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Throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Europe underwent a media revolution with the expansion of printing technology across the continent. In England, the printing press allowed men and women to engage in discussion about royal and Parliamentary politics, thus indirectly influencing political change. In the long decade of the 1680s, the burgeoning political ideologies of the Whigs and the Tories created national strife that at first threatened the exclusion of a royal heir from the throne and eventually led to the deposition of a monarch by his own people. Printers and pamphleteers, as much as politicians, shaped the ideological arguments that occurred on the streets and at coffee houses in London and throughout major cities in England. While every pamphleteer put his or her own twist on the social issues occurring at the time, two themes – the argument that England was a Protestant kingdom and that to be English was something politically and socially unique compared to the French and other countries – arose out of these writings. The pamphlets written in the decade of the 1680s steered public opinion about the actions of the court and Parliament. This demonstrated that both women and men of the middling and lower classes could influence political policy.
The story of the dramatic transformations of the 1680s began years before the Restoration of the Stuart monarchy with Charles II. In the mid-sixteenth century, Henry VIII brought the Reformation from the European continent to England in a political manner, sweeping away the country’s Catholic allegiance in a broad stroke in order to secure an annulment of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon. For the rest of the sixteenth century, English monarchs attempted to shift popular belief in religion to suit their own personal opinions or political needs. Political statutes such as the various incarnations of the Oath of Supremacy, requiring English subjects to swear religious allegiance to the monarch as the Head of the Church of England, created domestic strife for Catholics and Nonconformists. The statutes made the Catholic and Nonconformist populations second-class. Religious tensions played substantial roles in the most violent events in England throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, namely the oppression of Protestants during the reign of Mary I and the English Civil Wars.

By the end of the Civil Wars, the supremacy of the Church of England seemed secure. Charles II showed his willingness to support the established Church, though many devout Anglican and Nonconformist national figures and pamphleteers still feared Catholic encroachment in English society. This fear of Catholicism in England arose out of a long history of conflict with foreign states and religious division at home. The separation between the English monarchy and the Pope in the Tudor era led to lasting suspicions against Catholics because of the presumption that they were disloyal. Hatred against Catholics intensified further because of Spanish aggression against the Protestant countries throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.
Spain, as the champion of Catholicism during the initial throes of the
Reformation, dealt with the vehement hatred of Protestant printers across Northern
Europe. Pro-Reformation writers argued that the Spanish interacted with the rest of the
world with unnatural cruelty and barbarism because of their rule over the Native
Americans in the Americas and their treatment of Dutch Protestants during the Eighty
Years War.¹ This Catholic hatred and suspicion changed as Spain lost her position as the
premier power in Europe to France. Pamphleteers, who relied on the economic gains of
their works from popular audiences or wealthy patrons, wrote for the times.² When the
political and religious villain shifted from France to Spain, the pamphleteers, in turn
switched their subject accordingly. The mistrust and fear of Catholicism grew over the
course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to exist in most political rhetoric
fashioned against the Stuart court and their choice of political allies and personal beliefs.

The geopolitical conflicts between England, France, and the Netherlands in the
late seventeenth century fashioned the domestic political battles in the English Parliament
and among pamphleteers on London streets. France and her link to Catholicism, however,
always served as the pivot on which the English and Dutch formed their foreign and
domestic policies. For the succession of English kings: Charles II, James II, and William
III, domestic difficulties arose out of fear of Catholic infiltration or French territorial
expansion on the continent. These issues, combined with the precarious nature of foreign
relations, made the kings vulnerable to propaganda created by their political opponents in
England. Over the course of thirty years, the kings of England balanced both
successfully, and unsuccessfully, to govern their country, fend off foreign influence, and

² Ibid., 138.
keep their subjects from dissenting. The emotional fears felt by the English public against France and Catholicism would break the English monarchy and usher in a new era of government with Parliament decidedly in control.

The various pieces of this study draw from a large historiography that both focuses on both the general transformations of politics and printing in the late seventeenth century. In order to gain a complete understanding of the era, the study draws upon the observations of the mistresses of Charles II such as Louise de Kerouaille and Nell Gwyn, prominent pamphleteers and printers of the late seventeenth century, and women politically involved in the Glorious Revolution.

Historiography about the Glorious Revolution appears as complex and contentious as the pamphleteers who argued in favor of their ideologies in 1688. The first seminal texts about the Revolution appeared in the mid-nineteenth century in Thomas Babington Macaulay’s *History of England*. Macaulay established the narrative of the Glorious Revolution as a straightforward process in which Protestant Whigs chafed under the tyrannical Catholic regime of James II. According to Macaulay, English political and religious liberties were threatened, and finally popular uprising across the country, combined with William and Mary’s support from the Netherlands, forced James to flee, thus renouncing his throne. From this point England enjoyed sublime religious liberty and political freedom, ushering in a new set of social beliefs for the modern world.

This narrative has been reinforced and attacked throughout the twentieth century as historians discovered new sources from the era and explored new theoretical frameworks. Contemporary perspectives complicate the Glorious Revolution. Marxist historians such as Angus McInnes and Jacobite historians like Eveline Cruickshanks
argue against the Romantic interpretation of the Revolution. Those outside the upper
echelon of society, according to McInnes, did not effect change in court or Parliament
and saw little political or social change in their everyday lives. The Marxist interpretation
argued that the Revolution concerned only English property-owners who saw James II’s
religious and political projects as a threat to Anglican supremacy and aristocratic power.³
Cruickshanks continued the complication of the Whig narrative, arguing that the
Revolution did not receive support from the majority of the population. She believed that
the importance of the Revolution to English history came in the form of strengthening
English foreign policy and government finances. However, that strength began during the
reign of James II and continued during the regime of William II. She does not believe
that William’s monarchy fostered a new sense of liberty.⁴

The most recent work on the Revolution by Steven Pincus further deconstructs the
narrative established by Macaulay. Pincus argues that the political battle fought between
James and the Revolutionary Whigs was not one that pitted conservative thought against
progressive ideals about liberty and justice. Instead, both James and the Whigs attempted
to modernize England – James II through a project that mirrored the modern Catholic
absolutist monarchy of France, and the Whigs through a project that mirrored the modern
commercial Dutch Republic. He undermines the central position that religion played in
the Revolution, thus showing how the rhetoric of the politicians and pamphleteers
becomes part of the ideological conflict but not the main issue that necessitated Whig
revolution. The ideological battles of the Glorious Revolution parallel the geopolitical


events occurring on the European continent. The English people were caught between two modernizing parties that believed the traditionalism of the mid-seventeenth century held back the country. The outcome, according to Pincus, was a state formed on the Dutch model of political participation and religious toleration, which would oppose Continental politics during the eighteenth and nineteenth century.5

For this study, the historiography of the Restoration mistresses and women pamphleteers and printers during the Glorious Revolution add different elements that highlight an even more complex and interesting picture of England in the 1680s.

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, amateur historians and biographers from Britain and the United States constructed most of the writing about the mistresses until after the shift in historical studies near the turn of the twenty-first century, when greater nuances were established. These older works held biases towards Gwyn and other English mistresses such as Barbara Villiers and ‘La Belle’ Stuart over Kerouaille6. In her study of Kerouaille, Nancy Klein Maguire focused on the construction of Kerouaille’s political power in the Restoration court because of her appearance in pamphlets like the Articles of High Treason and Other Crimes and Misdemeanors against the Duchess of Portsmouth.78 Maguire argues that Kerouaille held influence over Charles II and his

---

5 Steven Pincus, 1688: The First Modern Revolution (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009)


7 Articles of High Treason and other High Crimes and Misdemeanors against the Duchess of Portsmouth (1680).
councilors otherwise this pamphlet, presumably sponsored by Anthony-Ashley Cooper, the Earl of Shaftsbury, would not have been written. Meaghan Schenkelberg has written the most recent study of the mistresses and their representation in the media during the Restoration. Her dissertation examines various pamphlets and other writings produced throughout Charles’ reign and illustrates how media used the mistresses to make commentary on issues such as disease, English identity, and ideas of motherhood.

Schenkelberg advanced the studies of Kerouaille, Gwyn, and Villiers that historians such as Sonya Wynne and Nancy Maguire pioneered. Whereas the latter scholars focus on the real political power of the mistresses, Schenkelberg introduces the important elements of representation in print culture to discover how the media portrayed the mistresses to the public.

The historiography concerning women in the Glorious Revolution is scarce, aside from the studies on Aphra Behn written by Janet Todd and others. Unfortunately, little research has been put forward about many of the women who wrote before and during the Glorious Revolution. Further, more complete, research on the topic of Whig women who published or wrote pamphlets during the latter seventeenth century has been written by Melinda Zook and Lois Schwoerer. They mention women such as Jane Curtis,

---


9 Meagan Schenkelberg, “Headlong He Runs into Circe’s Snares: Representation and the Restoration Royal Mistress” (PhD. Dissertation, The University of Rutgers, 2012.)

Elizabeth Gaunt, and Alice Lisle, but greater investigation into the material that these women wrote would create a better understanding of their role in the Whig cause at the beginning of the Glorious Revolution.

Historians of the late seventeenth century, specifically of the Restoration and Revolutionary periods in England, have covered a great amount of material in their aims to understand the social and political events during a period of great upheaval. Still, much room exists for scholarly advancement of the 1680s. Some material by specific printers and pamphleteers remains unexplored or requires greater analysis of its effect on the political change in the reigns of Charles II and James II.

Women like Elinor James, Jane Curtis, and the scaffold speeches done by Elizabeth Gaunt and Alice Lisle only appear briefly in contemporary historiography. In work concerning the mistresses, Schenkelberg moves forward from the solely political work of Maguire of dealing with the mistresses she only explains how the mistresses functioned as figures of interest in the media. She does explore into the ideological loyalties of the printers who constructed such controversial arguments about women like Gwyn and Kerouaille.

This project advances the various scholarship put forward by Meagan Schenkelberg, Melinda Zook, and Lois Scheowerer by illuminating the political and ideological themes exploited by the writers and publishers of controversial pamphlets in the 1680s. For over a decade, between 1679 and 1690, pamphleteers argued over the dichotomy of Catholicism and Protestantism in England and the establishment of a sense of ‘Englishness’ among the people. Arguments over religious and national identity shaped England's political ambitions during a period of political turmoil and warfare on
the European continent. The following chapters demonstrate that for Whig pamphleteers a theme of anti-Catholic and anti-French rhetoric appears in their works whether the pamphlet was written by a woman or a man, whether it appeared earlier or later in the decade, or whether it argued about religious or political injustice. Likewise, works by Tory writers like Aphra Behn and Elinor James feature a loyalty to traditionalism and a greater understanding for religious toleration, if only to keep the country held together and the monarchy intact.

This study, which incorporates a large number of printed primary sources from a wide array of printers and writers with differing ideologies, shows the political and social nature of the pamphlets. Beyond their arguments about the nature of identity and religion in England, the pamphlets also provide a lens into the society developing during the late-seventeenth century in England and across Europe in general. The spreading of ideas via print across England required a rise in literacy rates. Through measuring illiteracy, as determined by the ability of a man or woman to sign their name, historians can discover the literacy rate in Jacobean England and the extent to which the pamphleteers’ messages spread throughout the country.\(^\text{11}\) Literacy grew significantly throughout the seventeenth century, especially in London. By the 1680s the illiteracy rate for women had dropped to seventy-eight percent, while for male tradesmen, only twenty-two percent were illiterate. The illiteracy rate, as expected, remained higher in rural areas outside London, where

tailors and weavers hovered at a mean of forty-seven percent.\textsuperscript{12} This meant that over half of the male population of London, and approximately a quarter of the female population could interact with printed news.

Increased literacy made pamphlets available for reading by the public, but even before the polemical battles of the late-seventeenth century, the pamphlet as a genre of writing and political discussion had complicated English society. The term ‘pamphlet,’ by the end of the sixteenth century, had come to describe a short work, written in the vernacular about social, political, or religious issues. With the continual expansion of printing in England, the pamphlet flourished in the 1580s as a form of writing that tackled the tensions happening in the Elizabethan church and the societal transformations of the English Reformation. Pamphlets incorporated all manners of political and social arguments. Their writers told full truths and half-truths, often with fabricating stories and downright lying to readers.\textsuperscript{13} Pamphlets changed the way news was disseminated to the public and whether people described them as insignificant, untrustworthy, deceitful, or a waste of time. People read pamphlets and were influenced by their writers to believe in certain social fears and specific ideological leanings. This presented problems for government officials in the Elizabethan period as in the Restoration and the Glorious Revolution. Pamphlets were seen as potentially dangerous works that required censorship and monitoring.

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., 144 – 148.

\textsuperscript{13} Joad Raymond, \textit{Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 7 – 11.
Various attempts to censor pamphlets took place throughout the latter seventeenth century, but censorship was always used in trying to create balance between the writers who supported the monarchy against those who resisted the court. For instance, the Restoration government made no attempt to censor writers until 1662, when the *Act for Preventing the Frequent Abuses in Printing Seditious, Treasonable, and Unlicensed Books and Pamphlets* was passed as seditious and critical writing against the government began to surface. As criticism began to surface against Charles II and later, James II, officials like Roger L’Estrange sought to curtail seditious printing and writing through constant policing and investigating the media trade in London and across the English countryside. He attempted to restrict private presses and shrink printing shop workforces in the hopes of making printing communities more manageable for policing. Further, L’Estrange hoped to infiltrate printing communities in order to have loyal printers and writers pass on information about seditious material and who were responsible for its printing. The curtailing of media was never wholly successful. Given lapses in the Licensing Act and the speed with which knowledge and news traveled through society, the censors always fought a losing battle with the desire for sensational storytelling from the public.

The rising institution of the coffee house, too, further germinated the ideas of Whig and Tory pamphleteers into the public. Coffeehouse culture took the European continent by storm and by the late seventeenth century, many European capitals and cities featured coffee houses where men and women gathered to make conversation and discuss

---

14 Ibid., 324.
15 Ibid., 326.
local and national politics. Jurgen Habermas, in his theory of the creation of the public sphere, believed this to be an important facet of that theory where people outside of the aristocratic could initiate dialogues that influenced larger society. In the decade of the 1680s, the pamphleteers found a public ready to receive and understand the printed discussions and satires and saw their opinion of the monarchy and Parliament swayed between the Tories and Whigs.

Beginning at the initial strife generated with the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis, Chapter I introduces the political and religious problems that first plagued Charles II and that would plague his brother, the later James II, for his entire reign. Chapter I describes how Whig printers attacked royal policy in the Restoration by focusing on Charles II’s mistresses, specifically the French Catholic Louise de Kerouaille and the English Protestant Nell Gwyn. The pamphleteers wrote about the mistresses in order to comment on issues about religion, national identity, court extravagance, and debauchery without risking an attack on the king. As such, many of the pamphlets were written anonymously. However, by looking at pamphlets concerning the mistresses alongside other pamphlets printed in the same print shops, we see that the publishers established political themes. They used the mistresses as part of a larger discourse on Protestantism and English identity.

These arguments, especially concerning religion and national identity compared to the French, formed the basis of Whig rhetoric that occurred later in the 1680s. Whig pamphleteers used Nell Gwyn’s Protestant faith, her impoverished background, and charitable nature to enshrine her as a folk hero and construct a portrait of an acceptable

---

woman figure at court. Opposite to Gwyn, the pamphleteers highlighted Louise de Kerouaille’s Catholic beliefs, her French identity, the vast wealth she accumulated as a mistress, and her diseased body as the foreign threats that endangered England. The two mistresses became recognizable figures in the national events of the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis, in which Whigs believed that the moral health of the country would return if Kerouaille and her French Catholic ilk withdrew from the court.

Chapter II continues the analysis of the material production of printers by analyzing the output of Richard Baldwin, one of the most prominent Whig printers of the late-seventeenth century. Baldwin garnered an infamous reputation as a bookseller and printer throughout the 1680s by printing scandalous and seditious texts that frequently led to confrontations with state authorities. Baldwin’s printing included two of the most firebrand writers of the Glorious Revolution period, Robert Ferguson and Samuel Johnson. These two radicals, along with other Whig writers in the months surrounding James II’s deposition, produced many pamphlets that appeared in Baldwin’s shop.

The material production from Baldwin’s shop and the other Whig writing created during the Glorious Revolution illustrated the strength of William III’s powerful propaganda machine that sought to turn popular opinion against James II and his support for Catholicism. Baldwin and the writers associated with his print shop justified the Glorious Revolution and William III’s ascension to the English throne through anti-Catholic and anti-French rhetoric, which damaged the legitimacy of James II and James Edward Stuart, the Prince of Wales. The work produced also illustrated the
inconsistencies and complexities of Whig politics, especially in ideas of Anglican supremacy and the nature of government following the withdrawal of James II to France.\textsuperscript{17}

Chapter III remains in the period of the Glorious Revolution but shifts focus away from men like Baldwin and Ferguson to the participation of women printers and writers during this crucial period in English political history. Women, demonstrating loyalty to either Whig or Tory beliefs, contributed to political arguments through scaffold speeches, petitions, and poetry. They also ran print shops, where they furthered the production of material for their ideological associates. While women did not have the same opportunities as men to enter political discussions, women such as the playwright Aphra Behn and the printer Jane Curtis produced critical work that pushed their names into the public – and not always in a beneficial way. The pamphlets written and printed by women featured similar arguments to the writings of their male-counterparts.

Whig women, such as Elizabeth Gaunt and Jane Curtis, attacked James II because of his practice and toleration of Catholicism and for his political closeness to France, especially after his exile to the court of Louis XIV. These women contributed valuable pieces to Whig propaganda that diminished the popular support of James II within England.

Ideologically opposed to the Whig women writers, Tory women, such as Aphra Behn and Elinor James, countered through their criticism of Whig and Protestant radicalism, questioning the legality of William’s kingship. Some of their arguments went as far as advocating religious tolerance, though always with a level of suspicion of their

Catholic countrymen. They became effective writers for the defense of James II and maintaining the traditionalism of English monarchy and divine right. However, after the deposition many of these women found themselves in a society that disapproved of their writing because of both their gender and their ideological loyalties. Nevertheless, women on both sides of the political divide created a large corpus of political propaganda showing their involvement in a movement that is often seen as solely the sphere of men.

Taken together, these chapters trace the arguments established by Whig and Tory pamphleteers that challenged or supported the Jacobean monarchy in the 1680s. The pamphleteers established a sense of what it meant to be English and Protestant through an illustration of the evils of France and the suspicions of Catholics both home and abroad. In the Exclusion Crisis, Whig pamphleteers enshrined Nell Gwyn as the symbol of English Protestantism in opposition to the French Catholic Louise de Kerouaille and argued that Kerouaille and her associates were part of the problem of England’s troubles in the early 1680s. Throughout the troubled reign of James II, Whig pamphleteers and printers like Richard Baldwin and Jane Curtis maintained these arguments as part of the powerful propaganda machine that William III fashioned during the Glorious Revolution. They retained the idea that James II’s Catholic beliefs and his friendship with France were reasons why his deposition was justified. Meanwhile, Tory writers like Aphra Behn argued that with the deposition of James II the Whigs dismantled the very fabric of the English monarchy and nation. These arguments formed the basis of the first successful deposition of a king by his own people and led to Parliamentary power with a distinct Protestant slant in England becoming forever solidified.
CHAPTER II

WHIG PAMPHLEETERS AND THE RESTORATION MISTRESSES DURING THE EXCLUSION CRISIS

Since the mid-seventeenth century, English regimes whether royalist or republican contended with two major problems in creating a stable government—political sovereignty and religion. Arguments over political sovereignty between the king and parliament led to open warfare in the 1640s, but the republican Cromwell regime made the English population unhappy and desirous of change. Policies of religious toleration continued to sway from toleration of Protestant Nonconformists and Catholics to the supremacy of the Church of England. These arguments concerning political power and religion also merged with ideas of national identity for the English population. In their writing, pamphleteers separated England from countries like France. They contrasted the Church of England and English Common Law with French Catholicism and the growing centralized power of the French monarchy. As a result, when Charles II came to power in 1660, he faced questions of political sovereignty, religious toleration, and English identity.

---


The latter seventeenth century was a perilous time in European politics as Louis XIV of France waged several campaigns against his neighbors, specifically the Spanish and the Dutch. After fighting with the Netherlands between 1665 and 1667, the English and the Dutch sued for peace due to the start of Louis’s Wars of Devolution. England joined with the Swedish and Dutch in an alliance in 1668, however, the political aims shifted soon after, as Charles desired greater financial independence from Parliament and focused on the Dutch as rivals for expanding English global trade. He even entertained the thought of an Anglo-French alliance. Louis jumped at the chance to pull England into the French sphere of influence and sent Charles’s sister, Henrietta Maria, wife of the Duke of Orleans, to London in 1670 to conclude what was to become the secret Treaty of Dover. The treaty promised substantial monetary aid to Charles and, anticipating a victory over the Netherlands, several key ports along the Dutch coast.\(^\text{20}\) In return for French aid, Charles promised to support Louis’s conquests against the Dutch on the continent, begin repealing anti-Catholic laws, and announce his own conversion to Catholicism. On the last stipulation, Charles wisely stated that his personal conversion could occur any time he saw fit and Louis would still have to pay Charles soon after signing the treaty.\(^\text{21}\) Charles did not openly convert to Catholicism until hours before his death.


These issues of religion created the most conflict during the Restoration period and directly influenced the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis. Early on in his reign, Charles attempted to introduce laws of religious toleration. The Declaration of Indulgence of 1672 gave Protestant Dissenters the freedom to worship in public while also giving English Catholics the ability to worship without penalty in private. This toleration sparked outrage in Parliament and across the country causing Charles to abandon the Declaration of Indulgence as Parliament pressured him to sign the Test Act of 1673.

The passing of the Test Act led to the resignation of several of Charles’s ministers and more importantly, the resignation of James, Duke of York, from his post as Lord High Admiral. His resignation proved to Parliament that he had converted to Catholicism. The project of a Catholic monarchy that might lead England to becoming subservient to the Pope, and possibly the French, eventually caused political and social crisis by 1679.

National crisis finally erupted when a rumor begun by Titus Oates, a failed preacher and conman, stated that Jesuit priests would assassinate Charles. Oates illustrated the conspiracy with precise detail. The Pope wanted Charles assassinated in hopes that he would be replaced with the Catholic, James, Duke of York. Then a Catholic army led by Louis XIV would assist James in maintaining his hold over the British Isles

---

22 Note: Coward cites a census ordered by Thomas Osborne, Lord Danby, in 1676 which gives assumed demographics of the religious population in Restoration England. “The exact extent of Protestant dissent in Restoration England is impossible to estimate…of the adult population over the age of sixteen 2,477,254 were conformists, 108,676, were nonconformists, and 13,656 were papists, and that nonconformists were much stronger in the south and eastern parts of England than in the north and west.” 253.

and bring England back into the fold of the Catholic Church. At first, the court dismissed Oates’s accusations, but after the discovery of correspondence between Whitehall and Versailles in the hands of Edward Coleman, one of the supposed conspirators, Oates’s accusations seemed true. Coleman’s correspondence seemed to implicate the Duke of York having relations with the Pope. News of the “Popish Plot” spread quickly through the court and across London, gripping the country in hysteria. The London mob targeted Catholics and demanded the execution of many of the conspirators Oates named such as Edward Coleman and even aristocrats such as William Howard, 1st Viscount Stafford.

Amidst the fear of Catholic intrigues in the royal court, fears about the royal succession were voiced in Parliament. The Earl of Shaftesbury, who served in Charles inner circle during the Treaty of Dover, became the major advocate of excluding the Duke of York from the succession. He used Oates’s accusations to incite fear among fellow and more moderate MPs about the religious future of England if the Duke of York came to the throne. Over the course of the next two years, Shaftesbury’s supporters, known as the Country Party or the Whigs, battled with the King and his supporters, known as the Court Party or the Tories, over the future of succession.

---

26 Ibid., 9.
Unlike political parties of today or even of the eighteenth century in Britain, the Whigs and Tories of the Restoration existed as nebulous organizations, ushering in the beginning of party politics in England.\(^{27}\) Firstly, the Whigs did not simply oppose Roman Catholicism, but instead attacked the installation of Popery. Their opposition extended to more than simply religious faith, but an adherence to power, wealth, extravagance and universal monarchy.\(^{28}\) Secondly, the Tories, while supporting the king, had their own socio-political ideology to enact. The Tories attempted to change royal policy to fit their own needs, in maintaining the supremacy of the Church of England in religious affairs and crushing both republican supporters and Protestant Dissenters.\(^{29}\) The political status of Parliament and its divided perspectives on religion, sovereignty, economics, and foreign policy only intensified the succession crisis.

Religion and foreign policy were not the only two political difficulties that faced Charles throughout the Restoration period. One of the greatest deficits in Charles’s governance lay in his extravagance.\(^{30}\) Within Whitehall, Charles entertained scores of women from various economic classes and regions across Europe. These mistresses and Charles’s many illegitimate children needed monetary support. For the more religious members of the Church of England and the Protestant Dissenters, the upkeep of Charles’s extravagant lifestyle invited their constant criticism.\(^{31}\)


\(^{28}\) Clark, “Protestantism, Nationalism, and National Identity,” 262.

\(^{29}\) Goldie, “Danby, the Bishops, and the Whigs,” 77.

\(^{30}\) Coward, *The Stuart Age*, 248.

So thus, when Parliament failed to renew the Licensing Act, pamphleteers unleashed a bevy of writings attacking or supporting the Duke of York’s claim on the throne. The pamphleteers treaded over dangerous ground in attacking royal policy and never signed some of their harshest writings. The pamphleteers focused on the weaknesses of Charles’s court, the pro-Catholic and pro-French policies and the extravagance, represented by his many mistresses.

Under these circumstances Nell Gwyn and Louise de Kerouaille rose to prominence. By the time of the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis, these two mistresses commanded great notoriety in the court and among the public. This made them recognizable characters for the pamphleteers to lampoon when discussing royal policy.

Nell Gwyn’s rise to success in Restoration England tells a story of remarkable fortune and knowledge of supreme wit and cunning. Before becoming Charles’s mistress, Nell made her living as an orange girl, selling fruits to audiences in the London theater community. Her charisma and banter with audiences caught the eye of several playwrights and dance instructors of the King’s Theater and soon Nell became one of the leading actresses of the London stage. At this time, both Orange Girls and actresses were socially lumped together with prostitutes. Nell first became the mistress of Charles Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, before returning to the stage and catching the eye of the king.

---

33 Ibid., 33.
He had her installed as mistress in 1671 and Nell’s new house at Pall Mall became a political salon that freed Charles from the intrigues of Whitehall and allowed both him and his ministers to conduct foreign and domestic policy away from spies.34

Louise de Kerouaille first came to England in 1670 as Henrietta Maria’s maid-of-honor when Charles signed the Treaty of Dover. Charles became instantly enamored with the young French noblewoman desiring her to stay in England, but due to obligations to Kerouaille’s family, Henrietta Maria could not release the young Louise from her entourage. Henrietta Maria died soon after returning to France and Kerouaille, poor and alone, had few avenues for advancement in the Versailles court. Learning of Charles’ romantic interests in Kerouaille, Louis XIV believed that she could serve French interests as a spy and she knew that she would have greater potential for social advancement in England.

By the time of the Exclusion Crisis, Nell vied with Kerouaille as the most powerful mistress of Charles’s court. Unlike Kerouaille, Nell held influence with the London mob and the Whig pamphleteers identified her Protestantism and English background as important in a court filled with intrigue and political crisis.35 While the pamphleteers attacked Kerouaille they turned Nell into a folk heroine, defending the court against Kerouaille’s Catholic and French influence. The pamphleteers, however, still made jabs at Nell when discussing the court’s libertine ways.
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In the early 1670s, the idea of “intimacy politics” influenced the intrigues of court as women who lived close to the king exercised influence on royal policy. Kerouaille, more than any other of Charles’s mistresses, acted as a political agent for her own social advancement and the advancement of pro-French and pro-Catholic policy. The advisors at court favored and supported various mistresses in hopes of influencing Charles within his most private spaces. Protestant courtiers such as George Villiers, the Duke of Buckingham, supported Nell Gwyn, as a Protestant mistress in the later 1660s to steer Charles away from his pro-Catholic policies. Catholic councilors, like the Earl of Arlington, welcomed Kerouaille when she returned to England in hopes that her closeness with Charles would strengthen his desires for religious toleration. The growing influence of Louise de Kerouaille also created political problems for Charles during the Popish Plot and the Exclusion crisis as Whig pamphleteers used her French and Catholic background as an avenue to criticize royal policy. To the pamphleteers, the introducing of other Catholics at court, like Kerouaille, in addition to the Queen and Heir Apparent, demanded a revival in anti-Catholic rhetoric starting in the early 1670s. Politicians and Whig pamphleteers feared that this influence would cause Charles to introduce another toleration bill to Parliament and aggressively fought to keep this from occurring.
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Political failings of the court caused a negative reaction against the mistresses from the pamphleteers.\textsuperscript{40} These writers, who would eventually become part of the Whig faction, saw the mistresses as a weakness of the court. When the Exclusion Crisis occurred, Kerouaille became a symbol of Catholic weakness that tore the country apart while writers saw Nell Gwyn as a symbol of court debauchery.

As waves of pamphlets began appearing during the Exclusion Crisis, Louise de Kerouaille became the principal target for many writers. The anonymously written \textit{Articles of High Treason and other High Crimes and Misdemeanors against the Duchess of Portsmouth} published in 1680, accused Kerouaille of twenty-two crimes ranging from harboring Papal agents in Whitehall to spending large amounts of cash from the treasury. Of all the pamphlets dealing with Louise de Kerouaille the \textit{Articles of High Treason} is the most damning. The document, though not written by Shaftesbury most likely received his sponsorship.\textsuperscript{41} It demonstrates the paranoia in London during the Popish Plot, the assumed influence of Kerouaille in Charles’s court, and the power of the Earl of Shaftesbury’s propaganda machine during the Exclusion Crisis. Shaftesbury used the \textit{Articles of High Treason} as a threat for her to back the Exclusion Bill. He knew she had slept with other ministers, such as Thomas Osborne, Lord Danby, one of Shaftesbury’s chief rivals in Parliament, and he threatened to remove her from power and prosecute her as a common whore.\textsuperscript{42}
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Many of the articles within the *Articles of High Treason* deal specifically with the English political nation’s fears of Kerouaille’s participation in the Popish Plot and influencing the royal succession. Article XVII accused Kerouaille:

> that she hath and doth relieve and countenance in her Family and Lodgings in *Whitehall*, several Servants, whom she knows to be Papists and ill affected to the Protestant religion and government, giving them frequent and private access to His majesty to the hazard and danger of his Majesty’s person.43

Kerouaille brought her own entourage of French Catholic servants with her on her arrival in England, and the existence of these servants alarmed Whig supporters in Parliament. Not only did Kerouaille’s household come under investigation, Oates further accused Catherine of Braganza’s personal physician, Sir George Wakeman, and accused the Queen herself, incurring the wrath of Charles.44 The thought of Catholic servants within the intimate places of Whitehall near the king stoked English fears that the Popish Plot could actually occur.

Article XX of the *Articles of High Treason* dealt with the fears surrounding the royal succession and accused Kerouaille “that she has by her creatures and friends given out and whispered abroad, that she was married to His Majesty and that her Son the Duke of Richmond is His Majesties Legitimate Son and consequently, Prince of Wales.”45 Catherine of Braganza throughout Kerouaille’s tenure as mistress battled with sickness and the fear of death. At moments of the Queen’s sickness rumors abounded about the future of the mistresses. The Venetian ambassador to England noted that during a bout of
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queenly illness in March of 1672, Barbara Villiers, the Duchess of Cleveland entertained desires for becoming the new queen. A year later, Kerouaille believed that if the Queen died she would be considered for marriage and from there could install her son, the Duke of Richmond, as heir to the throne.\textsuperscript{46} The pamphleteers and Parliament both attacked mistresses who entered the political game, and only at the end of the Exclusion Crisis did Shaftesbury nominate the Protestant Duke of Monmouth, Charles’s eldest illegitimate son, to replace the Duke of York as heir.\textsuperscript{47}

The \textit{Articles of High Treason} illustrate best the English concerns over religious politics in the midst of the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis. The first accusation against Kerouaille states that she:

\begin{quote}
hath and still doth cohabite and keep Company with the King, having foul nauseous and contagious Distempers, which once possessing her blood can never admit of a perfect cure to the manifest danger and hazard of the Kings person, in whose preservation is bound up, the wealth and happiness of the Protestant Religion, our Lives, Liberties and Properties, and those of our Prosperity forever.\textsuperscript{48}
\end{quote}

This accusation embodies all the Whig religious fears that Kerouaille represented at the court. Similar to the articles that accused Kerouaille’s servants of being dangerous, Kerouaille served as a possible mortal threat to Charles’s safety by existing in his most intimate spaces. This mortal threat included more than Kerouaille having physical access to the king’s bedroom. Her “distempers,” presumably a result of her sexual behavior, resulted in potential danger to Charles’ body and therefore the state. By the very presence
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of Kerouaille at court, she infected Charles with the threat of physical disease, but also infected him with foreign influence from Catholic France. Kerouaille’s open practice of Catholicism and her French background infected the court as much as syphilis may infect the king.

English writers of the seventeenth century, such as the writer of the anonymous tract, *The Whore of Babylon’s Pocky Priest*, linked the fear of venereal disease to Catholicism. ⁴⁹ In similar language to the *Articles of High Treason*, the seventeenth century French medical theorist, Nicholas de Blegny wrote “the Pox is a contagious Distemper” when defining venereal diseases. ⁵⁰ Venereal diseases, brought over through biological exchanges with the New World, scared Europeans into a distrust of the foreign. Diseases they had little knowledge about became the product of foreign enemies and different European states labeled the pox as originating from hated rivals. The Italians termed venereal diseases as the Spanish Pox and the English, in turn, labeled it the French Pox. This emphasized a fear of the foreign, of absolutism and Catholicism, therefore it was the disastrous result of foreign influence taking hold over a nation’s politics and spiritual morality. ⁵¹ The fear of the foreign, however, did not originate only with the French, but long before that with English fears and concerns with the Spanish. The Spaniards because of their travels back and forth between the Americas brought venereal disease to Europe, along with their severe mistreatment of the Native
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Venereal disease evolved in English political rhetoric depending on the geopolitical threat at the time and by Charles II’s reign, that threat personified itself in Louise de Kerouaille.

Different writers accuse Kerouaille of possessing a diseased body that could infect the king and endanger the continuation of royal policy. Her presence at court already brought in Catholic and French influences into a country struggling to find their own identity as Protestant and English. In the context of the Exclusion Crisis, Kerouaille’s sexual health and her political loyalties mattered to the health of the state.

The anonymous writer described Charles as innocent of the machinations of Kerouaille. The king symbolized all the positives of England as a champion of the Protestant religion that further coalesces with English property rights and law while in contrast, as Article II stated, Kerouaille, “introduced Popery and Tyranny…by her Counsels.” The pamphleteer described Kerouaille as a Catholic agent who desired nothing more than to help create a universal monarchy tied to the Catholic Church. Whig writers and MPs believed these events would transpire if the Exclusion Bill failed and the Duke of York came to power.

Beyond simply attacking Kerouaille’s Catholic faith, the Articles of High Treason synthesized Whig beliefs that Popery meant more than just a fear of Catholicism but a combined power of universal monarchy, opulence, sexual disease, and tyranny, all symbolized by the French monarchy. Article IV charged that Kerouaille “advised and still does nourish, forment and maintain that fatal and destructive Correspondency and
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Alliance between *England* and *France* being sent over and pensioned by the *French* King.” The *Articles* argued that Kerouaille’s existence in the Whitehall court from her entrance at the time of the signing of the Treaty of Dover and the launching of the failed Third Anglo-Dutch War showed a continuation of pro-French and pro-Catholic policies. The pamphleteer attacked Kerouaille as responsible for these policies and her influence on that king. The *Articles* identified Kerouaille as a French spy in the pay of Louis XIV to keep Charles tied to supporting French conquests on the continent, which threatened English national security. The writer believed that agents like Kerouaille kept England from returning to pro-Protestant foreign policy free of French influence.

Other anonymously written pamphlets appeared during 1680 that accused Kerouaille of being a threat because of her poisonous body. In *A Satyr*, the writer said that the Duke of York and Kerouaille were conspiring against Charles to convert England to Catholicism and enhance their personal power. The pamphlet constructs a negative image of Kerouaille, stating, “*Portsmouth* Frenchified-Bitch, That Damn’d Papisick-Drab; An ugly, and most nasty Witch, Eat up with Mange and Scab. This *French* Hag’s Pocky Bumb…rules both Church and State.” The pamphleteer combined Kerouaille’s French and Catholic identity with her syphilis-scarred appearance to create a truly horrific image that combined the primary fears of the English public during the seventeenth century. Kerouaille represented the assumed growth of French and Catholic
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influence over the court given her ties with other Catholic figures of the court such as the Duke of York. She also potentially threatened the physical and social health of the state through her intimacy with the king because of her disease.

In the social paranoia that Catholics, under the influence of France, would take over England and destroy Protestantism, Nell Gwyn became a heroine of the Protestant cause. Many of the pamphlets dealing with the mistresses in the Exclusion Crisis feature combative dialogue between Nell Gwyn and Louise de Kerouaille. In A Pleasant Battle between Two Lap Dogs of the Utopian Court printed in the final moments of the Exclusion Bill in 1681, Nell Gwyn, allegorically represented by the dog, Tutty, attacks Kerouaille saying:

A French Whore will never make a good Protestant Lady, for if she should turn Protestant, and make a whore of religion, as she has of her body, the whole world would set a mark upon her for a notorious murderer of both religion, honesty, and common reason.56

This pamphlet depicts the merging of the religious conflict between Protestantism and Catholicism with a growing sense of national identity among the English political nation, who opposed French influence in England. The pamphlet decries Kerouaille as a foreigner and someone who can never properly enter English culture not only because of her Catholic faith, but because her French identity is also a crime. This philosophical assumption separates England from France and Catholicism from Protestantism. If Kerouaille were to try to merge the two cultures together it would be an affront to natural reason and all religion.

56 A Pleasant Battle between Two Lap Dogs of the Utopian Court (London: R.B., 1681), 3
Other pamphlets appeared from the same printer, R.B., in the early 1680s that took part in the dialogue about fostering an English and Protestant identity, though one identity specifically, that of belonging to the Church of England. In *The Late Speech and Testimony of William Gogor, One of the Three desperate and incorrigible Traytors*, the writer presented the final words of one of the men implicated in the Sanquhar Declaration in Scotland that renounced Charles II as king. The pamphlet showed the dangers of the Scottish Covenanters, a Dissenter group, when the accused stated “say what ye will Devils…we are owning the Truth of Christ…I leave my Blood upon you again to be a Witness against you, and a Condemnation in the great Day of Judgement.”57 Similar to the negative influence that Kerouaille’s Catholicism presented at Court, English pamphleteers in London saw religious strife from all directions and believed the Protestant Dissenters as dangerous as Catholics. The pamphlets printed in R.B.’s shop convey an attitude that only those belonging to the Church of England could have a positive effect on the country’s social stability, thus showing the strengthening of an English identity tied directly to the Church of England.

The rivalry between Nell Gwyn and Louise de Kerouaille in the pamphlets expanded beyond religious issues as the pamphleteers emphasized Nell Gwyn’s common background with the London population and her English identity. The best known instance of Nell Gwyn championing her own Protestant background is when the London mob attacked her carriage, mistaking it for Kerouaille’s. She appeared and exclaimed “Be still, friends. I am the Protestant whore.”58 This moment, recorded in all historiography:

57 *The late Speech and Testimony of William Gogor, One of the Three desperate and incorrigible Traytors* (London: R.B., 1681), 2.

about Nell Gwyn may be the work of fiction, exaggerated through word of mouth over
the course of two centuries. However, the fact that the story remained in the
historiography showed the image that pamphleteers shaped for Gwyn during her time as a
mistress.

Pamphlets like *A Pleasant Battle* emphasized Nell Gwyn’s identity while
attacking Kerouaille’s foreignness and attachment to France. The lap dog representing
Nell Gwyn responds, “My Lady is a good Commonwealths woman… your Lady rather
makes provision for the Entertainment of her French Monarch.”59 In *A Dialogue between
the Duchess of Portsmouth and Madam Gwin at Parting* printed in 1682, the pamphleteer
has Nell Gwyn state to Kerouaille that “in my clear Veins best *British* blood does
flow…whist thou like a *French* toadstool first did grow.”60 Both of these pamphlets
emphasize Nell Gwyn belonging to England and further illustrate her as British in
opposition to French influences. The pamphleteers showed that this fear did not belong
specifically to London. The entirety of the British Isles needed to unite against French
influences in the opinions of the writer. The fear of the three kingdoms not standing
together surfaced in the Popish Plot as Oates’s description of the plot said that Catholic
peers in Ireland and Scotland would support Louis XIV’s army when it invaded
England.61 Kerouaille, to the pamphleteers, presented a danger to Charles not only as a
spy, paid by Louis, but as a poisonous mushroom whose French identity and diseased
body threatened the health and stability of the court.

59 *A Pleasant Battle*, 2.
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1682), 2.
Beyond the threat of Catholic or French infection, Kerouaille incurred the wrath of pamphleteers because of the massive gifts and salaries Charles provided for his mistresses and their children. The king allowed Kerouaille a salary of £12,000 p.a. and even Nell, who was never ennobled, received £8,000 p.a.  

In addition to the salaries, the mistresses constantly begged for more money from Charles or advances on their payments as Nell purchased fine silks for her apartment. Kerouaille turned her rooms into replicas of the parlors in Versailles, which only further alienated her from the English political nation and showed the result of her foreign infiltration into the English court.  

The perilous financial state of the crown factored into many of the pamphlets appearing about Kerouaille and Nell Gwyn that contrasted Kerouaille’s spendthrift attitude with Nell Gwyn’s charity. Many pamphleteers saw the moral failings of the court paralleled the political instability of the 1670s and 1680s.  

The Articles of High Treason accuse Kerouaille in Article X that Parliament “having had given her, for many years, past…Summs of Money…as well out of the Publick Treasury, as the privy Purse.” The fact that Kerouaille received a salary also came under attack when Article XI listed that “those vast, prodigious Sums she hath for the most part, was to be transported to a Nation by Religion, Interest and Practice, an Enemy of our Religion and Government.” The pamphleteer highlighted the fact that Kerouaille used English money to finance her
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machinations against Parliament, supporting the growth of French and Catholic influence in the court. Kerouaille demonstrated this growing influence by spending large amounts of money on clothes, carriages, and furniture. This highlighted Kerouaille as French, and therefore, foreign, and also added a new criticism of opulence that she used her money for her own grandiose purposes.

The printers used Nell Gwyn, in contrast, in creating an aura of her charity to Londoners. Stories grew that she promised twenty pounds in her will to release debtors from prison on Christmas. The Whig pamphleteers never overlooked her charity and common bond with Londoners. In A Dialogue between the Duchess of Portsmouth and Madam Gwin, Nell replies to Kerouaille’s extravagance by saying “I do the [people] justice…with less sums a year…I pay my debts and distribute to the poor.” The pamphleteers identified the connection between Nell Gwyn and the majority of London in that even though she received a substantial salary never received nobility and donated her money to debtors.

Even after she died, her Elegy printed in 1687 stated she was “courteous even to the poor…[she] did much Abound in Charity.” Nell Gwyn became a significant boon to both the court and the Whig pamphleteers. The London population welcomed Nell Gwyn as she became the personification of pro-English and pro-Protestant policies in Charles’s government. She provided the pamphleteers with a heroine to contrast with the Catholic,
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French, and extravagant Louise de Kerouaille. Yet, even Nell Gwyn did not completely escape the wit of the Whig pamphleteers as they poked fun at both her and Kerouaille in their role as mistress when criticizing the blatant debauchery of the royal court.

Similar to political criticisms about Charles concerning his financial extravagance, Parliament and devout Protestant Dissenters and members of the Church of England saw the amoralities of the court as going too far. Even though a general sense of laxity existed in England after the fall of Cromwell’s regime, Christians of all denominations wavered on their opinions of the mistresses at court given that Kerouaille and Nell Gwyn often appeared in public.70 This wavering opinion appears in the Whig pamphlets. For while the pamphleteers championed Nell Gwyn as a good English and Protestant woman, she could never escape her unseemly past as an actress and orange girl. In *A Dialogue between the Duchess of Portsmouth and Madam Gwin* Kerouaille has one of her few victorious moments in the pamphlet when saying of Nell Gwyn was a “Dry Orange...which greedily the Monarch did Devour Though it nourished fatal seeds within the Core.”71 While Nell Gwyn championed the Protestant cause in the pamphlets against the Catholic Louise de Kerouaille, the writer of this pamphlet still regarded her as a whore. Her presence stained the reputation of the royal court.

Kerouaille nevertheless received harsher attacks about the state of court debauchery than Nell Gwyn. Unlike Nell Gwyn, who remained faithful to Charles throughout her tenure as mistress, Kerouaille’s other romantic conquests allegedly included the Moroccan ambassador who came to London to negotiate the return of
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Tangiers to the Moroccan government. Though the reality of the affair seems speculative, writers and publishers gravitated to the idea of attacking Kerouaille, even if doing so indirectly. *A Letter from Tangier concerning the Death of Jonas Rowland the Renegade, and other strange Occurrences since the Embassadors Arival here*, published by J.S., who also published *A Dialogue between the Madam Gwin and the Duchess of Portsmouth at Parting*, connects the Moroccan ambassador with Kerouaille. The pamphlet stated that upon returning to Morocco the Ambassador “spake very kindly of England…but had forgot two things which merited his Commendation…their Wine and Women, with whom he had been as familiar, and to whom he was as deeply engaged as the rest.” The anonymous writer argued that the Moroccan ambassador fit nicely in with the libertine nature of Whitehall. He enjoyed Kerouaille as much as the other men who took her to bed, such as Charles. Whether the affair occurred between Kerouaille and the ambassador, Whig pamphleteers who wanted to shame her gravitated to the story.

Other pamphleteers used the amoral aspects of that affair and Kerouaille’s figure at court to attack her prestige. In *Madam Gwins Answer to the Duchess of Portsmouths Letter* the pamphleteer uses Nell Gwyn to speak about Kerouaille saying:

> If you have so lascivious an appetite as your letter mentions, it’s well if the French Kings army can satisfy you, as for my part I can content myself with the society of one or two good likely footmen, after I have had a little Royal pastime.

The writer pokes fun at both Nell Gwyn and Louise de Kerouaille calling both of the women whores, but emphasizing that Kerouaille as mistress did not even put her
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benefactor first. Her allegiance, according to the pamphleteer, lay with the French and with other potential lovers. Surrounded by mistresses and bastard children, Charles could not hope to display the court as a symbol of religious purity or righteous morals.

While the pamphlet does not specify the writer, the publisher J. Johnson, published pamphlets of various style and ideological loyalty in 1682. *A Congratulatory Poem, on his Royal Highness James Duke of York* and *A Letter from His Holiness the Pope to the most illustrious Protestant Prince, James, Duke of Monmouth* demonstrate the Tory element in Johnson’s list. The *Letter from His Holiness the Pope* alleged the attempt of the Pope to convert the illegitimate Duke of Monmouth to Catholicism because of his popularity among the English population saying that the Dissenters “admire you, they love you, they honor you…you are their Oracle…their Bullwork of defence.”

However, instead of a sincere statement, Johnson linked two despised groups together that threatened the sanctity of English stability at the time – the Catholics and the Dissenting Monmouth rebels. For Johnson, the instability caused by the Dissenters and the Catholics threatened the entire country and Monmouth’s association with such rabble made him a less than qualified candidate for a king. In the *Poem* the anonymous writer glorified in saying “Let the dull Scots lament we shall not grieve, Unless your Highness doth sweet England leave. Your absence long has bread out discontent.”

James, while Catholic, represented stability compared to the radical and dangerous rabble associated with Monmouth. Johnson no doubt, as a businessman, saw James II as the
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sensible choice for the continuation of England’s peace and prosperity. But by printing both Whig and Tory perspectives of the crisis, Johnson’s shop would receive indirect advertisement, adding to the success of his shop.

Pamphlets like these dominated the English political nation for over three years, with many attempting to garner popular support for the Exclusion Bill among Londoners. Shaftesbury sought support from the mob in other ways such as festive parades that illustrated England’s Protestant past. Through these demonstrations, he hoped to force the king into removing the Duke of York from the succession in reaction to public outcry.77 Unfortunately, for Shaftesbury and the Whigs, the outcry never happened. Charles remained firm against Parliament, refusing to abandon the Duke of York. With financial aid from France, Charles dissolved Parliament in 1681, never to summon it again for the rest of his reign. The public, tired of executions and plots, abandoned support for Shaftesbury and the Whigs. The Tories gained prominence among the political nation and Charles enjoyed relative political stability until the end of his reign. He imprisoned Shaftesbury in the Tower of London and then the defeated Whig leader fled to France.78 The other pivotal players of the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis, like Titus Oates, were publically humiliated.

Yet even after the defeat of the Exclusion Bill other pamphlets continued to express concern over a Catholic conspiracy between Kerouaille and the Duke of York. *A Letter from the Duchess of Portsmouth to Madam Gwyn, on her Landing in France*, charges Kerouaille in saying “the Mariners were my Votaries, they looked upon me as
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the Star by which they guided and the Sea-Nymphs paid me Veneration; for Neptune, whom they must obey, is but Charles’ Vice-Admiral and you may imagine what influence I had upon him.”

The pamphlet alludes to the past career of the Duke of York as Lord High Admiral and illustrates the fears that with the Exclusion Bill soundly defeated, the future James II would take his influence from agents like Kerouaille who represented a distinct French and Catholic voice in court. Further, the pamphlet shows the fears of the writer that Kerouaille commanded greater influence over the court and even the military so that when James became king, French and Catholic agents could work through James to cement their power over the country.

Charles II died in 1685 and his brother, James, Duke of York inherited the throne as an openly Catholic monarch. James reigned for three years before his daughter Mary and her husband, William of Orange, deposed him during a crisis known to Protestant English as the Glorious Revolution. William III provided the pamphleteers of the early 1680s with a monarch who was decidedly anti-French and Protestant. William, while foreign, achieved his support because of the ties that Whig pamphleteers built in the Protestant haven of the Netherlands as they fled from the Catholic James II in the mid-1680s. Their smear campaign against Louise de Kerouaille to influence the public about the evils of French and Catholic influences in royal policy had, in many ways, succeeded.

Neither Nell Gwyn nor Louise de Kerouaille reaped the benefits of their courtly positions after Charles died. Nancy Maguire and Jenny Uglow provide conflicting accounts of Kerouaille and her life after serving as a mistress. Maguire argues that because of the invaluable role Kerouaille served as a spy and informant for Louis XIV,
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the French king gave her a pension and paid her debts. Uglow provides a narrative closely aligned to the writings in early twentieth century British historiography concerning the mistresses that Kerouaille died penniless and broke in France.\textsuperscript{80} Though Maguire’s account may overemphasize Kerouaille’s importance as Charles II’s mistress, she is most likely fairer in her description of Kerouaille’s last years.

Not surprisingly, British historians tend to fall on the side of kindness when discussing Nell’s death. Uglow focuses on Nell Gwyn’s charity, giving what little money she had to debtors in prison and even to poor Catholics.\textsuperscript{81} MacGregor-Hastie’s account of Nell’s final years is perhaps, more accurate, in saying that she spent the last two years of her life in poverty.\textsuperscript{82} Though she did give what remained of her meager estate to charity, Nell’s later life held none of the glamor often associated to her by the older British historiography.

The popular press played a significant role in this conflict of religion that coincided with discussions about English national identity and law. In their pamphlets, Whig writers used Nell Gwyn and Louise de Kerouaille as objects of commentary, while avoiding direct criticism of Charles. Whig Pamphleteers transformed Kerouaille into a wasteful and lustful villain of England. As a Catholic and as a French noblewoman, she stood for everything foreign to England and her presence in the royal court galvanized fears that strong French influence still existed in Charles’s intimate spaces. The pamphleteers found a heroine in Nell Gwyn. Coming from humble beginnings, she represented the link between the public and the court. Because she was Protestant and
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charitable to the poor, the pamphleteers saw Nell as the perfect mistress compared to Kerouaille. The conflict between these two women in the court and through their fictitious representations in the pamphlets continued well into the twentieth century as legions of amateur historians and biographers champion the story of their favorite mistress. Much like the pamphleteers of the Restoration, these historians argue how either Kerouaille or Nell Gwyn transformed Charles’s court and how their mistress deserves the title of the true queen of Restoration England.
CHAPTER III

RICHARD BALDWIN AND THE WRITINGS OF THE RADICAL WHIGS

Richard Baldwin, a Whig printer during the Restoration and Revolutionary eras, appears in contemporary historiography, along with discussions about the influential and notorious writers of the Revolution such as Robert Ferguson and Samuel Johnson. However, the historiography concerning the 1680s rarely, if ever, observes the formation of Baldwin’s politics or his contributions to the Whig political machine. Baldwin deserves greater attention given the amount of printing his shop undertook and the prominence of the individuals he sponsored.

Baldwin illustrated how the Whigs justified the Revolution and William III’s accession to the English throne through anti-Catholic, anti-French, and anti-authoritarian rhetoric, which damaged the reputation of the Stuart regime. This rhetoric established the Whig project for the Revolution – the modernization of the English state, which mirrored the ideologies of the modern commercial Dutch Republic. In the minds of these Whig revolutionaries, England would be a state that allowed religious toleration, political participation, and distancing from the landed aristocracy. However, the work produced in his print shop also illustrates the inconsistencies and complexities of Whig politics,
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especially in ideas involving Anglican supremacy and the nature of government following the withdrawal of James II to France. Baldwin’s printing proves that no universal Whig ideology existed.  

Following the various crises during the Restoration monarchy of Charles II, his brother James, the former Duke of York, faced national crisis immediately after becoming king. During the Exclusion Crisis, Shaftesbury and the Whigs identified Charles’ illegitimate son, James Scott, the Protestant Duke of Monmouth as the best alternative to James. Robert Ferguson, the notorious Whig plotter and pamphleteer who appeared later in Richard Baldwin’s print shop, wrote a pamphlet in 1680 attempting to justify Monmouth’s legal right to the crown. Printed in 1680, *A Letter to a Person of Honour, concerning the Kings disavowing the having been Married to the Duke of Monmouth’s Mother*, Ferguson advocates for the legitimacy of the Protestant Duke of Monmouth through the rumor that Charles had a legitimate marriage to Lucy Walter. He made a plethora of attacks stating:

> The whole [of London] is apprehensive, at the King though endeavoring by this Act to secure himself in the Grace at least forbearance of the Duke and Popish Party, will find in the issue that instead...he hath left himself naked and exposed to their wrath and malice.  

Statements like these illustrate the Whig propaganda themes of the Exclusion Crisis and later Revolutionary rhetoric. Even before becoming King, James threatened the moral constitution of the English people through his Catholic loyalties. Whig writers  
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remembered the sacrifices and martyrs of the Marian period and saw those issues in addition to the Parliamentary struggle for authority with Charles I as problematic in figuring out the best solution for England’s political problems.

Spurred on by Whig support, Monmouth led a rebellion in Western England. The series of plots and rebellions allowed the Stuart regime to destroy or neutralize most of the leadership of the Whig radicals. These defeats scattered Whig leaders throughout England and drove some to the Netherlands where they sought asylum among the Calvinist Dutch. However, James failed in allowing two of the Whigs’ most radical thinkers, John Locke and Robert Ferguson, to escape. Ferguson and Locke would come to write some of the best Whig propaganda for justifying William III’s claim to the English throne.

Where Charles attempted to create religious toleration reform, but scaled back to appease the Anglican majority, James actively pushed for religious toleration. In doing so, he isolated himself from the most powerful institutions in England. A historiographic trend exists in most popular history about the Glorious Revolution that presents James II as completely inept at ruling and that Parliament immediately opposed him in all acts of governance. Historians looking at the Glorious Revolution from the perspective of the Irish, Scottish, or the English population outside of the aristocracy have since refuted this interpretation. Eveline Cruickshanks, who writes from a Jacobite perspective, explains that initially James’ Catholicism, because of his private nature concerning religion, had little effect on creating negative public opinion.
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Early in his reign, James did not incur the disapproval of Parliament. He levied customs and excise duties in order to raise money to defeat Monmouth and Parliament granted him these duties later in 1685 without complaint. While these instances did not incur the ire of Parliament and the politically literate against James early on, his religious reforms, which took power away from the Church of England, caused great discord among the people.

While James dealt with an unhappy government in London, William prepared for war with the Catholic King of France. Louis XIV, since the 1670s, had continuously waged war against the Dutch and other Protestant states in the Empire surrounding France. Repeated victories resulted in France standing as the most dominant military force on the continent. William vigorously opposed French expansion and formed an alliance of Protestant states in Northern Europe. The League of Augsburg went on to include Catholic states such as Habsburg Spain and Austria who feared the expanding power of the Bourbon Dynasty. Before the events of 1688, Louis XIV went so far as to financially assist the Ottomans in their attacks on Habsburg Europe. With such a precarious political environment in Europe, William and his allies wished to bring English naval power to bear against the French. Seeing the religious discontent rising in England and receiving the invitation to force James’ deposition from the Council of Six, William saw an opportunity to bring England into the war against France.

\[88\text{Ibid., 15.}\]
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William landed in the west of England at Torbay and brought with him many of the Whig radicals who fled England after the Monmouth Rebellion. As the Dutch army crossed southern England toward London, radicals such as Locke, Ferguson, and other Whigs churned out pamphlets in a relentless propaganda campaign against James. The Whigs arguments centered on one theme of portraying William as a selfless deliverer of England’s religion, law, and liberty, compared to the Catholic tyrant – James II.90

James was greatly displeased at this outpouring of pro-William propaganda and clamped down on news media in London and the surrounding countryside. He went as far as to suspend coffee house licenses for displaying newspapers and burning all books suspected of containing seditious material.91 The attempt failed and James watched as loyal officers of his army, such as John Churchill, the later Duke of Marlborough, betrayed him to support William’s claim. Without support from the army or in Parliament, James and his family fled London. His wife and son arrived safely in France, but Kentish fishermen caught James in his attempt to leave and dragged him back to London, much to the chagrin of William who saw James’ retreat as a way to easily fill the power vacuum in London. Weeks later, William allowed James to leave for France, removing James’ threat to his power, at least until the Jacobite incursion into Ireland a year later. The chaotic environment in London proved troublesome for William, for though he had support from the Whigs, Tories and other political factions passed on giving him their immediate support.
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Parliament, now free from James’ control, convened early in 1689 to solve the crisis that now faced the country – England was without a king. In London and throughout England, Whig pamphleteers worked tirelessly to justify William’s invasion and his eventual claim to the throne. They pushed their ideology through printing anti-Catholic satires, reprints of arguments made during the Exclusion Crisis, and the dying speeches of the Rye House plotters and Monmouth rebels.\(^92\) However, as the Convention of 1689 continued, cracks surfaced among certain Whig pamphleteers over arguments in Parliament. Before his landing, William told his Whig supporters he would not seek the throne. His coming to England would be simply to remove James from power due to his tyrannical motives and then allow Parliament to decide on the best course of action for the country. William had no intensions of honoring this given that without the crown he could not command the English military against France. However, a plethora of different ideas surfaced at the Convention that prevented William from immediately staking his claim.

Radical Whigs and High Churchmen of the House of Lords formed the extremes in the debates about the monarchy. The Radical Whigs saw the ousting of James as the beginning of a pattern in which all governments deemed tyrannical could be resisted and eventually overthrown by the people. In contrast, the High Churchmen did not consider Parliament’s convention legal and felt that James should be invited back as rightful king.\(^93\) The majority of the members of Parliament pushed a middle ground, isolating both extremes by accepting the crowning of William and Mary, but removing any idea


that the Revolution occurred through popular support. This interpretation caused divisions among the Whigs, especially radicals such as Samuel Johnson who refused to support to any revolutionary movement that removed the participation of the population. These issues were not the only arguments barring William from his objective.

While the Conventioneers mostly agreed that James could not return to England and the establishment of a popular republic was far too radical, Tory members pushed the idea of Princess Mary, James’ daughter, inheriting the throne instead of William. This avenue for governance also failed because female rule remained taboo for the majority of Englishmen even though Elizabeth reigned during a period of prosperity and a flowering of English culture. Given the volatile nature of European politics at the time, the English needed a masculine, virile, and martial ruler. By February 1689, William could no longer endure political delays from Parliament. France had advanced against William on the continent and he needed the immediate entrance of English forces to counter the anticipated French campaign against the Netherlands. He threatened Parliament that he would withdraw the Dutch army from London and return to the continent wiping his hands clean of English politics. Parliament feared unrest breaking out in London and the surrounding areas, as well as the possibility of James returning with the support of a Catholic French army. By the end of February, both Whigs and Tories in Parliament offered the crown to William and the Convention became an official Parliament.
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94 Both the Whig and Tory membership came from the landed gentry or wealthy merchants across England and members of both political affiliations agreed that the general masses presented a stabilizing issue when they organized. Uprisings like the Diggers, who sought to divide land equally among poor and rich farmers, and the Levellers, who sought universal male suffrage and an end to aristocratic privilege, could not happen again after the Glorious Revolution solidified Parliamentary control over the country.

During the political debates surrounding the Glorious Revolution, Richard Baldwin worked as a prominent bookseller and printer in London near the Old Bailey. Lois Schwoerer mentions Baldwin as a suspected producer of seditious, heretical, and blasphemous material along with many other printers of the period.\(^96\) Other historians briefly mention Baldwin as a printer associated with the words of Robert Ferguson or Samuel Johnson and nothing more. Even then, historians such as Schwoerer err on Baldwin’s details by confusing the names of his wife and daughter or writing about him as a Whig printer without discussing his complexities in his printing during the Revolutionary era. Only Beth Lynch, in a small entry in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, offers some detail on Baldwin’s contribution to printing and English politics throughout the late seventeenth century. In her entry, she points out that Baldwin made his debut in the volatile world of English politics and propaganda during the Exclusion Crisis in the early 1680s. He printed pamphlets and broadsheets supporting the Earl of Shaftesbury, in addition to producing two pro-Exclusionist newspapers – the Protestant Courant and the London Mercury. In contrast to many of the other booksellers in London at this time, what made Baldwin different and more prominent was his shift from bookbinding to publishing. Doing this allowed him to leave his mark along with the great propagandists and writers of the period.\(^97\)

Due to the Exclusionist nature of Baldwin’s newspapers and choice of printing, he came under constant investigation and prosecution from government agents, among them, Roger L’Estrange, the surveyor of the press. Baldwin paid numerous fines and served a


week in prison for printing libel against Charles II. When the Tories regained power in Parliament due to the scandal of the Rye House plot, Baldwin tempered his Exclusionist publishing, especially due to pressure from the Stationers Company. Evidence of Baldwin’s publishing footprint is reduced by the reign of James II, most likely because the power of the Tories in Parliament made it difficult to print oppositionist literature. However, Baldwin did not disappear completely and published oppositional political works about in 1688, such as Samuel Johnson’s *Purgatory Prov’d*, which railed against Catholicism. Baldwin received the advent of William III with jubilation and reentered the publishing world with vigor. During the Revolutionary Era, Baldwin printed several tracts justifying the ascendancy of William III. He cemented his anti-French and anti-Papist politics, during the 1680s in *The Post Man*, which was his longest running newspaper. Despite his apparent support for the new king, Baldwin maintained a troublesome reputation with government censors, who sent him to Newgate Prison in 1690 on charges of high treason for publishing the *Causes of the Present Disasters in England*. Baldwin died in 1698 and his wife, Abigail, continued their publishing business. It remained successful throughout later generations. Both Richard and Abigail Baldwin dramatically effected English politics and printing during the Revolutionary era. They grew their company from simple bookbinding into a major distributor of Whig literature in the seventeenth century.

One of the shortcomings of scholarship concerning Baldwin is that it does not address how the Whig tracts published in the Revolutionary era give insight to the formation of Baldwin’s political ideology. The tracts printed at the beginning of William
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III’s reign illustrate a definite anti-papist and anti-French discourse, and he used both these issues to justify the deposition of James. Then there are the tracts that discuss the rights of Non-conformists and the corruptions of High Churchmen in the Church of England. These other tracts show the disunity of Whig opinions. These, combined with the moderate writing of George Savile, the Marquis of Halifax, show the complicated political position Baldwin held in the Revolutionary era.

The crowning of William and Mary in 1689 occurred alongside an outpouring of Whig propaganda that sought to justify the position of William as king. Popular support for the Prince of Orange’s claim was imperative for those Whigs who supported him because Tories, Anglican high clergy, and many others did not immediately support William. Several prominent figures, especially in the clergy, refused to take allegiance to the new king and as became known as nonjurors, forfeiting their livings.100 Pamphleteers like Robert Ferguson garnered popular support for William’s claim through blatant propaganda. Ferguson spent his entire career as a propagandist, first as a devout Whig and then, after the Jacobite defeat at the Battle of the Boyne, a stern supporter of James II’s hopes to reclaim the throne. His complicated nature has baffled historians, but the switching of ideological loyalty happened to many propagandists and intellectuals in the Revolutionary era.101 Similarly, to Baldwin, Ferguson’s seemingly malleable political opinions allowed him to remain relevant as a commentator during a volatile political time. The pamphlets often attacked the policies of James II more than focusing on any credentials held by the Prince of Orange.
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Ferguson’s *Brief Justification of the Prince of Orange’s Descent into England* provided a framework by which the Convention Parliament of 1689 could depose James legally from the throne and pass the crown to William. Ferguson created opposing images of the two monarchs saying “the Prince of Orange with a Compassion Generosity, and Zeal…hath put it into our own power, to retrieve and re-establish the Privileges and Liberties which by force and Fraud have been wrested from us.” Ferguson thus portrays William as the selfless defender of English liberties, specifically Whig conceptions of liberty, which James threatened as king. These statements are purely propagandist in nature. At the time of the Convention, William had not threatened the security of the Convention in his demand for the throne nor had passed any official political policy. The monarchs become absolute images of freedom and despotism.

Ferguson attacked the various religious and social reforms enacted by James II in order to justify William’s claim. His first example discussed specific Whig grievances against James over religion stating:

[James II] having dispensed with the Oath of Supremacy, which precluded all Forraign Jurisdiction, and through having received the Pope’s Nuncio, and Provincial Romish Bishops: he hath thereby rob’d the Crown of its brightest Jewel, namely of the having and exercising Authority and Jurisdiction over all Persons in this Dominion, and hath transferred and aliened the Regal Power of this Kingdom to a Forraigner.

In this statement, Ferguson accused James of giving the power of English sovereignty away to foreigners, specifically the Pope. Ferguson saw Catholics as subservient to the
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Pope in Rome and thus James could not serve properly as King because his Catholic religion beheld him to the governance of the Pope. The grievances listed were valid as James received a Papal ambassador in 1687 and reestablished formal diplomatic contact with the Papal States. Further, James overturned the Penal Laws, allowing Catholics, along with Non-Conformists, to serve as public officials and military officers. While having not mentioned William by name, Ferguson argued that James was not fit for the crown and needed to be deposed.

Ferguson justified William’s claim to the throne later in the pamphlet first when decrying the idea of a democratic republic saying that:

As the Mercurial and Masculine Temper of the English people, is not to be molded and accommodated to a Democracy; so it impracticable to establish such a Commonwealth; where there is a numerous Nobility and Gentry, unless we should first destroy and extirpate them.

The idea of creating a new Commonwealth was held only by a small minority of Whig radicals and the Convention Parliament quickly discredited the idea due to the amount of national strife encountered when Cromwell held power. This statement illustrates Ferguson’s radical nature among the Whigs of the Revolutionary period. While not as extreme as other radicals who called for the reinstitution of a Commonwealth, Ferguson nevertheless stated that establishing a republic would require the destruction of the nobility and gentry, aligning him with the rhetoric of the Leveller and Digger movements of the Civil War era.


When mentioning William by name, Ferguson used pro-Protestant and anti-French rhetoric to justify the decision of the Convention Parliament to give William the crown. He argued that William:

Being the Head of the Protestant Interest in Europe, tendeth no less to our benefit and safety, than it doth to his honor and glory. And the Resentment he retains of Injuries done him by the French King, will lead him not only to avenge himself, but this Kingdom also upon that common enemy.  

With France as the premier Catholic power of the seventeenth century, Catholic allegiance, while tied to Rome, was seen by the Whigs as undoubtedly linked with Versailles. William, as the leader of the League of Augsburg, defended English liberties simply by being the most prestigious Protestant monarch of the era. According to Ferguson, this justified William’s claim to the throne. This is not to say that Ferguson had no reservations about William as King. Ferguson did not believe that William was a de jure monarch because of the murky happenings surrounding James’ deposition. Even in the Convention Parliament, officials argued incessantly over whether the throne was vacant or abdicated. Giving unbridled support to William and Mary would in turn make all future monarchs vulnerable to revolution and Whig leaders saw writing like Locke’s *Second Treatise on Government* as dangerous given its message of political responsibility and the rights of property owners to revolt.
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Ferguson supported Princess Mary’s claim to the throne with greater fervor as he did not begin writing about William until forty-five pages into the tract. Ferguson’s anti-French and anti-Papist leanings made him support William, rather than any actual love for the Dutch Prince. While Baldwin did not share Ferguson’s radical ideas, given his wide range of other printing, he did not shy away from these kinds of volatile writings. While Ferguson enjoyed wide Whig popularity before and during the Revolution, many Whigs of the 1690s saw him as dangerous. He carried the negative connotations of plotting and secrecy associated with the Earl of Shaftesbury. Baldwin understood that financially Ferguson’s argumentative writing would increase sales and no doubt agreed with him on some issues given Baldwin’s repeated imprisonments, fines, and conflicts with state media censors.

A Brief Justification established the themes that other Whig writers published in Baldwin’s shop would take in discrediting James and cementing popular support for William. Soon after William legally gained the throne with consent by the Convention Parliament, he brought England into the Nine Years War against France. The war, while fought mainly in continental Europe, did involve a contest for the English throne between James and William that concluded at the Battle of the Boyne in 1690. Baldwin’s shop used decidedly anti-French rhetoric to justify nation-wide support for English actions against France and the Jacobites.
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The Intreigues of the French King at Constantinople, written anonymously in 1689 was published for a printer named Dorman Newman, but appears in a list of broadsheets sold by Richard Baldwin in his publication of The Secret History of the Duchess of Portsmouth.\textsuperscript{111} It is unclear the relationship that Newman had to Baldwin, but the pamphlet’s anti-French focus is similar to the Whig propaganda that appears in many of Baldwin’s published tracts. The anonymous author depicts France as an immoral, heretical, and heathen country, not simply because of its Catholic allegiance but due to Louis XIV’s diplomatic relations with the Turks. He states the conflict surrounding the Nine Years’ War:

Was not the first time, that the Most Christian Kings had made...Alliances with the Turks...above an Hundred and forty years ago, [the Sultan] brought an Ottoman Army before the Walls of Vienna, and was within an Ace of seeing that Rampart of Christendom laid in Ashes.\textsuperscript{112}

The author’s justification for supporting William’s war is based on a long-standing hatred based on the apparent tendency of French kings to make unholy pacts with the Muslim Ottoman Empire against other Christians. Based on this, no European Christian – Catholic or Protestant – could trust the French. Because of France’s willingness to make pacts with the Muslims, the author implied that the French lay outside of Christian Europe and fighting against them is a holy act. The author is writing about the alliance made by Francis I in the sixteenth century with the Ottomans against the Habsburg Emperors. He paralleled that with Louis XIV’s willingness to help the Ottomans besiege Vienna in the early 1680s.


\textsuperscript{112} The Intreigues of the French King at Constantinople (London: Dorman Newman, 1689), 4.
The author emphasized the idea that Louis has imperial ambitions by saying the reason for the French alliance with the Turks is so they:

might so far weaken the Germans, and undo the Emperors own Estate, as to render the one incapable of supporting the Emperial Dignity, and to force the other to call in the French King to their assistance and to Proclaim him Emperor, which even he had the rather reason to hope, that he had entertained Correspondence with a great many Princes of the Empire, and had been liberal enough of his Gold to gain their friendship.\(^{113}\)

He did end up capturing the city of Phillipsburg on the French eastern border but did not succeed in wresting the title of Holy Roman Emperor away from Leopold I. William, leading the Protestant alliance, allied Catholic Austria against France. According to the author, no longer could religion be the dividing line in Europe. This kind of rhetoric had been gaining strength since the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. In a move to gain greater continental supremacy, Catholic France supported the Protestant princes of Northern Europe against Catholic Austria, destroying the political alliances based on religion. Because of these changes, the arguments of the pamphleteers changed. England fought in the Nine Years War, allied to both Catholic Austria and Spain. The Protestant worldview was changing as the religious dividing lines blurred.\(^{114}\) Pamphleteers took advantage of this to make France a religious enemy because of its relations with true non-Christians, like the Turks.

France appeared dangerous to England, not only because of its Catholicism, but also because the French could easily sacrifice Christian virtues for greater political power. Further, the author identified Louis’ willingness to use vast sums of money to purchase support from the German princes. The author highlighted this as a weakness of
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the French that Louis needed to resort to bribes instead of acting as a powerful king on the battlefield.

Aside from justifying English entrance into the Nine Years War from an ideological and religious perspective, Baldwin also printed pamphlets that showed the French as barbarous animals who needed to be destroyed given their treatment of English prisoners of war. Richard Strutton, presumably a prisoner of war of the French, wrote *A True Relation of the Cruelties and Barbarities of the French upon the English Prisoners of War* after returning to England after a harrowing ordeal that took him across the countryside of western and southern France. During his travels, the French subjected him and his fellow prisoners to various injustices that show their complete lack of humanity. He explains that a French marine “dru’d [a group of prisoners] so long that I believe he gave them at least Fifty blows, so that I saw the Piss run out of the knees of the Breeches of one of them.”115 To Strutton, the French appeared no better than animals, mistreating the English prisoners. The parallels for Strutton’s polemics formed from within English suspicions of the Spanish, especially out of the narratives told by Las Casas, which painted the Spanish as barbarous because of their treatment of natives in the Americas. It allowed English pamphleteers to illustrate the Spanish as barbarous.116 While the English did not have personal experiences to draw from, the parallel was easily constructed in the case of the French. Their lack of humanity justified to English audiences to the support of the war against French that William waged on the Continent. Even though it did not directly affect English welfare, the ending of; or the goal of ending, French barbarity


served as a righteous reason for war.

Not only did Strutton note the barbarities of the French, he also described to the stupidity of the French peasantry. He remarked that when the English prisoners were under guard by a group of French marines and peasants, he “saw [a peasant] looking upon his Pistol, holding the Muzzle in his hand, and with the other hand he was tampering with the Lock. I stood looking on him a good while, thinking by and by to see the foolish Dog shoot himself.” Not only did Strutton note the barbarities of the French, he also described to the stupidity of the French peasantry. He remarked that when the English prisoners were under guard by a group of French marines and peasants, he “saw [a peasant] looking upon his Pistol, holding the Muzzle in his hand, and with the other hand he was tampering with the Lock. I stood looking on him a good while, thinking by and by to see the foolish Dog shoot himself.” Strutton portrays the French as both barbaric, deserving no mercy in war for their treatment of English prisoners, and as inept fools. Thus, this type of rhetoric establishes both a martial and moral prowess that the English processed in contrast to the French. The English treat war as honorable and understand the intricacies of combat.

Further, Strutton used this type of rhetoric to justify William’s claim to the throne through tying James II to the French. He wrote that the prisoners were “shouted and scoffed at by the [French] all the way we passed, calling us Rebellious Rogues for Fighting against our lawful King James; one who, as they say, was righteous as a God.” By arguing that the French support James II as the rightful English king, Strutton unmistakably ties James to the same moral and martial failures as his allies who support his claims. The pamphlet appeared to London audiences only a few days before the Battle of the Boyne in Ireland. James was already on the move as Strutton wrote, and an outpouring of Williamite pamphlets in London and the surrounding area weakened any Jacobite strength within the English political nation as conflict erupted across Ireland.
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and across Europe. The printing of the anonymous work condemning Louis’ alliance with the Turks against Habsburg Europe and Strutton’s illustration of French moral and martial weakness show that Baldwin held extreme anti-French sentiment along with many of his fellow Whigs.

Though the Intreigues detailed Christian understanding between the Catholic Habsburgs and the Protestant Williamites against the French, Baldwin included anti-Catholic rhetoric in his printing that came from Samuel Johnson and other writers active in the early 1690s. The Whigs used Anti-Catholic rhetoric as another method of illustrating James II as a tyrant and ineffective ruler, given that he stood apart from majority of English society with his choice of religion. Strutton offered issues of religion as a reason for hatred between the English and the French throughout his ordeal as a prisoner. He wrote that at first the French gentry, obviously more cultivated than the peasantry, pitied the English prisoners but then they:

Having Information, that we were not of their Opinion, but on the contrary, that we were Calvinists; their Charity to us was barefooted and cold. While we lay in this place, I do believe there was not less than Twenty several Orders of Clergy-men came in to see us, telling us we were wretched People, for fighting against God and the True Religion.119

Strutton attacked Catholics in saying that even as Christian people they lack the goodwill to take pity on those of a different religion. This suggested that all Catholics must lack compassion for those of different or even opposing religions, which parallels how Strutton perceived James II as king, given his Catholic leanings. Not only are the sophisticated gentry unable to show compassion to the English prisoners, but the French
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Catholic clergy lack compassion.

Samuel Johnson, in two separate pamphlets, printed by Baldwin moved anti-Catholic rhetoric away from political problems with France and simply wrote to discredit Catholics as a whole, whether their loyalty lay with Louis XIV or James II. While the beginnings of doctrinal discontent in Catholicism did not start in the sixteenth century with Luther, the abuse of indulgences by Johann Tetzel and the concept of purgatory were the spark of the formal era of the Reformation on continental Europe. Several months before the deposition of James II took place, Johnson wrote *Purgatory Prov’d by Miracles*, which compiled countless stories of Catholic saints. The stories show that Purgatory existed in Catholic traditions, but to Johnson, as he states in the preface of the pamphlet, “I shall…examine Purgatory as a Doctrine of the Poets, but by no means as a Doctrine of Christianity, and consider what a wise Heathen would have said it.”\(^{120}\) Johnson accused the Roman Church of simply fabricating the idea of Purgatory as a story and nothing more. He added to his premise that he Catholic Church was willing to create myths when saying:

> The same may be shown in the other Points of Popery, as Invocation of Saints and Angels, Worship of Images, Worship of Relicks, or Dead Mens Bones, Prayers in an Unknown Tongue, etc. Which are downright Contradictions both to the Doctrine of Scripture, as also to the Principles of Natural Light, and the everlasting Notions which we have of God.\(^{121}\)

The entire teachings of the Catholic Church, according to Johnson, have no basis in Scripture or religious reality and contradict the Nature of God. Coming to these
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conclusions, Johnson charged that the Catholics were barely Christian, creating their faith through superstitious beliefs in miracles and relics that have no actual power or connection to God. Protestants, in contrast, he argued had none of these superstitious ideas and his rhetoric undermined the legitimacy of James because a Catholic king will only lead the country to ruin through superstitious belief.

What seems shocking about this pamphlet and another pamphlet, *The Way to Peace among All Protestants*, written by Johnson a month after *Purgatory Prov’d*, is that both pieces of writing were officially licensed. Even under the extreme censorship that James placed the press under during the last months of his reign, radical Whigs like Johnson still made their rhetoric available to the public through official channels.

Johnson’s writing displays mastery in satire. He supported the popular radical sentiment in England while not mentioning James or his Tory supporters in name or through allegory. His attacks just better verbalized the reigning political problems and concern in England. In *The Way to Peace*, Johnson again attacks Catholics as a corrupting influence within English society saying:

> though I know not of any one Ceremony enjoied in the Church of England, which is not both Lawful and Primitive, and of an elder date than Popery. Yet because the Slovenly Papists have spit in them, and by corrupting and abusing them have endeavoured to make them their Own, I hope the Wisdom of the Nation my hereafter suffer them to be so; Especially since all wise Protestants know very well, that we can Live without them.”

122

Johnson argued that the Catholic presence in England had destroyed the religious ceremonies once held by English churchgoers and that as a Protestant nation, the English people must do anything in their power to remove Catholic influences from the country.

Johnson’s desire to remove Catholic corruption from the country matters especially when the king was looked as a representation of the country as a whole. Catholicism needed to be removed from all facets of the country and as a result, a Catholic monarch needed removed from governance. Anti-Catholic rhetoric gave the pamphleteers working through Baldwin’s shop a weapon to discredit James II because of his abnormal religious identity in a country that saw itself as solidly Protestant.

Matters of religion even beyond the Catholic-Protestant dichotomy remained important issues for Whig pamphleteers like Samuel Johnson. Seeing Catholics as the ultimate threat to Protestant religious in Europe, Johnson argued in *The Way to Peace* that members of the Church of England and Non-Conformists must come together as friends because of their shared commonality. He stressed that all Protestants “have all but one Rule of Faith and Life, one Standard of Religious Worship and Practice, which is one and the same English Bible; and why should we not then All be of One Heart and One Soul? We all believe that there is one God, in opposition to Polytheism.”  

Mentioning polytheism was a swipe at the superstitions of the Catholics as he declared their faith based on relics and dead men’s bones in *Purgatory Prov’d*. Protestants, in contrast, share the same theological and scholarly traditions because their faith came directly from Scripture instead of from established doctrine outside the teachings of Jesus. A united Protestant front in England would weaken Catholic influences on the country, whereas divided Protestant factions such as Conformists and Non-Conformists only caused unnecessary friction.
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Johnson went on to praise the Non-Conformists who, he asserts:

would rather lie under all the penalties of Non-conformity, than go about to weaken or undermine the Authority of the Laws which secure to all Protestants their Lives, and a much greater thing than their Lives, I mean the Bible, which I say again is the whole Religion of all Protestants.124

Unlike the Catholics who stirred up constant discontent throughout the country and proved to be a corrupting influence in government, the Non-Conformists simply suffered through the penal laws. Johnson, of course, gently removed the actions of Non-Conformists in emigrating from England to North America or the Netherlands, as well as Non-Conformist millennial movements such as the Fifth Monarchists. These instances to Johnson were not worth mentioning because of the perceived discord between Protestants could undermine the unity Protestants needed in the face of a Catholic regime.

However, in spite of the Non-Conformists and the need for Protestant unity, Whig writers identified that problems existed within the Anglican religion, specifically with the strength and power of the bishops. A year before the deposition of James II, Baldwin published another anonymous pamphlet, *A Sensible Discourse Shewing the Unreasonableness and Mischiefs of Impositions in the Matters of Religion*, written by A Learned Pen. This pamphlet bears similarity to Johnson’s future tracts written about religion along with the Whig tendency to use historical events to build arguments in the present. The author attacks upper clergy throughout the tract saying that the early fathers of the Church, the bishops, “began to vouch themselves the Successors of Christ…yet presented to be Heirs and Executors of the Jewish High Priests, and the Heathen Tyrants,
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and were ready to prove the Will.”\textsuperscript{125} The author attacked the high clergy, not differentiating whether his aim is against Catholic or Anglican clergymen, by associating the bishops with the Jewish priests and the pagan kings of antiquity, those who helped condemn Christ to death. Instead of focusing on matters of faith and concern with the people’s spiritual wellbeing, the bishops of the Roman and Anglican Churches entered into the political realm and caused social chaos because of their attempt at lawmaking.

The author further argued that the entire position of the bishops only caused problems for the faithful. Instead, he suggested:

\begin{quote}
Everyman is bound to work out his own Salvation with fear and trembling, and therefor to use all helps possible for his best satisfaction. Hearing, conferring, reading, praying for the assistance of God’s Spirit: but when he hath done this, he is his own Expositor, his own both Minister and People, Bishop and Diocese, his own Council.\textsuperscript{126}
\end{quote}

The invasiveness of the bishops in the Catholic Church, and whose tradition the Anglican clergy followed to a large degree, opposed the central tenets of Protestantism which held that through the Bible alone a man could find Salvation. Man could have faith well enough without the prying eyes of the clergy instructing him on the proper manner of religion and the enforcement of penal codes because of a lack of conformity to the official religion. These types of statements suggest the radical nature of the author that appears synonymous with Johnson’s later writings on religion and the criticisms leveled against Catholic clergy. The similarities between the two pamphlets makes it likely that Johnson indeed held the ‘Learned Pen’ that composed this pamphlet. The radicalism of

\textsuperscript{125} A Learned Pen, \textit{A sensible Discourse Shewing the Unreasonableness and Mischief of Impositions in the Matters of Religion}. (London: R. Baldwin, 1687), 10.
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the writing only increased as the deposition of James II drew near. Constant anti-Catholic propaganda appeared in Baldwin’s print shop to hasten the destruction of James’ reputation against the coming Protestant William III.

While historians depict Baldwin as a Whig printer and many of his associates wrote influential Whig tracts, Baldwin printed pamphlets that countered the radical beliefs of Ferguson, Johnson, and other Whigs. During the Exclusion Crisis, a political faction led by Sir William Coventry and George Savile, the Marquis of Halifax, wedged itself between the pro-Royalist ideology of the Tories and the Exclusionist beliefs of the Whigs. Known as the Trimmers, these politicians and intellectuals, according to Nicholas von Maltzhan, desired a limited monarchy. Parliament would bind Catholic monarchs to uphold the ancient constitution, while at the same time rule without the fear of dissent from radical politicians in the government. Several pamphlets written throughout the 1680s helped define Trimming philosophy in terms of political and religious identity, one of the most important being *The Character of a Trimmer*, written by Halifax in December of 1689, right during the throes of the deposition of James II.

Halifax positions the Trimmers between the Whigs and the Tories as he argued “We in England, by a happy use of the Controversie, conclude [the Whigs and Tories] both in the wrong…that Monarchy leaveth them no Liberty, and Commonwealth…allows them no quiet.” Halifax understood that the two extremes of the Whigs and the Tories only caused dissent in England. The monarch could not have absolute power, Halifax agreed with the rhetoric of the time that republican thought threatened the stability of the
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country. Instead, Halifax wrote that “the King and Kingdom ought to be one Creature, not be separated in their political Capacity”\textsuperscript{129} and that the Trimmers were friends “to Parliaments, notwithstanding all their faults, and excesses.”\textsuperscript{130} He saw the relationship between king and Parliament as necessary, but that the two needed to balance each other and through coming to this idealistic compromise the political problems surrounding James II’s reign would disappear. The compromising and idealistic nature of the Trimmers earned the faction ire from both the Whigs and the Tories. Whigs such as Shaftesbury accused Halifax as being dangerously republican-minded while the Court refused to honor the Trimmers’ pleas for compromise, thus creating the political deadlock that lasted throughout the late seventeenth century.

Issues of religion also entered into the structuring of Trimmer ideology, which did not seek to create any religious understanding between the Anglican majority and the Catholic and Dissenting population. Halifax argued that the Trimmers were “far from approving the Hypocrisie which seemeth to be the reigning Voice amongst some of the Dissenting Clergy.”\textsuperscript{131} While at the same time believed that “if a Man would speak Maliciously of [Catholicism], one might say it is like a Disease, where as long as one drop of the Infection remains, there is still danger of having the whole Mass of Blood corrupted by it.”\textsuperscript{132} Both the Dissenters and the Catholics presented political problems for the country, the Dissenters because of their approval of republican thought and the Catholics for importing despotic political ideology from the Continent. However, Halifax
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wrote that these differences needed to be put aside for the political health of the country that “our Obedience is to be given to a Popish King in other things, at the same time at our Compliance with him in his Religion is to be deny’d.”

Unlike the Whigs, who saw James II’s Catholic beliefs as the paramount reason for his Exclusions, Halifax believed that religion had no influence on the nature of kingship and the duty of the people to obey the monarch. At the same time, he also believed that Catholicism and all types of Non-Conformity endangered the state. The inconsistent nature of the Trimmers made them unpopular among the premier political circles of Revolutionary England, but their rhetoric highlighted the shortcomings of Whig and Tory arguments after William became king.

English entrance into the Nine Years War required a restructuring of English finances that directly caused the creation of the Bank of England. While this war is rarely mentioned in textbooks, the Nine Years War and the deposition of James II allowed for the occurrences that helped transform England into a world power by the middle of the eighteenth century. The Jacobite claimants, in exile in France, still presented a threat to Williamite and later, Hanoverian, stability as James Francis Edward Stuart, the Old Pretender, and his son, Charles Edward, known as Bonnie Prince Charlie, attempted to reclaim their thrones. Charles Edward, the young prince, led by far the most successful attempt but forces under William, the Duke of Cumberland, the youngest son of George II, defeated the Jacobites at the Battle of Culloden in 1746. After the battle no other significant Jacobite attempts to retake the English throne occurred. Meanwhile, the
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Whigs maintained power in Parliament and became the dominant party in government during the beginning of the Hanoverian succession in the early eighteenth century. The Whigs enacted protocol making Protestant succession absolute and bringing in German relatives from Hanover to keep Catholic and therefore, French Jacobite influence out of England forever.

After Baldwin’s death, near the turn of the eighteenth century, his printing shop continued to flourish under the leadership of his wife. Abigail Baldwin became an influential printer and bookseller in her own right, publishing works by Daniel Defoe, economic journals, and the notorious newspaper, *Female Tatler*. When she died, John Roberts, Baldwin’s son-in-law, inherited the print house and it continued successfully for another fifty years.\(^{135}\)

Baldwin only appears briefly in contemporary historiography. He appears as a printer of seditious material in league with Samuel Johnson and Robert Ferguson, constantly in trouble with state authorities. He appears as a successful businessman who used Whig arguments and rhetoric to print controversial news that he knew would sell in the hostile atmosphere during the months surrounding the deposition of James II. Baldwin published tracts ranging from attacking French influence in the Jacobite court to bringing Anglicans and Non-Conformists together as friends, Melinda Zook argues that this wide range of publications occurred so that Baldwin could stay relevant in a changing economy. Nevertheless, this wide range of tracts showed the uniformity in what prominent and influential Whig writers argued to justify the claim of William III to the throne of England. While it may be impossible to have Baldwin speak in his own words, his politics and hopes for Revolutionary England become clear in the works of Ferguson,
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Johnson, and Strutton. He saw the threats to England coming in the form of widespread Catholicism and French influence and these themes arose repeatedly in his associates’ works. Baldwin did not write, but the outpouring of pamphlets from his shop shaped Whig rhetoric and English politics surrounding the Glorious Revolution adding to his influence and his ability to help shape the Revolution along with many printers and writers around him.
England’s Civil Wars in the middle part of the seventeenth century resulted in widespread political and social change. William of Orange, Stadholder of the Netherlands and the son-in-law to the English James II, landed an army west of London and forced James’s withdraw from the country at the behest of Whig radicals. William employed a brilliant propaganda campaign led by Whig writers like John Locke, Robert Ferguson, and Samuel Johnson, who depicted him as a just liberator freeing the country from tyranny. James, too, employed the propaganda machine through the writings of Roger L’Estrange, but women like Aphra Behn and Elinor James came to James’s rescue quickly and passionately in the war of words.

The presence of Behn in debates surrounding the Glorious Revolution illuminates the influence women had in shaping political dialogue through their writings and actions. Women on both sides of the ideological divide contributed to arguments in scaffold speeches, petitions, and poetry. Whig women attacked the Stuart monarchy because of
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136 Scaffold speeches, as the ones made by Alice Lisle and Elizabeth Gaunt were the last words either written by the women or transcribed for them by a witness before they were executed. A number of these appeared after the Monmouth Rebellion during the Bloody Assizes as James II made an example of traitors who posed a threat to his state building projects in 1685. Steven Pincus suggests that James
its political closeness to France and its tolerance of Catholicism. Tory writers countered by criticizing Whig and Protestant radicalism, questioning the legality of William’s kingship, and advocating for religious tolerance – often seen as one of the positive aspects of James’s reign. Women created a large corpus of political propaganda showing their involvement in a movement that is often seen as solely the sphere of men.

Women did not possess great political strength in the latter part of the seventeenth century. Even during the period of Queen Elizabeth I when various women had great influence over the thrones of England, Scotland, and France, men held true the ancient notions of Aristotle about women – that they had no place in public or political life.\footnote{Lois G. Schwoerer, “Women and the Glorious Revolution,” \textit{Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies} 18 (1986): 198.}

John Knox and other preachers of the sixteenth century further developed Aristotelian ideas regarding gender.\footnote{See: John Knox, \textit{The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women} (Geneva: J. Poullain and A. Rebul, 1558). John Knox showed his contempt for the idea of female rule in Britain when he exclaimed: “Amongst so many learned and men of grave judgement, as this day by Jesabel are exiled, none is found so stowte of courage, so faithful to God, nor loving to their natiue countrie, that they dare admonishe the inhabitants of that Ile how abominable before God, is the Empire or Rule of a wicked woman, yea of a traitoresses and bastard.”}

They argued that women’s emotional spontaneity and instability made them unfit to rule as queens and political leaders.\footnote{See: Sharon L. Jansen, \textit{The Monstrous Regiment of Women: Female Rulers in Early Modern Europe} (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2002). In her monograph, Jansen explained the European wide reaction against the idea of women holding positions of power. Much of her writing focuses on the late sixteenth century where women such as Elizabeth Tudor, Mary Stuart, and Marie de Guise held much power in England, France, and Scotland. This caused strong reactions from Evangelical preachers such as John Knox who saw women ruling as unnatural and detrimental to the social order.} Women challenged these ideas, whether through their actual political governance in the case of Elizabeth Tudor and Mary Stuart, or
intellectually, through the creation of women-led salons in France and Italy. Men, like Knox, even came to apologize for their harsh words against female statecraft, specifically during the reign of Elizabeth I. This showed that Knox and other preachers who railed against the Catholic Queen Mary I and approved of the Protestant Elizabeth most likely had concerns over issues of religion rather than gender. Yet, while women held important positions in the household and managed property, men still controlled the avenues to power and influence in society. These traditional mindsets played an important role in shaping Stuart attitudes toward women within English politics.

Lois Schowerer argues that the Stuart kings affected the development of women’s position in society in a negative way. Throughout the seventeenth century, the ideal of the learned lady declined as the Stuart kings had no place for women of intellectual capacity at their courts. Schowerer looked specifically at the libertine nature of Whitehall during the reign of Charles II. Salon culture did not travel from Paris to England until the eighteenth century and women’s academies focused on superficial activities such as dancing and learning a smattering of French. Even as the government bureaucracy expanded, posts did not open up for women whether in the royal court or in Parliament. Peeresses could no longer sit in the House of Lords as occurred in the fourteenth century. James II did not employ women as Charles II had done with Aphra Behn in the 1660s. This analysis by Schwoerer, however, is extremely myopic. It fails to take into account the other avenues women took to influence political policy. Women of the court, such as the queen, the princesses, the mistresses of the king, and the wives of prominent
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nobleman all had access to political players during the twilight period of the Stuart monarchy. The presence of women in court life showed that they possessed education and had political acumen in which they left their own footprints on political and social policy.

Women of the lower and middling classes, too, were not as restricted in their abilities to join social discussions. Most men lacked real political influence whether due to a lack of literacy or wealth. Royal and Parliamentary politics remained arenas for the wealthy, but this did not stop women from speaking their opinions. Printers’ wives, female playwrights, and actresses cultivated discussions of civic self-consciousness. Political agency in the seventeenth century was a matter of class.\textsuperscript{142} This advances the idea that female pamphleteers cared more about religious and political loyalties than to loyalties to women on the other side of the ideological divide.

That is not to say that the Stuart monarchy provided an arena in which women could flourish as thinkers and writers, the historiographical case of Aphra Behn alone showed that women were only compared critically to other women.\textsuperscript{143} The recent revival

\textsuperscript{142} While Schewoerer and other historians correctly argue that among the polemics of the Glorious Revolution written by women, the issue of gender appeared sparse; arguments about gender and women’s place in society were alive and well. With the publishing of misogynist dialogues in pamphlets such as those written by John Knox and Joseph Swetnam, women wrote their own responses, arguing for their place in society. As Katherine Henderson and Barbara Henderson argue, the changing structure of Renaissance England, a society becoming based on the urban and commercial, saw a feminist rhetoric develop. Writers like Jane Anger identified the disparities between men and women in writing “Our good toward [men] is the destruction of ourselves; we, being well formed, are by them fouly deformed…we are contrary to men because they are contrary to that which is good.” This rhetoric continued well into the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries with figures like Mary Astell and Mary Wollstonecraft. Women never ignored their station in English society, but during pamphlet wars of the Revolution, women like Behn, James, and Curtis believed their efforts as well as their financial well-being were better focused on issues of religion and politics than gender. See: Katherine Usher Henderson and Barbara F. McManus, \textit{Half Humankind} (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1985), 4; Jane Anger, \textit{Her Protection for Women} (London: Richard Lowe and Thomas Orwin, 1589), 5.

in interest in women’s writing and their influence on the shaping of political dialogue in
the Glorious Revolution has changed how historians have perceived this period. No
longer are Englishwomen of the seventeenth century seen as political non-entities but,
rather, as vital players in political change and proponents of revolutionary ideas.

The issue of women’s status as a unified gender, however, rarely appeared in the
writings of women of any social class. Aristocratic women were already secure in their
social power and saw a greater connection to women of their own class than to women
married to laborers and artisans.144 This was not only a matter for women. Men of the
gentry, too, were secure in their political power and influence and cared little for the
plight of the lower classes. Only when the London mob grew out of control during
political crises did the aristocracy seek to please the lower classes out of fear of repeating
the disasters of the Civil War and medieval peasant revolts.

Women writers of the middle and lower classes wrote repeatedly on matters of
political importance concerning the monarchy instead of the status of women in England.
In their writings they emphasized themes of peace, harmony, and justice in society, but
never the hope of gender equality with men.145 Their primary hopes came in improving
their own lots in society rather than draw parallels with wealthy women. They instead
saw solidarity within their religious beliefs whether Nonconformist, Catholic, or
Anglican, or found connections in their political ideology. Women such as Elinor James
wrote petitions to law makers and more prominent printers like Aphra Behn and Abigail
Baldwin printed pamphlets or wrote satires about the Stuart political environment.
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Among the issues that women addressed in their pamphlets, speeches, and petitions, religion appears more frequently used than in writings by Whig and Tory men. This makes sense considering that religion was one of the few issues about which women could freely write. Whereas men could comment freely on any topic, women were limited in subject matter and so had to present their views within socially accepted parameters. Religion, because of the traditions established by the Nonconformist sects in the mid-seventeenth century, was one such area. Religious organizations such as the Quakers allowed women to speak freely at services and Millennial groups like the Fifth Monarchists included women in their leadership. Some women, such as Anna Trapnell who became famous through her writings and prophecies, garnered the attention of government officials. By the late seventeenth century, the conservative backlash that followed the Rye House Plot and the breakdown of the Whig faction in Parliament harmed the social standing of the Nonconformists. The number of sects dropped drastically by the reign of James II compared to the number that existed during the Civil War. Outspoken women, such as Trapnell, became more marginalized. The lack of Nonconformist sects did not deter women from writing and speaking out. Women used religion as a tactic to justify their political arguments.

The use of religion to argue against policies enacted by James II appeared frequently in Whig scaffold speeches. Men and women about to be executed used powerful imagery of religious judgment and revelation in their final testimonies. Whig printers jumped at the opportunity to print the final words of the condemned in order to
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further engage in strong political rhetoric against the monarchy. Well before Elizabeth Gaunt and Alice Lisle had their words published and used against James II, anti-Papist propagandists gathered the last words and deeds of martyrs killed by Queen Mary I in the sixteenth century in *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*. The speeches of Gaunt and Lisle decried the king’s religious beliefs and defended their Protestant and Whig loyalties.

Alice Lisle was one of the first influential women executed by the Stuart government after the Monmouth rebellion. She was executed for sheltering rebels running from royal authorities after rebel defeat at the Battle of Sedgemoor. Her speech appeared in *The Dying Speeches of Several Excellent Persons, who Suffered for their Zeal against Popery; and Arbitrary Government* in 1689, along with speeches given by other famous Whigs such as William, Lord Russell, and Algernon Sidney, the conspirators of the Rye House Plot of 1683. Appearing after the dethronement of James II, the pamphlet served as a way to further justify the decision of the Whigs. The speeches emphasize the righteousness of Whig Protestant martyrs in contrast to a despotic Catholic regime. Writings like these influenced the public to support the new Williamite regime that was just beginning to cement its power.

The pamphlet does not list a printer, but it appeared as part of the Whig project to construct a Whig martyrology that paralleled the ones constructed after the Marian burnings in the sixteenth century. Lisle’s inclusion is indicative of the propaganda value of her words, especially her inclusion with prominent Whigs like Russell and Sidney.
Lisle focused on Catholic influence in the royal court, stating that she died with her faith strong in the “Reformed Religion; always being instructed in the Belief that if Popery should return to this nation, it would be a great Judgment.” Lisle warned that, because James II was Catholic, he endangered the country spiritually as well as morally. The king was traditionally responsible for the spiritual well-being of his people, so a king whose religious practices damned his own soul also threatened the salvation of his subjects. William, because of his Protestant beliefs, did not endanger the religious and moral future of England. Whig pamphleteers willingly used this idea to present James as dangerous so long as he had remained on the throne and that he and his heirs could not be allowed the chance to return.

Lisle, however, believed that reconciliation might have been possible if James had gave up his incorrect beliefs. She stated “I pray God he may Reign in Peace and that the True Religion may Flourish under him.” Not all Whigs supported forced abdication and this dialogue that James II had that chance to change his religious beliefs and spiritual loyalties furthered the idea that the Whigs made the correct choice. Without exiling James II from England, the country could not have diverted from the path of religious damnation and political despotism. This talk of reconciliation is a common theme in other martyr writings such as that of Elizabeth Gaunt. Given the disagreement that Whigs faced on the deposition of James in the Convention Parliament of 1688 and 1689, it is no surprise that the martyrs had similar cautious tones.
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Elizabeth Gaunt’s scaffold speech paralleled Lisle’s in many themes when she was executed in the latter months of 1688. By the time of her execution, Gaunt had risen to prominence among the Whigs in large part because she was instrumental in getting Whig radicals relocated from England to the Protestant havens in the Netherlands. These actions drew the attention of royal spies and Gaunt’s association with the conspirators of the Rye House Plot sealed her fate. She was immediately arrested, convicted for treason, and sentenced to death by burning. In her speech, she forged an image of herself as a Whig martyr by using religious language to blast the government. Gaunt quoted Scripture:

> Hide the outcasts, betray not him that wandreth; be thou a comfort to them from the face of the spoiler…but men say, you must give them up, or you shall die for it; know who to obey, judge ye; so that I have cause to rejoice, and be exceedingly glad, that I suffer for righteousness sake.

Gaunt tied Christian morality to Whig political ideology. Her support of fleeing Whig radicals from the pressures of the state became a Christian act of sheltering the weak and oppressed. Whig readers readily saw a parallel of the Stuart monarchy’s oppression of the Whigs to Roman oppression over the early Christians. Just as early Christian martyrs sacrificed their lives for the Truth, Whigs portrayed those executed by the state for their cause as sacrificing their lives for the truth. Thus, Gaunt is depicted as suffering happily because her death fully illuminated the despotic nature of the Stuart regime and gave the Whigs a reason for continued dissent after Monmouth’s defeat.
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In keeping with her Christian idealism, Gaunt offered James reconciliation and the ability to save the monarchy from the wrath of God. She stated that:

I leave it to him, who is the avenger of all such wrong who will tread upon Princes as upon mortar...know this...that tho you are seemingly fixed, and because of the power in your hands, are weighing out your violence...unless you can secure Jesus Christ...you can never...accomplish your enterprises.\textsuperscript{153}

Gaunt attacked the philosophy of royal divine right when she acknowledged that James’s position on the throne was fixed and unmovable. She makes it clear that it is God who places a king on the throne, and if that king disobeys God’s laws then God can revoke that right of kingship. This immediately delegitimized James’s kingship and made him vulnerable to Whig attacks. James’ adherence to Catholicism made him little better than a heathen in Gaunt’s eyes, he did not hold the right to call upon God for legitimacy unless he converted to Protestantism. The language of her speech delivered a powerful warning to James II. Whig printers immediately seized upon Gaunt and her story, enhancing her image within the Whig movement. Her words became available in both English and Dutch in several publications.\textsuperscript{154} Women like Gaunt and Lisle existed as more than just religious martyrs, their words spoke from a lens of political activism that pushed them beyond mere religious figures into women who shaped political argument in the years leading up to the Glorious Revolution, in the case of Gaunt, and influencing events after the deposition of James II, in the case of Lisle.
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Political participation through religious rhetoric could only create so much vocal power for women. Though Gaunt and Lisle definitely had some impact on the dialogue created during the Revolutionary period, their scant publication of written works kept them from obtaining a more noticeable position in the historiography of the era. Women across the social spectrum developed ways beyond those linked to religious beliefs to make their voices heard by men in power and by the masses. This was a necessary step for women who could not directly influence ideological debates within the Court or in Parliament. Women of the gentry no doubt had concerns over ideological loyalty but more often were driven to express themselves, verbally as well as in writing, out of concern for their families, husbands, or personal reputation. Aristocratic women knew that their voices held sway, because of either personal wealth or their connections to powerful men, and they could influence their husbands to enact change in London.\textsuperscript{155}

Whig printers in London and across England were of great importance to William of Orange in convincing the English people the villainy of James II’s reign. Once in power, William’s propaganda machine continued to churn out pamphlets. These pamphlets emphasized William’s accomplishments and Whig ideology while berating James for his policies as king and for fleeing to France. Only a handful of women participated in the printing industry at the end of the seventeenth century. Seventy-five of the roughly seventeen-hundred booksellers in London were women.\textsuperscript{156} Nevertheless, those women who did manage to excel in the printing world published pamphlets of high
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quality and excellent argument. Jane Curtis, for example, printed various pamphlets that got her into trouble with state authorities for her views on religion, national identity, and political oppression.

In 1689, after James II fled London, Curtis published the *Orange Gazette*. She discredited James through his associations with the French along with playing on a national mistrust of Catholicism. She stated that on February 28, 1689 in France “the French King set forward from Versailles, accompanied with the abdicated king of England…taking with him [to Normandy]…his ablest engineers, to strengthen and build forts on the coast, to prevent…any Descent, which he fears will be made upon the country.”157 The writing is pure propaganda. While Louis XIV may have visited the Norman coast in the late winter of 1689, the choice of words show Curtis’s ideological loyalty to the Whigs. She described James II as an abdicated king. The Convention Parliament argued over the nature of his leaving the country. The Whigs favored the term ‘abdication’ to show James’s abandonment of his country, compared to the Tories who argued William unlawfully deposed James. The description of Louis and James traveling together only makes the image of James more deplorable. Curtis aptly includes the idea that Louis feared an allied Protestant invasion of France in order to depict him as afraid of retribution for his conquests in earlier years.

In destroying James’s reputation and image, Whig printers often focused on the issues of Popery that still existed in English society. She continually engaged in negative reminders to her readers of the inexcusable connection between Catholics and the Pope. The printers put forth the idea that as long as Catholics were allowed to live openly in
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England there would always be a threat to state security. Curtis emphasized the mistrust of the Catholics in England when she wrote that in Birmingham on February 14 in 1689, that being the Market Day:

Mrs. Richardson…bought…butter off a Popish Woman Higler, Tenant to our late Popish High Sheriff – and carrying the same home to expend in the family…perceiving it discolored with yellow and green spots, showed it to an Apothecary, who was of the opinion it was poysoned.\textsuperscript{158}

The painting of such a sensational scene accomplished two things for Curtis’s readers. It strengthened the anti-Catholic rhetoric spoken by the Whigs that every Catholic in the country threatened the peace and well-being of innocent Protestants. Papists existed in every facet of society and this became more dangerous when they infiltrated the upper echelons of government, whether that is as a local sheriff or as the king. Promulgating the idea of a direct Catholic threat to the country further damaged the reputation of James II and his Catholic beliefs. If the average Catholic was more than likely to poison Protestants, then a Catholic head of state could only inflict lasting national damage onto the entire population. Such arguments reignited memories of the religious intolerance under Mary I or the debates over religion surrounding the Civil War.

In addition to impugning James’ image and the reputation of all Catholics, Curtis strengthened William’s image and fostered continued support for the war against France. She stated that:

\textsuperscript{158} Ibid., 1
The Prince of Orange who has done such a glorious work for the British nation, by rescuing it from Popery and Slavery, will undoubtedly perform the like to France…uninslave the peasants, re-edifie the Protestant Churches, confirm the Edict of Nantes, and restore the true and ancient Gallican Liberties…the People of that Kingdom will, with the same assurance, endeavor to accomplish the Work, as those of England have done before them.159

Curtis wrote at length about the necessity for England to support William’s continental war against France. William needed the strength of the English navy to push back against the continual expansion of France. The objective of the war which Curtis presents to the English is decidedly Whig. Allied soldiers would transform France into a Protestant paradise in the model of England and the French people would welcome the English and their allies with open arms. This political change in France, which would make the country more open to Protestants, would stop the emigration of French Huguenots, reducing the fear of French spies in the country. Further, the outcome of such a war would influence members of Parliament and wealthy merchants to support the war and fund a potentially costly campaign.

Curtis further used the idea that a powerful bond existed between Protestant England and other regions opposed to France, whether Catholic or Protestant. Concerning Switzerland, she stated that “Both the Evangelick and Catholick Cantons are very Unanimous therein, Zurich having already gotten together 6000 men with cannon, their quota of forces, in a readiness to march upon the first occasion.”160 In order to galvanize support for the war, especially a war where England would fight alongside Catholic entities like Austria, the Whig propaganda machine showed the benefits of such a

159 Ibid., 1
160 Curtis, Orange Gazette, 2.
coalition. Curtis created a parallel of Protestant England allied with Catholic Austria through the different religious loyalties of the Swiss Cantons. These notions reflected a Europe that had changed dramatically since the end of the Thirty Years War. States fought for geopolitical supremacy over resources and trade, and their loyalties lay with those states with similar political ambitions instead of religious ideology. Curtis wrote to convince a country to support a war effort that superseded religious loyalty and focused on destroying England’s greatest political rival – France.

As the 1680s ended and Whig propaganda became more readily available in coffee houses and social clubs across London and the rest of England, Tory writers continued to publish in defense of the Stuart monarchy. Roger L’Estrange was the most prominent of the Tory pamphleteers of the late-Stuart era, but alongside his scathing criticisms of Whig ideology various Tory women wrote to galvanize popular support for James II and his reforms. Elinor James and Aphra Behn questioned the legality of the Dutch invasion, defended to some degree the principles of religious toleration, and sought to inspire critical discussions on the nature of Whig sensationalism surrounding the Popish Plot. These women represented the reactionary movements to Whig writers who often become the focus for historians researching the Glorious Revolution.

Historians have paid a great deal of attention to Aphra Behn since historiographical shifts began including actresses and female playwrights as having as much social sway as their male counterparts. Behn sculpted a complicated figure for herself in the years before the Glorious Revolution. She first served as a spy for Charles II early on in his reign. Then throughout the 1670s and 1680s she wrote a series of plays and stories that illustrated themes on race in early modern Europe, radical politics in
England, and the present state of the monarchy. Some, like *Oroonoko* achieved critical acclaim and cemented Behn’s place as one of the renowned writers of seventeenth century England, or at least one that drew criticism from playwrights like Dryden and writers like Samuel Johnson.¹⁶¹ She also produced a number of pamphlets during the Revolutionary period that displayed her passion for the Tories.

Behn took aim at several national issues in the months surrounding the Revolution such as the rise of Whig radicalism after the Popish Plot and the boldness of the Whigs in inviting William of Orange to England.¹⁶² Some of her rhetoric, especially concerning the royal family before the deposition, used religious themes to strengthen the ideas of divine right pertaining to James II. She reinforced these themes in her *Congratulatory Poem to her Most Sacred Majesty*, written for Queen Mary of Modena after the birth of the Prince of Wales. She stated about the Prince’s birth that “Adoring Princes shall arrive from afar, / Informed by Angels, guided by the star.”¹⁶³ Behn made obvious parallels between the Prince of Wales’s birth and that of Christ, which in turn enhanced the Tory rhetoric of the time. The Prince’s birth became a new Nativity and thus gave the royal offspring legitimacy based on this correlation to Christ. Such rhetoric also reinforced the nation of the divine right of kings. Behn saw him as the irrefutable heir and that arguing otherwise was akin to questioning the legitimacy of the monarchy but the legitimacy of Christ Himself. Unfortunately, for Behn, William and the Whigs had different interpretations of the legitimacy of James II’s child.

---


¹⁶³ Aphra Behn, *A Congratulatory to her Most Sacred Majesty, Universal Hopes of all Loyal Persons for a Prince of Wales* (Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1688), 4
The national paranoia surrounding the Popish Plot heavily influenced Behn’s writing. Her works reflect her belief that the political and moral stability of the country had splintered since the Plot and the Exclusion Crisis. In her *Poem to Sir Roger L’Estrange*, applauding him for his continual defense of the Stuart monarchy, Behn accused the Whigs of causing:

Fraud and Flattery first in Courts began / And thence assum’d by all the Race of Man: / Grave Judges, Church-men, and whole Senates now / Ev’ Laws and Gospel, were corrupted too. / By these misled, the restless People Range. Into a Thousand Errors, New and Strange.¹⁶⁴

According to Behn the original accusations made by men like Titus Oates caused mass paranoia to sweep over the country and destroyed the structure of law, allowing chaos to reign. Many Catholics were killed, such as the Earl of Strafford, simply because of the fear Whigs perpetuated about Catholics to the London mob. Writing this poem in 1688, Behn saw parallels between the Whig fears of James II establishing a Catholic dynasty and the paranoia about Catholics during the Plot. Religious fear, she reasoned, would turn the people and the courts against the rightful king.

Her accusations that the “Inspir’d Rabble, now wou’d Monarchs Rule, and Government was turn’d to Ridicule: / No Majestrates, no Order, was Obey’d, / But New Club Laws; by Knaves and Villains trade.”¹⁶⁵ Behn strongly associated divine right associated with the English monarchy and thought it wrong for English subjects to say they had the authority to decide who should be monarch. She laid blame squarely on the creation of the Whig political movement, going back to the foundation of the Green
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Ribbon Club, because it allowed radicals to come together and subversively plot against the monarchy. L’Estrange, according to Behn, combatted the constant appearance of Whig propaganda throughout the 1680s and helped defend James II against a slew of attacks.

Behn found herself on the wrong side of the political divide after the Revolution. To help alleviate her situation, she produced *Poem of Sir Roger L’Estrange*. The pamphlets *A Pindaric Poem to the Reverend Doctor Burnet* and *A Congratulatory Poem to her Sacred Majesty Queen Mary upon her Arrival in England* showed Behn’s words more subdued, yet still possessing a Tory bite. Both poems illustrated Behn’s doubts about the legitimacy of William III as king and her belief that exiling James II would have disastrous effects on the country, as they most assuredly had disastrous effects on her. In her *Pindaric Poem*, addressed to one of the most influential Whig propagandists, Bishop Gilbert Burnet, Behn mirrored the coming of William III to England with the Greeks invading Troy:

> When the wiser Greeks o’er came their Foes, / it was not by the Barbarous Force of Blows. / When a long Ten Years Fatal War had fail’d, / With luckier Wisdom they at last assail’d, / Wisdom and Counsel which alone prevail’d. / Not all their Numbers the Fam’d Town could win, / ‘Twas Nobler Stratagem that let the Conqueror in. \[166\]

On the surface, Behn’s words appeared to congratulate William on his ability to avoid bloodshed in his bid for the English throne. She further likened William and his Whig allies as the triumphant Greeks compared to the unwise and unfortunate James II who mirrored King Priam and his Trojan followers. This is illustrative of the critical attitude she possessed where James II and the Tories were concerned. While she supported them,

\[166\] Aphra Behn, *A Pindaric Poem to the Reverend Doctor Burnet, on the Honour he did me of Enquiring after me and my Muse*. (London: Richard Baldwin, 1689), 7.
she also questioned their abilities to act successfully against Whig challenges.\textsuperscript{167} It also suggested she felt abandoned by both the Tory movement and the Stuart monarchy when they capitulated to William. However, Behn still strongly criticized William and the Whigs since they relied on treachery and trickery to force James off the throne.

Her attack on William appeared more direct at the end of the poem as she said “Great Nassau shall in your Annals live / To all Futurity. / Your Pen shall more Immortalize his Name, / Than even his Own Renown’d and Celebrated Fame.”\textsuperscript{168} Behn poked fun at both William and his most faithful propagandist. She argued that the propagandists like Burnet and other Whigs had done more to propagate William’s name than the king’s own accomplishments. This showed the disdain that Behn held for the Dutch leader and the doubt she had that William would lead England into a period of prosperity. Similar to some Whigs like Ferguson, and many of the Tories, who favored the idea of Mary ruling alone, Behn wrote \textit{A Congratulatory Poem to her Sacred Majesty Queen Mary} that emphasized her hope for Mary to rule because of the natural legitimacy she possessed. Behn heaped accolades on Mary when she exclaimed:

\begin{quote}
All Hail Illustrious Daughter of a King, / Shining without and Glorious all within, / Whose Eyes beyond for scantier Power give Laws / Command the Word, and justifie the Cause, / Nor to secure your Empire needs more Arms. Than your resistless all Conquering Charms.\textsuperscript{169}
\end{quote}

Given that the Convention Parliament of 1689 could not easily decide whether James II had abdicated or that he had been deposed by the Dutch invasion, Mary provided the

\textsuperscript{167} Todd, “Introduction,” 11.
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\textsuperscript{169} Aphra Behn, \textit{A Congratulatory Poem to her Sacred Majesty Queen Mary, upon her arrival in England} (London: R.E., 1689), 4.
easiest and most calming transition for the monarchy. Behn believed Mary was the logical choice for Queen Regent, not only because of her biological ties to James II, but also because Behn believed her better fit to heal the kingdom after the Revolution. She included wording that not only spoke to Mary’s legitimate claim to the throne but emphasized the queen’s feminine features such as her eyes, her charms, and her command of speech, suggesting that Behn understood the need to include gendered rhetoric in her political writings. Portraying Mary in a purely political light risked exposing her to criticism and detracting from the issue of legitimacy.

In many ways, Behn’s poems to Queen Mary and Burnet signified her own capitulation. With the fall of James II and the exile or dishonor of many Tories like L’Estrange, Behn saw her own future as a professional writer threatened. In a *Congratulatory Poem to her Sacred Majesty Queen Mary*, Behn argued that only Mary’s ascension to queenship could allow her to remain a viable Tory propagandist. She lamented that:

\[
\text{Thro’ the thick Shade cou’d dart no Cheerful Ray / Nature dwelt here as in disdain of Day...All of a suddain thro’ the Woods there Rung, Loud Sounds of Jay that to Peans Sung. / Maria! Blest Maria! Was the Theam, / Great Britans happy Genius, and her Queen.}^{170}
\]

For Tories like Behn, only through Mary’s queenship could they hope to remain relevant in the new regime. Mary offered a chance for the Tories to stay relevant as they clung to the last vestiges of the old regime. However, when William became king, the Whigs controlled Parliament and maintained their hold on the outpouring of propaganda in the press. She exclaimed to Burnet in *A Pindaric Poem* that her capitulation was final. “Like

---
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the Excluded Prophet stand, / The Fruitful Happy Soil can only see, / But I am forbid by
Fates Decree / To share the Triumph of the joyful Victory.” With the triumph of the
Whigs, Behn could not hope to remain relevant on the stage or in the market place with
strong Tory views. It would have been difficult enough for a man to do so, but it was
virtually impossible for a woman. Much like other radicals in the early 1680s, she needed
to shift her focus if she were to stay influential either politically or culturally. The
pamphleteers of the 1690s, however, would not get to see how Behn would shape her
political opinions on the new government. She died in 1689 and did not receive historical
attention in the same light as seventeenth century playwrights like Marvell, until the
feminist shift in studying history occurred in the late-twentieth century. Still, during the
last months of her life, Behn believed she was forever separated from the mass political
movement happening in England.

While not as widely known as Aphra Behn, Elinor James enjoyed a much longer
period of activity, lasting from the beginning of the 1680s to her death in 1715. She
produced a bevy of works on topic concerning religion, commercialism, and politics, and
became quite popular as a printer among the literate of London. James’ detail for
sensationalism and tackling controversial subjects made her both influential to Tory
supporters and dangerous to Whig radicals who enjoyed power after the deposition of
James II. Whereas Whig writers embraced the idea of deposing James II quickly and
giving the throne to some combination of the king’s daughter and son-in-law, Elinor
James drew parallels between the Glorious Revolution and the execution of Charles I in

the mid-seventeenth century. She argued in *An Injur’d Prince Vindicated* that “A King he was, and from a King he came, / A Slaughter’d King, to Whigs Eternal Shame. / Nor can the Poison of their Lying Lips, / His Sacred Names and Harmless Life eclipse. / His Pious Memory will Fame out-live; / Justice and Truth his Character shall give.” The execution of Charles I continued to tarnish all ideas about republican forms of government decades after the end of the Civil War. Whig radicals like Ferguson and Locke, who argued against the sanctity of kings, created an easy target for James to attack. The execution of Charles I and the deposition of James II, according to Elinor James, were one in the same. It violated the honored status of the king. She painted the Whigs of the Glorious Revolution in the same negative light as the radicals of the Civil War.

The sanctity of kingship and royal ties to God arose as a theme throughout James’s pamphlets, in spite of James II’s Catholic beliefs. She firmly believed in the idea of obedience to the king even if religious ideology posed a problem. James argued in *Mrs. James’s Advice to the Citizens of London* that since the people knew that “God cannot contradict himself, therefore it is his Will that the King should be safe; for he hath declared, That none should touch his Anointed, nor do his Prophets any harm; and altho the King is gone, yet God remains.” James extended the idea to the people of London that while James II followed an incorrect religious ideology, the sheer fact that he ascended to kingship negated any theory that the people could chose a different king. Thus, by doing so, the Whigs would contradict God’s will and design on the universe.

---
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James did not forget to include a plug for herself against the volatile nature of the mob and politics that those supporting the king should not be harmed. Still, she did not approve of the king’s Catholic leanings and in various other pamphlets warned of the dangers of having Catholic beliefs in a Protestant country.

When the threat of the Dutch invasion loomed large over the country, James wrote a pamphlet addressed to James II called *Dear Sovereign*, entreat ing him to follow her advice to save the kingdom. She wrote:

> All men in general are willing to fight for your Majesty; but your Majesty cannot blame us if we are not willing to fight for Rome, because they own such Doctrine as Christ and his Disciples never taught…Rome darkens your Glory, and the fear of Popery has been the sole Cause of all our Differences; I do not condemn all Roman Catholicks, for I really think that there is Brave and Worthy Men amongst them that will be precious in God’s fight.  

James believed that the majority of the country would still fight for James II as the rightful monarch, but the great division that remained because of his Catholicism prevented the country from rising up against the Whigs and their desire to bring William III to England. If James II would convert to Protestantism then, the writer argued, that there would be no reason for the Revolution to occur. But similar to the rhetoric of the Whig scaffold speeches, which offered reconciliation, she did not condemn the Catholics, which showed some approval of James II’s ideas of toleration to the Catholics. While individual subjects might believe in incorrect doctrine it was nevertheless improper for a king to embrace the wrong religion.

---
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She further argued that the very troubles England faced could be divinely inspired saying that:

It was the Will of God, to suffer His Majesty to incline towards Rome, that he might be as an Angel to try our Sincerity, and that the Errors of Rome might have a Total Overthrow...and the King to be the Happy Instrument of Uniting our Differences...can convince my Sovereign Lord, and make him more Zealous for the Protestant Religion than ever he was for Rome.\(^{176}\)

James illuminated the religious and theoretical beliefs that the country was going through so much religious strife because of the king’s choice of religion. The religious conflict, according to James, came from divine judgment as a way to mend the differences between Protestants and Catholics that divided the English kingdom. If Protestants could learn to accept a Catholic king and if that Catholic king could refrain from installing Catholic beliefs on the country, all would prosper in her view. James still argued that if at the end of all this turmoil the king would convert it would lead to greater success and create a true Anglican paradise.

Even in the restrictive environment of the late-Stuart era, women played a pivotal role in enhancing political dialogue on both sides of the ideological divide. Female pamphleteers, like their male counterparts, interacted with the public through their constant printing of broadsheets, petitions, and works of fiction and theatre. Most women writing at the end of the seventeenth century framed their arguments within the context of religion. This subject allowed them greater flexibility because the audience accepted religion as a subject where women still held influence. Female Whig women pamphleteers and printers used this religious rhetoric and their anger at James II and his supporters to frame their arguments. The scaffold speeches dictated by Gaunt and Lisle
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blasted James II for his incorrect loyalties to the Roman Catholic Church and condemned him for state suppression and execution of radicals during the Bloody Assizes. Similarly, Jane Curtis focused on religious sentiment in tying James’s actions to that of Louis XIV of France in comparison to the Protestant William of the Netherlands.

Elinor James, the Tory writer, also used religious themes, but from an apologist standpoint in trying to show that obedience outside of religion was important for the continual maintenance of the monarchy. Only Aphra Behn seemed to focus primarily on the political positives of the Stuart monarchy instead of delving into powerful religious rhetoric. Though fewer in number than male writers during the Glorious Revolution, women left a distinct presence on the political and cultural production of the period and not simply because they were women. Whig and Tory women created niches within which they could operate in seventeenth century English society. This guaranteed them not only an audience, but influence and the ability to argue for distinct political policy. Given that James fled England due to a series of desertions among key figures in his military and government, the Whig propaganda was more effective in creating change. However, while Behn died soon after the Revolution, Elinor James continued printing and writing into the eighteenth century as she became satirized as the Godmother of London. Polemics written by both men and women continued long after the Revolution and debated the future of the kingdom with every passing year. Whether they hampered or strengthened the Stuart monarchy, or convinced the English people to support or resist the new regime of William and Mary, women’s voices were an important part of the discourse.
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CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

In all the pamphlets analyzed between the long decade of the 1680s, a mistrust and fear of Catholicism and all things foreign emerged among the Whig writers. These chapters have traced how the Whig arguments made at the onset of the Exclusion Crisis did stay, for the most part, consistent with their original objective – the removal of James II from power. The arguments made by the anonymous writers of the *Articles of Treason and Misdemeanors* along with the other pamphlets about the mistresses showcase the fears of Whigs to the infiltration of Catholics into the monarchy. Catholic infiltration, especially on an intimate level in the case of Louise de Kerouaille, threatened to destroy the moral fabric of the state. Thus, James II presented a drastic problem for the Whigs and this problem only grew worse after the birth of James Edward Stuart, the Prince of Wales.

With the threat of a potential Catholic dynasty being established, the Whigs grew bolder in their attacks against the Stuart monarchy. Out of print shops, such as the one belonging to Richard Baldwin, Whig radicals wrote pamphlets that condemned James II and justified William III’s arrival in England. Their justification lay in William’s
Protestant leanings and the royal legitimacy that his wife, Mary II, gave him to claim the English throne. The fears of Catholics generated by men like Baldwin, Robert Ferguson, and Johnson, were also aided with the writing of Whig women like Elizabeth Gaunt, Alice Lisle, and Jane Curtis. Anti-Catholic and anti-French themes helped Whig pamphleteers construct an idea of what it meant to be English and Protestant. Tory writers like Aphra Behn and Elinor James countered with the argument that a level of sanctity existed within the institution of the monarchy. However, Elinor James, as a devout Anglican still could not justify the beliefs of James II. The Tory argument could not stand up against the radical Whigs and it would take several years for the Tories to regain their influence in popular opinion.

While extensive research has been done on pamphleteers and media during the late seventeenth century, several niches still exist among the subjects covered in this study that require greater exploration. Where Nell Gwyn, Barbara Villiers, and Louise de Kerouaille have been the subjects of various biographies and studies going back all the way to the mid-nineteenth century, mistresses like Hortense Mancini, ‘La Belle’ Stuart, and other minor women of the court lack much analysis. Future studies on the mistresses could reveal the dynamic roles that these other women played in galvanizing popular opinion in support or against the behavior of the crown. The topic of women printers, aside from Aphra Behn, who has received strong analysis by researchers like Janet Todd, could further the general understanding of the Glorious Revolution. Women such as Elinor James and Jane Curtis provide a lens into the understanding of women’s political and social contributions to the Glorious Revolution on both sides of the political divide.
Tapping further into the social and political contributions of the lesser known mistresses and women printers and pamphleteers will give a better understanding of the Glorious Revolution and the years surrounding the deposition.

The decade of the 1680s proved a transformative period where the changes in society and media in England contributed to the bloodless ousting of James II from power. Whig and Tory pamphleteers waged a war that spanned much of the latter part of the seventeenth century as they established the idea of what it meant to be an English Protestant in contrast to state enemies both foreign and domestic. The arguments made by the Whig pamphleteers galvanized popular opinion against the idea of a Catholic monarch who had friendly ties to Catholic France on the throne and spurred the people to action and approval of William III’s invasion and deposition of James II. Tory writers countered these arguments, albeit unsuccessfully, because of the fear that deposition and revolution would led to a dismantling of the monarchy. Without the pamphleteers, the aspirations of Whig politicians could never have come to fruition.
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