremy Black and Jeremy Gregory (ed.), *Culture, Politics and Society in Britain 1660-1800* (Manchester, 1991), pp. 49-81; Jonathan Barry, *Methodism and the Press in Bristol 1737-1775* (Wesley Historical Society, Bristol Branch, bulletin 64, 1992).

<sup>5</sup> Elizabeth Ralph (ed.), *Marriage Bonds for the Diocese of Bristol, 1637-1700* (BGAS Records series 1, 1952), p.158; R. Price, *Marriages at St James Church Bristol 1559-1753* (Bristol, 2014).

January 1681 as his father's son and apprentice.<sup>6</sup> His elder brother Robert died in 1681,<sup>7</sup> and his other brothers never married so Joseph inherited his father's brewing business, based in Lewin's Mead where the family lived, as well as the extensive properties to the east of Bristol on Ashley Hill which Andrew Hooke senior had bought from the Winter family, and where he had built a country residence, Ashley Court.<sup>8</sup> The exact date of our Andrew's birth is not known but he was reported as age 65 when he died in 1753, so he was presumably born around 1688.<sup>9</sup> He was his father's eldest son and in the 1696 Marriage Tax listing he was living in Lewins Mead with his father (taxed at the higher £600 rate) and mother, two younger brothers (Joseph and Humphrey) and 2 servants, as well as three bachelor uncles or cousins.<sup>10</sup>

His mother's father, Godfrey van Ittern, was a sugarmaker from Hamburg who had moved to London by the early 1660s and was naturalised in 1667, shortly after which he moved to Bristol to provide the technical expertise for the sugarhouse established by the Bristol merchant Thomas Ellis in Whitson Court and continued by Joseph Hooke's brother-in-law Michael Pope (a Presbyterian, whose son and namesake was minister of Lewin's Mead Presbyterian chapel 1705-18).<sup>11</sup> Ellis was a founder and ruling elder of the Broadmead Baptist congregation, which included a 'sister Vanittern', but Godfrey, presumably born a Lutheran, conformed to the Anglican church, serving as churchwarden of St James in 1677 (as Joseph Hooke did in 1694), and bequeathed money in 1686 both to the parish poor and for an Anglican funeral sermon.<sup>12</sup> Like both Andrew (senior) and Joseph Hooke, Godfrey died a wealthy man, leaving several thousand pounds to his children in legacies. The family's German background and partnership with Protestant nonconformists must have shaped Andrew's Whig beliefs and his

---

<sup>6</sup> G.D. Squibb (ed.), *The Visitation of Somerset and the City of Bristol 1672* (Harleian Society, N.S. 11, 1992). p. 33; BA 04359 (3).

<sup>7</sup> The National Archives (hereafter TNA) PROB 11/366/418.

<sup>8</sup> TNA PROB 11/391/195, will made 27 May 1687, proved 16 May 1688.

<sup>9</sup> H.R. Plomer, *Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers Who Were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland 1726-75* (Oxford, 1969), p.130.

<sup>10</sup> E.Ralph and M. Williams (eds), *The Inhabitants of Bristol in 1696* (Bristol Record Society, XXV, 1968), p. 53.

<sup>11</sup> I.V. Hall, 'Whitson Court sugar house, Bristol 1665-1824' *TBGAS* 65 (1944) 1-97 at 1-4, 22-3, 32-6, 57-9.

<sup>12</sup> TNA PROB 11/384/325 made 14 June 1686 and proved 14 September 1686; W. Barrett, *The History and Antiquities of the City of Bristol* (Bristol, 1789), pp. 395, 398.

commitment to that ‘forward policy’ of support for Protestantism across Europe which distinguished Whigs from Tories.

Andrew’s father Joseph died in 1699, after which the young Andrew succeeded his father and grandfather as a parish feoffee for St James (first recorded as such in 1701).<sup>13</sup> However, Andrew did not follow the family business or reside in the city, but rather lived as a gentleman at Ashley, becoming a Justice of the Peace for Gloucestershire. Indeed, he may have moved away for a period, if he is the Andrew Hooke of Bridgwater gentleman who was licensed to marry Mary Grevill of the same parish spinster at Bridgwater, Charlton or Chedzoy on 17 January 1709-10.<sup>14</sup> Andrew Hook or Hooke ‘gent’ obtained the freedom of Bristol as Joseph’s son on 12 August 1713 (just before that year’s election). His first public act occurred the following year, when a loyal address from the ‘Protestant dissenters of the city of Bristol’ was presented to George I by ‘Andrew Hooke esquire’, introduced by Thomas, Earl of Wharton.<sup>15</sup> The next year the Independent minister John Catcott dedicated his *Sermon First Preached at Bristol on His Majesty’s Inauguration* (London for J. Penn, 1715) to ‘Andrew Hooke esquire of the city of Bristol’ as one of the lovers of the country who have ‘for four years past been stemming the tide of those who have used I hope their last offices to enslave us to France and Rome’. He values Hooke’s friendship, praising him as ‘so correct a judge of men’s writings’ and welcoming his concern for the preservation of the honour and safety of the royal family, the continuation of ‘our constitutional and religious rights and privileges’, the suppression of a ‘malignant prosecuting spirit’ and the ‘universal reformation of manners’. In 1722 (the first election when Whig voters are recorded) Hooke voted as a St James freeholder for the Whig ticket of Earle and Elton.

Little is known of his activity over the next twenty years. He had become a J.P. for Gloucestershire by 1719, when he was one of the justices who sent a suspected ‘popish priest’ seized at Bristol to

---

<sup>13</sup> BA P/StJ/VCD/1/2/4 19 July 1701, P/StJ/D/23/3 10 February 1718, BA PSt J/d/14/6a-b documents of 1-2 April 1736 where described as ‘of London esquire’, P/StJ/D/23/4 13 June 1740 and /5 and /6 ditto in 1745, P/StJ/VCD/5/1/1 1743; PSt J/d/14/7a-b 29-30 June 1743 and 18 a-b.

<sup>14</sup> A.J. Jewers, *Marriage Allegation Bonds of Bath and Wells* (Exeter, 1909), p.209. TNA C8/653/36 is a case regarding Bridgwater property where defendants include Andrew Hooke.

<sup>15</sup> BA 04359 (5); *London Gazette* 5270, 19 October 1714.

Gloucester for trial.<sup>16</sup> He was clearly outspending his income, as he began gradually to mortgage or sell off parts of the family estate, and there are also various law suits.<sup>17</sup> The Ashley estate included two substantial houses, which have sometimes been confused.<sup>18</sup> One, the future Ashley Manor House, described as being by Grove Mill (later known as Hooke's Mill) was bequeathed by Andrew Hooke senior in 1688 for their lives to members of the Pope family, but when they had all died it was to pass to Joseph Hooke or his heirs, and so to Andrew.<sup>19</sup> It was occupied by Foster when he became Bristol's recorder, suggesting he must have known Hooke well.<sup>20</sup> The second property, where Andrew Hooke senior himself had lived, is the future Ashley Court. Hooke sold this property, with about 200 acres of land, in 1731 to George Bridges, a distiller, for £9600.<sup>21</sup> His son William Bridges had the house enlarged and refronted in the late 1730s; it was demolished in the 1870s.<sup>22</sup>

By the mid-1730s Andrew appears to have run through his inheritance and moved to London (see n.13), but then he adopted a new strategy to re-establish himself in Bristol, offering his services to the Whig-dominated Corporation. In January 1738 he submitted a series of plans for financing the building of a new Council House and Exchange 'humbly offered to the mayor and magistrates of the city for consideration'. After calculations respecting the purchase of existing houses, building the Council House and Exchange and 'making 2 new streets and building dwelling houses contiguous thereto', amounting to a total cost of £22,000, he then outlines five suggested schemes to raise finances, with detailed annual calculations for 60 years regarding ways to raise £22,000 on annuities

---

<sup>16</sup> BA 09701(14), letter of 28 December 1719.

<sup>17</sup> BA 4964 is a series of documents from 1720 to 1751 re Hooke's Ashley estate ending with its sale. For various Chancery cases between 1718 and 1732 see TNA C11/1714/21, C11/613/3, C11/500/23, C11/93/17 and C11/2619/34.

<sup>18</sup> Notably by Roger Leech, *The Town House in Medieval and Early Modern Bristol* (Swindon, 2014), 110-11, 255, 385-6.

<sup>19</sup> See BA 4964(5); J. Pritchard, 'Bristol archaeological notes for 1908', *TBGAS* 31 (1908), pp. 304-8.

<sup>20</sup> Latimer, *Annals*, pp. 92, 197, 224, 341; BA 14754/1; N.G. Jones, 'Sir Michael Foster (1689-1763)' at <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/9964>.

<sup>21</sup> [http://maps.bristol.gov.uk/knowyourplace/images/her\\_pc/1688.jpg](http://maps.bristol.gov.uk/knowyourplace/images/her_pc/1688.jpg); BA 4964 (19 and 25),

<sup>22</sup> BA 4964 and 34901/1 1776 April 20, the latter involving Bridges' heir, Joseph Beck's wife; J. Evans, *Chronological Outline of the History of Bristol* (Bristol, 1829), footnote on p.219; O. Ward, 'Glass Mill, Ashley Vale, 1528-1898', *Regional Historian*, 10 (2003), pp. 11-17; Bristol and Region Archaeological Services unpublished report 1840/2007.

at both 7 and 10%.<sup>23</sup> Proposals to build a new Exchange dated back to 1717, with an enabling act passed in 1722 and some properties purchased in 1732, but on each occasion the plan had lapsed, due to the level of borrowing required.<sup>24</sup> Although Hooke's specific financing proposals were not adopted and the Council House, only built in 1704, was not rebuilt, the purchase of the surrounding properties commenced in 1739, eventually costing over £19,000, with Hooke leading in arranging the process.<sup>25</sup> The foundation stone of the new Exchange was laid on 10 March 1741 and John Wood's new building, which apparently cost about £50,000, was opened on 21 September 1743.<sup>26</sup>

On 29 March 1740 Andrew and Mary Hooke took apprentice John Davis, a cordwainer's son, to be educated as a scrivener but on 26 February 1741 Davis was transferred to John Farnell merchant.<sup>27</sup> By early 1742, with his work on the Exchange scheme completed, Hooke was apparently in Newgate prison for debt,<sup>28</sup> but on 3 April 1742 he launched his new venture, a weekly newspaper, the *Oracle or Bristol Weekly Miscellany*, backed by subscriptions.<sup>29</sup> In his last issue in 1749 he acknowledged the favour of the town especially those gentlemen whose 'original encouragement' and 'annual subscriptions' supported the paper, as well as occasional customers and advertisers. He lamented his

---

<sup>23</sup> Library of Institute and Faculty of Actuaries in London – MS RKN 14403.

<sup>24</sup> Latimer, *Annals*, pp, 118-19, 180.

<sup>25</sup> See BA 00448/23 and 00445/2 for Hooke's signatures on 1739 documents re properties for the market area.

<sup>26</sup> Latimer, *Annals*, pp, 58-9, 226, 247.

<sup>27</sup> BA 04353 (5-6).

<sup>28</sup> Latimer, *Annals*, pp. 51-2; *London Gazette* 8225 24 May 1743 lists 'Andrew Hooke esq.' among those prisoners for debt in Bristol Newgate taking advantage of the act for relief of debtors. *Oracle* 12 June 1742 contains an account of a correspondent being told by Hooke's wife, who was running the new St Michael's coffeehouse Magdalen Lane, that 'her husband, being under confinement, has lately for the support of his family engaged in a weekly paper called the Oracle'. But he was clearly not confined in Newgate until May 1743 since *Bristol Oracle and Country Intelligencer* 22 January 1743 reports that printing work is taken in for the author at the Printing Office in Shannon Court or St Michael's coffeehouse or at London coffeehouse in Corn Street 'where he may be spoke with every day between hours of 12 and 2'. BA F/AC/Box 50 corporation vouchers for 1742-3 include a bill from Hooke for work to the front of the late Surgeons' Hall 'now fitting up for a dwelling house for him'. *Bristol Oracle and Country Advertiser* 4 June 1743 Hooke denounced Farley for printing comments on his period in Newgate, denouncing him and his 'reverend hirelings' and predicting that the scandal would recoil on them.

<sup>29</sup> BA 40442/168 is an advertisement of 15 March 1742 for the new weekly paper. The first issue is 'printed for the Society' and the second issue contains letters 'from our chambers' from 'your well-wishers and subscribers' (presumably lawyers) T.H., S.P. and N.W. (*Oracle* 10 April 1742).

‘fatal experience’ of the difficulty of supporting two newspapers in Bristol, especially blaming a ‘foreign paper’: ‘swimming against the stream is a laborious and disagreeable exercise but the most melancholy idea of it arises from the certain knowledge that a man makes no way and has only his own labour for his pains ... let a man’s courage and resolution and vigour be however so great, he must at last cede to fate or sink under the operation’. If ‘gentlemen of fortune’ established another paper, he would ‘cheerfully contribute my mite’, subscribing for 3 sets for 7 years altogether and other assistance from time to time as needed but it ‘will require more stock and credit than I am or perhaps ever can be master of’. He signed off as the ‘humble servant of my fellow citizens in all useful public undertakings’.<sup>30</sup>

Hooke was constantly seeking ways to increase his paper’s circulation, not just in Bristol but across the country, and to save costs. This included, from January 1743, an ingenious process of alternating titles for his paper (initially *Bristol Oracle and Country Intelligencer* or *Advertiser*, then from April 1745 *Bristol Oracle* and *Oracle and Country Advertiser*) intended to render each a fortnightly publication rather than a weekly one subject to the normal Stamp Duty.<sup>31</sup> In both this and in using the postal system to circulate his newspapers to buyers across the country he probably relied on connivance from the Whig officials who managed Bristol’s stamp duty collection and post office,<sup>32</sup> but by 1749 he faced the threat of government prosecution for not paying the proper advertising duty.<sup>33</sup> Naturally his rival Felix Farley, who boasted the much greater sales of his newspaper in

---

<sup>30</sup> *Bristol Oracle* 16 September 1749.

<sup>31</sup> He also issued unstamped pieces on the victory at Dettingen and, when Farley ‘exceedingly griev’d to see his labours to propagate sedition and disaffection among the populace for half an age overturned’ had Hooke’s hawkers arrested, justified his actions by saying the Town Clerk had confirmed that a publication needed two separate pieces of news to require a stamp (*Bristol Oracle and Country Advertiser* 16 July 1743).

<sup>32</sup> *Bristol Oracle and Country Intelligencer* 14 May 1743 claimed he had free use of the mails provided by Ralph Allen of Bath.

<sup>33</sup> See TNA E134/22Geo 2/Hil2 1748-9 for depositions taken by commission on behalf of His Majesty vs Andrew Hooke regarding usage and custom among printers and publishers of newspapers in Bristol as regards charges for inserting adverts and E 134/22Geo2/Mich8 The Attorney-General v. Andrew Hook and 22 Geo. 2/Hil2.

Bristol, was keen to denounce Hooke's various schemes, though Farley also used alternating titles between 1743 and August 1746.<sup>34</sup>

Hooke's newspaper also faced rivals in capturing the 'anti-Farley' market. The *Gloucester Journal* was already well-established with a Bristol bookseller as its local agent. A rival paper, the *Bristol, Bath and Somerset Journal*, was also begun in 1742 by a Bristol vintner, Richard Winpenny, assisted by the poet, clergyman and schoolmaster Emanuel Collins, and its few surviving issues indicate a more populist publication than Hooke's, satirising Farley and his fellow Methodists. This paper lasted until at least 1746 and possibly until May 1747 when Winpenny announced he was giving up printing to run a tavern, and the next month he passed over his printing apprentice to Edward Ward, who late in 1747, probably using Winpenny's premises and equipment, began to publish the *Bristol Mercury*, a single-sheet paper costing only one penny, of which only one issue (20 September 1748) survives. Although this had probably lapsed by early 1749, Ward took advantage of the imminent end of Hooke's paper in September 1749 to start his *Bristol Weekly Intelligencer*, which ran until 1760.<sup>35</sup> Like Hooke, neither Winpenny nor Ward were trained printers and were probably encouraged by the Corporation to enter the market against Farley (Winpenny was used as a scrivener by the Corporation from 1740-6, while Ward, who had been a haberdasher and maltster before 1747, later became Clerk of the Market), perhaps reckoning that Hooke's highbrow papers could not appeal to the full range of Bristolians,<sup>36</sup> but this did not help Hooke turn a profit.

In response, Hooke sought to build a larger 'intelligence' service around his newspaper. The St Michael's coffeehouse his wife had run while he was confined was succeeded by one next to the Exchange, both offering customers access to the newspapers from which he compiled his paper, in particular his translations of the continental papers (showing his knowledge of French, Dutch and

---

<sup>34</sup> For a bitter attack by Hooke on Farley's 'puffs' and 'sauciness', claims to 'innumerable impressions' and geographical blunders, predicting his rapid decline into madness see *Bristol Oracle* 14 November 1747.

<sup>35</sup> *Bristol Weekly Intelligencer* 23 September 1749 Ward refers to a "fellow citizen to whom we sincerely wish well" declining publication.

<sup>36</sup> *Bristol Oracle and Country Intelligencer* 21 July 1744 boasts that his paper appeals to the 'superior class of mankind'.

German).<sup>37</sup> Hooke stressed that, unlike other provincial editors (such as Farley), he did not obtain his continental news indirectly via the London press's summaries of such papers, but directly, so increasing the speed and accuracy of his reports on the military, political and financial developments on the continent. But he also ran an 'intelligence office' alongside the paper, advertising jobs and services.<sup>38</sup> Furthermore, he offered courses of lectures in enlightened topics such as the use of globes to subscribers, possibly the same group as supported the paper itself. Initially he appears to have relied on other jobbing printers to produce his papers, but gradually he and Mary employed their own staff and offered other printing services. He also advertised in October 1747 that he intended to publish a monthly supplement, the 'Bristol Magazine', from April 1748, for a sixpenny subscription, with subscribers paying 2s 6d in advance. In addition to his historical memoirs of Bristol (discussed below), this would contain shipping and trading information, political papers and a historical chronicle of European events, with moral, philosophical and poetical essays and occasional dissertations on geography, history and politics.<sup>39</sup>

Following the closure of the newspaper in 1749, Hooke continued both his coffeehouse and his printing office in Shannon Court.<sup>40</sup> A written note on the back of a copy of his *Essay on National Debt* (published in January 1750), records 'Yesterday at a general meeting of the subscribers to the academical lectures at Hooke's coffeehouse it was agreed and ordered that a course of six lectures on Mr Locke's Essay .. be given successively ... in every week till the whole be ended'.<sup>41</sup> However the printing office had moved by December 1751 (when Emanuel Collins opened a school there) and in July 1752 Hooke advertised the lease of the coffeehouse for sale, stating that he was forced by ill health to reside in the country.<sup>42</sup> He died the following February, with Farley's paper carrying a surprisingly generous death notice: 'Thursday last died Justice Hook, so called, a gentleman

---

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid*; *Oracle* 12 June 1742.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 6 April 1745.

<sup>39</sup> *Bristol Oracle* 3 October 1747; *Oracle and Country Advertiser* 2 January 1748 and *Bristol Oracle* 9 January 1748 (by which time the start date had slipped to May; it is unclear if the magazine ever appeared).

<sup>40</sup> See his advertisement in *Bristol Weekly Intelligencer* 25 August 1750.

<sup>41</sup> *Bristol Journal* 20 January 1750; Bodleian Library, Oxford, shelfmark G116 Jur.

<sup>42</sup> *Bristol Weekly Intelligencer* 28 December 1751 and 25 July 1752.

wellbeloved and respected. He had an annuity of £50 per annum allowed him from the Corporation and Merchants Hall of the city for his singular services in forming an excellent scheme for purchasing the lands for building the Exchange and establishing the markets of this city'.<sup>43</sup>

The annuities in question (£30 from the Corporation and £20 from the Society of Merchant Venturers) had been paid following a petition from Hooke in August 1749, but two years earlier Hooke had submitted a much more elaborate printed petition offering a new scheme to pay off the debt on the Exchange. Claiming that 'I was the original projector of the Exchange and Market', he noted that his 1737-8 proposal had been 'not a romantick and imaginary but a practicable scheme' for carrying out the project without 'one shilling's expense to the chamber', but they had followed another method, so robbing him of the fruit of his labours and invention. Now he offered to pay off £40,000 of the debt within 6 months by an annuity of £1600 p.a. for 99 years rent to the annuitants and survivors, which he claimed would only cost £35,460, so earning the Corporation £4540. Hooke also requested the liberty to inspect any of the public books belonging to the city under the direction of the mayor.<sup>44</sup> In 1751 he proposed another building scheme to the Merchant Venturers, who owned much of Clifton, offering to establish a Cold Bath and other conveniences for the good of the city, expending £1000 on premises, in return for an altered lease, which the Society approved with a £50 fine, but this was apparently not implemented.<sup>45</sup>

Following his death, his widow Mary continued his printing business, producing handbills for the Jacob's Well Theatre and keeping a coffeehouse nearby.<sup>46</sup> In 1757 she petitioned the public for support, describing her husband as 'for many years' a J.P. for Gloucestershire but 'reduced to indigent circumstances by misfortunes from a very considerable estate'. His annuities had ended at his death, so that for four years his widow and two daughters had been left unprovided, printing playbills for the

---

<sup>43</sup> *Felix Farley's Bristol Journal* 3 February 1753. Both Samuel and Felix Farley also died in 1753, with Felix's widow Elizabeth carrying on this paper.

<sup>44</sup> BA, 02417 fo. 21, F/AC/Box 59 (1747), M/BCC/CCP/1/12 Common Council Proceedings (1745-54), February 1747 and August 1749, SMV/2/1/1/7 16 October 1749.

<sup>45</sup> BA, SMV/2/1/1/7 18 July 1751.

<sup>46</sup> BA 45883/7-8. Her playbills between 1754 and 1761 are described as 'printed by M. Hooke on St Augustine's Back', but from 1762 as from 'near the Theatre' or 'near Jacob's Well'.

‘late theatre’ and keeping their coffeehouse, but now the theatre was shut up (it was only open for a summer season) so they sought donations.<sup>47</sup> She continued her businesses there, however, until the theatre finally closed for good in 1766 with the opening of the new theatre (later known as the Theatre Royal) in King Street, when she moved her printing office to the Maiden Tavern in nearby Baldwin Street, operating there until at least 1772.<sup>48</sup> In January 1767 she sought to rent a small house with garden near town.<sup>49</sup> Mary Hooke was buried at St James, Bristol on 13 August 1774. Her will, as Mary Hooke widow of Clifton, made ‘being low in decline of life’, was proved by her daughter Mary Hooke spinster on 21 October 1774, together with the other daughter Hester Hooke ‘the only next of kin of said deceased’. It shows that, despite reduced circumstances, the widow still lived in some comfort.<sup>50</sup>

## Writings

Hooke published all his works in a few years between 1747 and 1751, and they can all be considered as extensions of his newspaper, expanding on its aims to educate the public in Whig truths and support George II and his Pelham administration.<sup>51</sup> Hooke broke with the standard press practices in presenting the news (primarily of European developments, such as the course of the War of Austrian Succession, though he also boasted contacts across the American colonies) in order to give his readers a correct understanding of events from a Whig perspective. This involved experimenting with various techniques, such as: abandoning the traditional presentation of the news in segments according to the various postal deliveries, in favour of a single summary of the week’s events; the provision of

---

<sup>47</sup> *Felix Farley’s Bristol Journal* 13 August 1757.

<sup>48</sup> Bodleian GA Glos B4a, fo. 293; BA 8978(3), 45883/7-8 and 49534/11; *Felix Farley’s Bristol Journal* 12 September 1767 and 16 July 1768.

<sup>49</sup> *Felix Farley’s Bristol Journal* 24 January 1767.

<sup>50</sup> TNA PROB 11/1001/354. She leaves £400 in cash to Hester and £300 to Mary, as well as giving Mary £500 lent to the Bristol Bridge at rate of 4%. Hester receives ‘3 large pictures, a man and two women’, and Mary ‘all the other pictures’ and ‘all my letter press and types and everything thereunto belonging’, plus ‘all the furniture of my best parlour viz two sconce glasses, 8 leather bottom chairs, 3 large mahogany tables’.

<sup>51</sup> *Oracle and Country Advertiser* 28 September 1745 has a front-page essay ‘A Calm Address to all Parties in Religion’ where Hooke argues that, leaving religion aside, the Jacobite rebellion was a profound threat to the ‘civil interest and commerce’ of Britain, as it would undo all the gains since 1689 and make Britain a puppet of France.

‘geographical notes’ about places and people in the news; and essays offering perspectives on the news, including several on Russia which stressed its geographical and economic position and hence its longterm interests within the European system of powers.<sup>52</sup> While celebrating victories (such as Dettingen) and fully supporting the need for Britain to lead a coalition to contain the pretensions to universal monarchy of the Bourbons of France and Spain, Hooke counselled against oppositionist patriots who neglected the complex realities of warfare and diplomacy. He also sought to denigrate such oppositionists by associating them with Jacobitism and sedition, accusing them of hidden motives for questioning the policies and achievements of George II’s government.<sup>53</sup> His readers were being given the intellectual resources to read and debate the news in an enlightened fashion.<sup>54</sup>

His only publication to have attracted either contemporary or later scholarly attention<sup>55</sup> is his *Essay on the National Debt and National Capital*, which was published in two impressions in 1750,<sup>56</sup> with a second edition with additions the following year.<sup>57</sup> This presented a series of calculations of what we would now call the Gross Domestic Product to prove that the level of national debt was not, as

---

<sup>52</sup> *Oracle* 3 April 1742, 10 July-14 August 1742; *Bristol Oracle* 21 March 1747, 2 September 1749.

<sup>53</sup> In an essay on the ‘selfish and egocentric tendencies of men’ he observed that ‘this humour keeps up Jacobitism’ and was the only cause of opposition to His Majesty and the administration (*Oracle and Country Advertiser* 20 May 1749).

<sup>54</sup> For example *Oracle and Country Advertiser* 1 January 1746 commenced a ‘Short Review of the Affairs of Europe in 1745’, ‘better to open’ the views of ‘the intelligent reader’ to future events.

<sup>55</sup> E.g. Robert Wallace, *Characteristics of the Political State of Great Britain* (London, 1758), pp. 123-4; V. de Mezague, *General View of England* (London, 1766), pp. 33, 115; Thomas Mortimer, *The Elements of Commerce* (London, 1774) vol. 1, pp. 423-7, 431-2 (urging Dr Price to use Hooke’s tables); John Brand, *The Alteration of the Constitution of the House of Commons* (London, 1793), p. 70, citing praise for it by Sir John Sinclair and Malachi Postlethwayte. The fullest modern discussion is in B.H. Mitra-Kahn, ‘Redefining the Economy’ (unpublished PhD thesis in Economics, City University, London, 2011), pp. 135-42

<sup>56</sup> Both impressions (ESTC N008694 and T033387) are ‘London: printed for W. Owen publisher at Homer’s Head, near Temple Bar; and sold by B. Hickey and J. Palmer booksellers and stationers in Bristol’, but there are titlepage differences in the typeface, layout and spelling. *Bristol Journal* 20 January 1750 advertises it as just published at one shilling. *London Evening Post* 13 February 1750 advertises it with a notice that ‘whoever pyrates it will be prosecuted’ and ‘to prevent impositions on the public no copies will be warranted genuine and correct but such as are signed with the author’s own hand A. Hooke’.

<sup>57</sup> London: printed for W. Owen, publisher, at Homer’s Head near Temple-Bar. MDCCLI. The dedication to Pelham is identical except that the date is changed from Bristol 6 December 1749 to January 1 1751. Subsequent quotations are from this edition. *Bristol Weekly Intelligencer* 6 April 1751 advertises it at 1s 6d.

government critics claimed, unsustainable, but rather perfectly manageable, adding, in line with his proposals for Bristol's corporation debts, a scheme for paying off the national debt via annuities.<sup>58</sup>

Its scope is therefore much greater than that of his first publication, *A Dialogue between a Member of Parliament and one of his Electors concerning the Window Tax* (1747), which is primarily a practical guide to the workings of that tax, written as a dialogue between 'Sir John' and an 'elector'.<sup>59</sup>

However, they share both an underlying political aim, namely to justify the financial policies of the Pelham administration, and a common method, namely political arithmetic. The *Dialogue* concludes with 'an estimate of the probable annual produce of the duties both in England and Scotland' which is based on estimates by 'your best political arithmeticians' of the numbers of houses in England and Scotland, the likely rates of exemption in both countries (50% in the poorer Scotland, 25% in England) and an (unexplained) average of 16 windows per house, to give £510,000, with £60,000 in costs, leaving a net sum of £450,000.<sup>60</sup> The 'elector' voices the opinion that this is 'a noble fund for the government's service' and 'the most equitable and least burthensome that could have been thought on', praising the minister responsible (Pelham) as 'a gentleman of great honour and humanity'.<sup>61</sup> In his preface 'to the reader' Hooke characteristically asserts that if lawyers disagree with his interpretation, he 'preserves his modesty by assigning the reasons of his opinion and appealing to the publick judgement; and, if it should be his unhappy fate to be reproach'd with heresy, by your orthodox canonical lawyers .... he thinks he runs no risqué of fire and faggot in a *Protestant* country, where free-thinking, and a right of private judgment, must always subsist on the basis of the Reformation'. Disagreements in opinion, 'since error is inseparable from humanity', should be dealt with in 'fair debate (either in publick or private)', treating 'the author with candour, good nature and lenity, becoming a scholar and a gentleman'.

---

<sup>58</sup> Hooke, *Essay*, pp. 53-61.

<sup>59</sup> London: printed for B. Hickey and J. Palmer, booksellers and stationers in Nicholas Street, Bristol; and sold by most other booksellers in town and country; as also by the author at his office in Shannon-Court and at his coffeehouse in Exchange Alley, 1747. (Price six-pence) (ESTC T182191). It is advertised in *Oracle and Country Advertiser* 11 April 1747. A 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (not recorded in ESTC) is advertised in *Bristol Oracle* from 19 July 1748.

<sup>60</sup> Hooke, *Dialogue*, pp. 43-7.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 45.

A similar tone is struck in *An Essay on the National Debt*, dedicated to Pelham: the conclusion to the preface in 1751 adds a long list of the achievements of the Pelham administration: ‘such masterstrokes of policy, executed under almost unsurmountable difficulties and in spite of the united efforts of all the branches of the House of *Bourbon* are overlook’d in the Pelhams which, in *British* story, would have done honour to the celebrated memories of a *Cecil* and a *Walsingham*’.<sup>62</sup> The dedication explains its purposes: to prove that ‘commerce is the genuine source of wealth and power’ through the gradual advance in British wealth since Elizabeth so that ‘the annual superlucration or increment of the capital stock over and above the expences of the people surpasses, at this day, the revenues of the French king, and doubles the produce of the mines of Peru and Mexico’. Hence, a British King ‘reigning in the hearts of his subjects, at the head of Britain’s Parliament and wise ministry is the richest and most potent prince in Europe’ with ‘great national abilities’, if fully asserted by his ministers, ‘to render His Majesty the terror of tyrants, the arbiter of Europe and a most powerful protector of the rights and liberties of mankind’. Through Hooke’s ‘new and arduous ... critico-political survey of the internal state of Great Britain’, the ‘leaders of the Opposition may, to their mortification, see their grand mystery of iniquity revealed’, by disproving their ‘daring denunciations of a national bankruptcy’. Hence ‘the unhappy deluded population may, to their great consolation, see, that the grand battery, or *dernier ressort*, of the disaffected, introduced with so much pomp and parade to deceive and intimidate the credulous and inattentive, when unmasked, proves a mere harmless apparatus devoid of every direful consequence; and that the source of all the fears and clamours, artfully raised and industriously propagated on the subject, is only the produce of phantom and chimaera, and has no real foundation in reason and nature’.

The ‘introductory preface’ to the second edition extends this. Explaining that the pamphlet is an expansion of the ‘first sketches ... hastily drawn in July 1749’ and published ‘in three successive *Bristol Oracles*’ to oppose those ‘weekly writers against the administration’, he reports that some of

---

<sup>62</sup> Hooke, *Essay*, p. xii. Hooke had written a letter of 6 folios to Henry Pelham 6 August 1748 suggesting the scheme to raise revenue to pay off the national debt (Univ. of Nottingham Special Collections, papers of Henry Pelham: NeC 318/1-3).

his readers thought it ‘might be a public service to give it a more diffusive circulation’ in a small pamphlet with London publication, where it sold out of its first edition in a very few weeks.<sup>63</sup> Before issuing a revised edition, he ‘determined to wait the public judgment’, including critical responses, especially as he was conscious that he lacked key evidence of the ‘mint account of the coinage in the last four reigns’ and would have been happy to revise or retract his case ‘as a sincere lover of truth’.<sup>64</sup> Instead, the response came in an attack by James Ralph in his opposition paper *The Remembrancer* (issue 120, 24 March 1750). But, to Hooke’s delight, Ralph’s attempted discrediting of his argument provided exactly the coinage information he was lacking, in a way which, Hooke claimed, confirmed his own arguments, ‘so that what was before a matter of belief and opinion only, is now become a matter of confidence and assurance, upon the highest evidence the nature of the thing is capable of’.<sup>65</sup> As he explains ‘arguments grounded on historical facts, and by proper mediums drawn out into just and coherent consequences, will discover remote truths, with as much certainty in the *moral* as in the *natural* world: so that Political Arithmetic is not barely a speculative amusement, as ‘tis generally esteemed, but, when rightly apply’d has a better claim to be rank’d among the sciences than many other branches of literature thus dignify’d’.<sup>66</sup> He develops this claim later in the pamphlet, comparing what he has done first to ‘political chemistry’ in analysing ‘this complicated subject’ and ‘fairly resolving’ it ‘into its original principles, with an honest intention to reveal it to the public in its natural, simple, and naked form, abstracted from all mystery and disguises’.<sup>67</sup> Then he claims to have given his reader a ‘specimen of the *new philosophy*, as applicable to politico-arithmetical subjects ... We have built no castles in the air, upon mere hypothetical foundations, by making our own data, like the *Cartesian* philosophers, who reason right, indeed, but upon wrong principles: No! our scheme is perfectly *Newtonian*: our first principles are a few plain historical facts, well established, and our conclusions from them, clear, natural and, we hope, just.’<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. i-ii. The original essays ‘Of the National Debt’ had occupied 10 and a half columns in *Oracle and Country Advertiser* of 15 and 29 July 1749 and *Bristol Oracle* 22 July 1749.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, p. ii.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, p. vii.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, p. viii.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 50.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 51-2.

It is beyond the scope of this essay to detail Hooke's methods in calculating the level of the 'national stock', which draws largely on data from Petty and Davenant (with ample criticism of both) as well as coinage figures and information from land and housing taxes. His key conclusions are that, were the national debt that of an individual, that man would be 'justly reputed in most flourishing circumstances whose *debts* do not amount to a *twelfth* part of his capital, or to *four fifths* of his annual *income*, and whose yearly profits in trade will, if appropriated to that purpose, actually discharge the whole within the space of *seven* years at *simple interest*?'<sup>69</sup> But of equal importance to him is his finding that, in 1600, 1660, 1688 and 1749, the ratios of 'cash stock, personal stock [which included commercial and industrial property] and land stock' remained roughly constant at 1, 20, and 12.33, thus demonstrating that land was not the major source of wealth.<sup>70</sup> He also critiques Davenant's jeremiads about the negative consequences of the Glorious Revolution and subsequent wars, using a battery of indicators of a massive increase not only in the value of trade, shipping and other personal assets, but also in the value of land since 1688.<sup>71</sup>

Just as Hooke's works of political arithmetic dealt heavily with history, at least since 1600, so his two historical publications drew heavily on political arithmetic, and were intended to illustrate the centrality of commerce to historical progress. Had they been published beyond the early medieval period, they would undoubtedly have been presented his Protestant and Whig interpretations of both British and Bristol history. Indeed for Hooke these two were indistinguishable, both demonstrating the progress of trade and liberty until the crisis of 1688, when God stepped in to save both through William's intervention.<sup>72</sup> Unfortunately, only a fraction of Hooke's historical material was ever published: several collections of historical information remain in manuscript.<sup>73</sup> These reveal the thoroughness with which Hooke collected and analysed historical information, not just from the city

---

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 31.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 33.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 38-50.

<sup>72</sup> A. Hooke, *Dissertation on the Antiquity of Bristol* (London, 1748), dedication.

<sup>73</sup> Bristol Central Library, Bristol Collection (hereafter BCL), 4504-5 notes for history of Bristol by Hooke; BA 45934/121 biographical notes on bishops, deans and prebendaries of Bristol by Hooke (formerly BCL 5009).

archives but also from various national collections, reflected in his correspondence with antiquarians such as Browne Willis, and from all the available printed sources.<sup>74</sup>

The title page of his unfinished *Bristollia: or Memoirs of the City of Bristol, both Civil and Ecclesiastical* also promised a second part, after the historical, with ‘a topographical view of Bristol, describing the city in general, with every parish, and extraparochial precinct in particular; containing their respective extents, boundaries, squares, streets, lanes, number of houses and inhabitants; parochial and other officers; annual taxes; publick edifices and select private buildings; alphabetically digested according to the parishes, Together with a brief account of its shipping, navigation, commerce, riches and government, civil, ecclesiastical and military.’ So, Hooke planned to combine history with geography as well as political arithmetic.<sup>75</sup> However, when he failed to attract the requisite 500 subscriptions to enable him to proceed directly with the book, he decided to publish it in his newspaper and then, when that failed, to publish it serially, reprinting his introductory work on Bristol’s antiquity first.<sup>76</sup>

It has not aided Hooke’s reputation as a historian that his only complete publication on Bristol, his *Dissertation on the Antiquity of Bristol*,<sup>77</sup> is devoted to what we might now regard as an ahistorical (or

---

<sup>74</sup> Hooke, *Dissertation*, thanks the Corporation for the ‘readiness and unanimity with which you granted my request of having free recourse to the city archives’ (p. iii) and acknowledges his Oxford correspondent, probably Charles Godwyn of Balliol (pp. 27, 33) and Browne Willis (pp. 52-3) whose work is also cited in BA 45934/121. A March 1747 letter of Hooke to the Rev. Samuel Rogers, asking him to intercede further with his friend Willis for assistance in transcribing Domesday book entries and other materials, refers to Willis’s earlier provision of lists of MPs, through the help of Robert Hoblyn, M.P. for Bristol since 1742 (Ken Spelman, Rare Books of York, *Catalogue 77*, January 2014, item no 7 at [https://issuu.com/spelman/docs/cat\\_77\\_mss](https://issuu.com/spelman/docs/cat_77_mss)). See also BCL, 11161 27 July 1747 letter to the other M.P, Sir Edward Southwell, regarding lists of Bristol M.P.s. Both Southwell and Hoblyn were moderate Tories.

<sup>75</sup> The printed prospectus for *Bristollia*, detailing the proposed chapters, can be found in Bodleian MS Willis 43, fo. 87.

<sup>76</sup> See *Bristol Oracle* 28 May 1748. To accommodate gentlemen who had subscribed he would reprint quarterly from his paper what relates to Bristol by itself and deliver books in numbers to those who were quarterly subscribers to his paper at 6d and to all others at 12d per number. See also his note at start of Godwyn’s copy of *Bristollia* in Bodl. Gough Som Add 8o 12, stating that ‘his circumstances are too well known to need any other apology’ and that he has ‘greatly suffered by the undertaking’.

<sup>77</sup> London: printed for W. Owen, publisher at the Homer’s Head, near Temple Bar (no date given, but 1748) (ESTC T197669). The *Dissertation* was then reprinted as the introduction to *Bristollia* later in 1748. See *Bristol Oracle* 10 December 1748, *Bristollia* no 1 ‘speedily published’, starting with the

certainly historically incorrect) endeavour to prove, contrary to Camden's *Britannia*, that Bristol was not a late Saxon foundation but as ancient as London or York, during which he even gives some credence to the myth of its foundation by the Trojan prince Brennus, echoing medieval and annalistic accounts largely abandoned by early modern scholars. Yet though clearly based on civic patriotism, his argument for antiquity is made not only using historical scholarship regarding the various settlement names that had been associated with Bristol by chroniclers and antiquarians, but also on the basis of geography. His fundamental argument was that Bristol's location made it such a natural trading centre that it must have been important, recorded by topographers but ignored by monkish historians only interested in religion and monarchy: once it became a centre of church and royal power then it attracted their attention. Hooke denigrated as pedantry Camden's humanist learning and undue respect for his scholarly authority, presenting himself, as in his political arithmetic, as a man who argued scientifically from raw historical and geographical facts to reach conclusions which must be true even if previous learning did not support them.<sup>78</sup> Using the Bills of Mortality to estimate gaps between generations and postulating a 400-year period of natural growth for a town to obtain a 'rank among the capitals of its country', he explained that while 'the generality of readers' may not see the force of such reasoning, those 'acquainted with the doctrine of annuities and political arithmetic know very well that arguments founded on a series of observations on the general law of nature or providence, notwithstanding the appearance of change or contingency, conclude with greater probability than other philosophical reasonings and approach as near to mathematical certainty as any other arguments whatsoever'.<sup>79</sup>

However, once he began his detailed annalistic history of Bristol in 1066, Hooke offered a well-informed critical digest of the traditional sources of medieval history. Perhaps too well-informed, because the early issues of his *Bristolliæ* were essentially acnational history of the reigns of William I

---

*Dissertation*, confirmed in the following week's *Oracle and Country Advertiser*, at one shilling per number.

<sup>78</sup> I have explored Hooke's historical work in more detail in 'Chatterton in Bristol', *Angelaki* 1:2 (winter 1993/4), 55-81, at pp. 56-8, 61-3, 69-70.

<sup>79</sup> Hooke, *Dissertation*, pp. 39-41.

and II, with almost no reference to Bristol, so it is perhaps hardly surprising that he gained few subscribers and abandoned the publication after 56 pages, having only reached 1097!<sup>80</sup> It is already clear from this section, however, as well as his manuscript notes for later periods, that he would have been highly critical of papal and clerical claims to authority while lauding the growth of constitutional liberty and local rights. He discusses, for example, whether the crown was hereditary or elective, judging that ‘the rule of succession in the Saxon age stood in the same principles of reason and policy and was supported by the same inviolable maxims of the law of nature and nations as at present’ so that ‘hereditary or testamentary right’ was ‘always connected with, at least, the tacit consent of the people and whenever that was wanting, as appears from the whole tenor of English history, our ancestors never failed to assert their innate right of election’.<sup>81</sup>

## Conclusion

A distinct irony run through the life and writings of Andrew Hooke. Literally a child of 1688, he spent his career defending the Whig cause of Protestant liberty and exalting the rapid growth in Britain’s wealth and power since 1688, which he sought to document through political arithmetic. Stressing the role of commerce and of cities like his native Bristol, he sought to educate his fellow citizens (local and national) in the geographical and financial knowledge which underpinned this progress, and to take advantage of new financial devices, such as annuities, to fund improvements. Yet his personal finances followed exactly the opposite trajectory: heir of a substantial estate built on brewing and sugar manufacture, he chose the life of a ‘scholar and gentleman’ and lost his estate, entered debtor’s prison, could not sustain his highbrow newspaper against the competition of a mere printer whose values he despised, and ended his life dependent on an annuity from the Whig merchant elite from whose ranks he, and his family, had fallen. His attempts to enlighten his fellow citizens failed to

---

<sup>80</sup> He began printing the memoirs in *Bristol Oracle* 25 June 1748, where they form the whole back page, but unfortunately the next four issues are missing, and by *Oracle and Country Advertiser* 30 July 1748 there are no memoirs. *Bristol Oracle* 7 August 1748 states that the third number of *Bristollia* is not to be printed till 500 stated customers, which was clearly never achieved, though he tried again in December (see above).

<sup>81</sup> Hooke, *Bristollia*, pp. 12-13. Cf. pp. 33-4 on the rise of ‘papal intrigues’ to extend their authority and ‘undermine the sovereignty of the crown and subvert the liberties of the people’.

attract wide support (at least in terms of sales), probably appealing largely to those already converted to his Whig enlightened values, who could appreciate his attempts to explain and justify government policy as built on longterm geographical and economic principles. Unlike other newspaper proprietors, such as Robert Raikes in Gloucester or Robert Goadby in Sherborne,<sup>82</sup> he lacked the entrepreneurial skills to build up a long-term customer base for a regional paper built on Whig values. Hooke's career reminds us that, as Black has so ably demonstrated, the 'Whig supremacy', in so far as it was ever achieved, was no inevitable outcome, but the much-contested product of strenuous effort, at both national and local levels, with many setbacks. Yet Hooke might have taken some comfort from the electoral success, the year after his death, of Robert Nugent as a Whig candidate for Bristol, who drew heavily on the services of Josiah Tucker, Bristol's more famous (and heavyweight) Whig intellectual, in developing much the same case for the Whig government of Newcastle, as Hooke had for his brother's administration.<sup>83</sup>

Jonathan Barry

University of Exeter

---

<sup>82</sup> David Stoker, 'Robert Raikes, 1690-1757' <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/70911>; Jonathan Barry and George Tatham, 'Robert Goadby, the *Sherborne Mercury* and the urban renaissance in south-west England' in Catherine Armstrong and John Hinks (ed.) *The English Urban Renaissance Revisited* (Newcastle, 2018), pp. 57-95.

<sup>83</sup> Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, pp. 133-61.